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The purpose of this investigation was to provide evidence for the proposition that when positive attitudes exist between the parties of the collective bargaining process labor peace exists.

Data were generated using the Walton and McKersie Attitude Structuring Model. The instrument used was a questionnaire prepared by Crandall (1976). Two-way ANOVA techniques were employed. Districts were designated by type of labor peace using criteria adopted from the Golden Studies of 1955. The sample population consisted of 30 school districts with 153 administrators, teachers, and board members responding to the instrument.

It was found that there were no interaction effects for the means of the types of respondents and the types of labor peace. Also, there were no significant differences in the scores of administrators, board members, and teacher association members.

The third null hypothesis relating to the type of labor peace was rejected at the .05 level. The districts designated as labor peace had significantly higher mean scores than the districts designated as no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace.

The following conclusions were drawn from the data analysis. Research Hypothesis 1 stated that differences existed among the
attitudes of the respondents and among the types of labor peace. The data from the present investigation could not support the acceptance of this position.

Research Hypothesis 2 stated that differences exist in the attitudes among the types of respondents. Data from this study did not support this position.

Research Hypothesis 3 stated that differences exist among the attitudes of the type of labor peace groups. Support for this position was generated from the data in this study.

Therefore, it is possible to designate school districts as labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace using the criteria adopted from the Golden Studies and this may be supported through Crandall's instrument. Therefore, based on the population used for this study, support was given to the proposition that there are differences in the attitudes corresponding to school districts designated as labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An expression of appreciation is deserved by many people including my family, associates, and colleagues. Without their interest, support, and encouragement this dissertation would never have been completed.

Dr. Carol Sheffer, Dr. Thomas Carey, and Dr. Jack Oatley have given of their time to make this dissertation a valuable project. Their expertise will always be appreciated.

Dr. Richard Munsterman, my advisor and committee chairperson, has given me unlimited support, encouragement, and time. His expertise has made this dissertation possible. His friendship will always be remembered and cherished.

Through the constant encouragement for an education, my parents, Eldon and Catherine Engel, gave me the personal determination to succeed. Their values helped to shape my life.

Finally, the encouragement and love of my immediate family deserve special recognition. My wife, Cathy, has kept our family together with her attention to many of my responsibilities. Her many hours of typing and making copies will always be remembered and appreciated. Her love and support through many difficult times has allowed us to grow as a family. My children, Jennifer (Jenny) and Jamie, have shown their love and support through their patience and understanding. It is to my family that I dedicate this dissertation.

Larry Eldon Engel
INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in “sectioning” the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University Microfilms International
300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Engel, Larry Eldon

Attitudes of Administrators, School Board Members, and Teachers Relating to Labor Peace

Western Michigan University

University Microfilms International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Ed.D. 1981
PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages ■
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print ■
3. Photographs with dark background ■
4. Illustrations are poor copy ■
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy ■
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page ■
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements ■
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine ■
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print ■
11. Page(s) ______ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) ______ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered ______. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages ■
15. Other ________________________________________________________________

University
Microfilms
International

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

## LIST OF TABLES

## LIST OF FIGURES

### CHAPTER

#### I  THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

- Introduction ..................................... 1
- Underlying Discussion .......................... 5
- Current Status of Bargaining in Michigan ..... 6
- Statement of the Problem ....................... 7
- Significance of the Study ..................... 9
- Overview of Dissertation ..................... 10

#### II  REVIEW OF LITERATURE

- Overview ........................................ 11
- History ......................................... 12
- Conflict Within Group Relations ............. 13
- Positive Relations and Conflict ............. 15
- Labor Peace ................................... 17
- Model of Labor Peace .......................... 21
- Public Sector Bargaining ..................... 23
- Summary ....................................... 29

#### III  METHODOLOGY

- Introduction ................................... 30
- Purpose ......................................... 30
- Population and Sample ....................... 31

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table of Contents—Continued

| CHAPTER | Validation for Identification Instrument | 32 |
|         | Validation for CAST Questionnaire         | 33 |
|         | Data Gathering Procedures                 | 35 |
|         | Data Analysis                             | 35 |
|         | Hypotheses                                | 36 |
|         | Summary                                   | 37 |
| IV      | FINDINGS                                  | 38 |
|         | Introduction                              | 38 |
|         | Description of the Survey Response        | 38 |
|         | Demographics of Districts and Participants | 44 |
|         | Analysis of the Null Hypotheses           | 50 |
|         | Summary                                   | 66 |
| V       | SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 69 |
|         | Introduction                              | 69 |
|         | Summary of the Study                      | 69 |
|         | Summary of the Findings                   | 72 |
|         | Limitations and Conclusions               | 73 |
|         | Implications                              | 77 |
|         | Recommendations                            | 79 |
| APPENDICES | Credentials of Judges                  | 82 |
| A       | Survey for Identification of Labor Peace  | 84 |
| B       | Criberia for Designation of Labor Peace   | 87 |
Table of Contents—Continued

APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Letter to Intermediate Superintendents</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Supportive Letter to Intermediate Superintendents</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Designation Survey for Labor Peace</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Cover Letter to Superintendents</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Supportive Letter to Superintendents</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Cover Letter to Teacher Association Presidents</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Supportive Letter to Teacher Association Presidents</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Second Letter to Superintendents</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Second Letter to Teacher Association Presidents</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nonrespondents to Surveys</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Crandall Attitude Scale Test (CAST) Questionnaire</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Comments From CAST Instrument</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIBLIOGRAPHY                                                                 | 120  |
LIST OF TABLES

1. Participation of Districts by Labor Peace, No Labor Peace, and Neither Labor Peace Nor No Labor Peace (Between) .............................................. 41

2. Participation of Respondents by Labor Peace, No Labor Peace, and Neither Labor Peace Nor No Labor Peace (Between) ..................................... 42

3. The number of Possible Participants Compared To the Total Population for Each Category .............................................. 43

4. Statements Given by School Districts That Were Nonparticipants by Frequency and Type of Labor Peace ................................................................. 45

5. Frequency, Percentage, and Respondent Position by Years of Collective Bargaining Experience ................................................................. 45

6. Frequency, Percentage, and Type of Labor Peace for Respondents by Years of Collective Bargaining Experience ................................................................. 46

7. Frequency, Percentage, and Respondent Position by Size of the District ................................................................. 48

8. Frequency, Percentage, and Type of Labor Peace for Respondents by the Size of the Districts ................................................................. 49

9. Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Total Scores of Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace ................................................................. 52

10. Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for Total Scores ................................................................. 54

11. Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Cooperation Scores by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace ................................................................. 55

12. Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Cooperation Scores ................................................................. 57

13. Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Friendliness Scores by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace ................................................................. 58

vi
List of Tables—Continued

14. Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Friendliness Scores ........................................... 60

15. Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Legitimacy Scores by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace .................................................. 61

16. Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Legitimacy Scores ........................................... 63

17. Two-way Analysis of Variance: Reported Trust Scores by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace .................................................. 64

18. Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Trust Scores ........................................... 66
LIST OF FIGURES

1. Attitudinal Structuring Components .............. 3
2. Intermediate School Districts in Lower Michigan .... 40
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

Introduction

Labor peace and its causes were identified by Golden through the work conducted by the National Planning Association (NPA) from 1947 to 1953. Golden defined labor peace as:

The product of the relationship between two organized groups—industrial management and organized labor—in which both coexist, with each retaining its institutional sovereignty, working together in a reasonable harmony in a climate of mutual respect and confidence. (Golden & Parker, 1955, pp. 7-8)

Peace in industrial relations presents both the company and union with many benefits including monetary savings, increased productivity, and a positive working relationship (Richards, 1969). Prior to the 1960's most collective bargaining involved blue collar industrial workers and trade union workers. They were the pioneers of the union movement and of the collective bargaining process. During the middle 1960's, public employee collective bargaining came into existence, with professional public employees taking an active role in the negotiations of collective bargaining agreements.

In the public sector, labor peace is also very important, especially in education, as evidenced by the 113 teacher strikes in the state of Michigan during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years. The strikes came at various times during the school year and interrupted the educational process in these school districts.
Because of the 113 teacher strikes during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years and for the purposes of this study, it was assumed that since labor peace was important in the private sector it also would be important in public sector collective bargaining. It was assumed also that labor peace would provide the professional staff with additional time and energy to work towards the educational goals of the community. Conflict which includes competitiveness, denial of legitimacy, distrust, and hate (Walton & McKersie, 1965) may cause internal problems which may reflect negatively on the educational process or even interrupt the educational process.

Walton and McKersie (1965) have identified the dimensions of industrial peace as (a) motivational orientation and action tendencies toward each other, (b) beliefs about the other's legitimacy, (c) feelings of friendliness toward the other, and (d) the level of trust (p. 185). The previously mentioned dimensions were measured by the Attitude Structuring Model from Walton and McKersie (1965), and the measurement of these relationships was on a continuum with the following components: conflict, containment/aggression, accommodation, and cooperation. The continuum of the dimensions of these relationships may be better understood by observing Figure 1, with the attitudinal dimensions listed in the first column and the relationship components measured on a 5-point attitude scale at the bottom of the model.

The basic process of collective bargaining in this country has been one of a general movement from conflict toward accommodation and, in some cases, cooperation. An underlying assumption of this discussion was that the unique needs of public sector negotiations can
Pattern of Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Dimensions</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Containment</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivational orientation</td>
<td>Competitive tendencies to destroy or weaken</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individualistic policy of hands off</td>
<td>Cooperative tendencies to assist or preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and action tendencies toward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about legitimacy of other</td>
<td>Denial of legitimacy</td>
<td>Grudging</td>
<td>Acceptance of status quo</td>
<td>Complete legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acknowledgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of trust in conducting</td>
<td>Extreme distrust</td>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>Limited trust</td>
<td>Extended trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of friendliness</td>
<td>Hate</td>
<td>Antagonism</td>
<td>Neutralism</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courteousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitude Scale

best be served by parties choosing a cooperative relationship pattern. The Walton-McKersie model of attitudinal components identifies the cooperation pattern as the pattern most likely to produce labor peace. The results of the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies seem to corroborate the relationship pattern of cooperation found in the Walton-McKersie Attitude Structuring Model (Herring, 1979) as cooperative tendencies, mutual trust, and legitimacy (Golden & Parker, 1955). In the cooperation pattern, labor peace exists when the parties have extended trust and friendliness and when they demonstrate beliefs in the legitimacy of each other. Walton and McKersie (1965) suggested labor peace may be achieved when the motivational orientation is cooperative, there is acceptance of the legitimacy of each other and the parties willingly extend mutual concerns beyond the familiar matters of wages, hours, and conditions. Therefore, positive attitudes exist when there is a high degree of cooperation, belief in legitimacy, mutual trust, and friendliness.

Although the Walton-McKersie model and the Golden studies seem to confirm the attitudes that tend to result in peace in private sector, there has not been a comparable attempt to study labor-management peace in the field of education according to LaMonica (1973), Crandall (1976), and Martin and Smith (1980). Knowing that cooperative relationships between the parties is important in the private sector, it would seem reasonable that cooperative relationships are important in the public sector in understanding what may contribute to labor peace.
Efforts to define labor peace seem to have begun with Golden in 1946 when he stated:

In my opinion, the time has come when, instead of looking into the causes of conflict that we know and hear so much about, we ought to try to discover how much peace there is and what makes peace. (Golden & Parker, 1955, p. ix)

This statement led to the endorsement by the National Planning Association (NPA) to establish a committee to study the causes of industrial peace, under Golden's chairmanship. The committee's goal was to identify the elements or characteristics of industrial peace. The committee's findings are summarized in the following quote:

Two principal elements exist in the industrial relationship—the employer and the employee. Their interests are not completely mutual. The employer represents, and is concerned primarily with, a property interest which in turn is directly related to the financial interests of a limited number of stockholders or owners. The interest of the employees' organization or union is primarily that of people—a greater number in most cases—and is concerned with their material as well as their spiritual and psychological interests and needs. In modern society each of these elements is interdependent rather than completely identical.

For the purposes of its studies, the Committee defines industrial peace as the product of the relationship between two organized groups—industrial management and organized labor—in which both coexist, with each retaining its institutional sovereignty, working together in reasonable harmony in a climate of mutual respect and confidence. (Golden & Parker, 1955, pp. 7-8)

This definition of industrial peace, formulated by the NPA committee, was used for the current study.

The current study was based on the concerns of public sector employers and employees, especially in education, in trying to solve
collective bargaining problems. The basic assumption for this study was that the cooperation pattern of the Walton-McKersie (1965) model of attitudinal components could be applied to the criteria for identifying labor peace from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies. The attitudinal dimensions of cooperative relationships (trust, friendliness, legitimacy, and cooperation) are the dimensions of the Attitude Structuring Model.

Current Status of Bargaining in Michigan

During the time of this study, many school districts in Michigan were experiencing declining student enrollments and subsequent loss of teaching and administrative positions. Commensurate with declining enrollment was diminished state aid funding, loss of millage requests, and erosion of monetary value due to inflation.

Complicating matters further was the emergence of regional bargaining units. Regional units were comprised of two or more formerly autonomous school district units. Regional units usually were founded by combining all the school districts within an intermediate school district. In the state of Michigan in 1980 there were 536 school districts and 58 intermediate districts. The purpose of the regional units was to strengthen the bargaining position of teachers and to seek bargaining contracts with less deviation among school districts from the same geographical area.

For example, during the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years there was a decline of 59,694 students or 3.1% of the K-12 students in the state of Michigan. At the same time there was a decrease of 2,120
teachers or a 2.3% decrease (Michigan Educational Statistics, 1980). Also, the state of Michigan reduced the state school aid for K-12 students by 11.7% according to the Department of Management and Budget—State of Michigan.

The overall state of the economy in Michigan was at a low level due to a recession when this study was conducted. Unemployment was at a rate greater than 10% in Michigan and the state had not adopted a budget for the 1980-81 fiscal year. During the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years there was a total of 113 teacher strikes in Michigan. This represented approximately 20% of the school districts in Michigan.

Statement of the Problem

Concerns about public employee strikes and labor unrest have developed increased attention on the relationship between the individuals involved in collective bargaining and the subsequent outcome of the collective bargaining process. The problem addressed in this study was to identify the cooperative relationships which may improve the collective bargaining process in public education. Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to provide evidence for the proposition that when positive attitudes exist between the parties of the collective bargaining process, labor peace exists. Data were generated using the Walton and McKersie (1965) Attitude Structuring Model. The instrument used in collecting the data was a questionnaire prepared by Crandall (1976). The questionnaire was to be completed by school board members, administrators, and members of the
teacher organization bargaining teams. In order for a district to be designated as having labor peace it had to meet most of the following criteria which were adopted from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies of 1955 and validated by five individuals currently involved in the collective bargaining process in Michigan. The individuals had experience in negotiating over 350 contracts over a combined period of 63 years and represented union, management, and a university. The modified criteria are as follows:

1. There is full acceptance by the school board and administration of the collective bargaining process and of unionism as an institution. The school board and administration consider a strong union an asset to management.

2. The union fully accepts management's operation of the schools; it recognizes that the welfare of its members depends upon the successful operation of the schools.

3. The union is strong, responsible, and democratic.

4. The school board and administration stay out of the union's internal affairs; they do not seek to alienate the workers' allegiance to the union.

5. Mutual trust and confidence exist between the parties. There have been no serious ideological incompatibilities.

6. Neither party to bargaining has adopted a legalistic approach to the solution of problems in the relationship.

7. Negotiations are problem centered--more time is spent on day-to-day problems than on defining abstract principles.
8. There is widespread union-management consultation and highly
developed information sharing.

9. Grievances are settled promptly, at the local level whenever
possible. There is flexibility and informality within the procedure.

Districts which did not meet the above criteria were designated
as nonpeaceful or neither peaceful nor nonpeaceful and they completed
the same questionnaire as the school districts which exhibited labor
peace.

When school districts designated as having labor peace scored
significantly higher on the Crandall (1976) Attitude Scale Test (CAST)
than the nonpeaceful districts, the assumption of positive attitudes
leading to labor peace was supported.

Significance of the Study

Because the nature of the process for reporting contract settle­
ments does not indicate how the agreement was reached, there was
little opportunity to know whether group behaviors were positive or
negative during the negotiations process. It was difficult also to
assess conflict, which may be defined as competitiveness, denial of
legitimacy, distrust and hate, or lack of conflict occurring in any
particular school district. Because of the contract settlement re­
porting process and the difficulty in assessing conflict it is diffi­
cult to predict why labor peace exists or does not exist. This re­
search provides data which may serve as a basis for predicting
labor peace in the public sector and identify the attitudes leading
to labor peace.
Therefore, through the use of the Walton and McKersie (1965) Attitude Structuring Model and a questionnaire prepared by Crandall (1976), this investigation provides empirical support for the proposition that the existence of positive attitudes leads to labor peace. The results may provide useful information for administrators, school board members, and teacher organizations in the training of negotiators. Hopefully, the research generated contributes information which can be useful in leading school districts toward labor peace.

Overview of Dissertation

The following topics comprise the remaining chapters of the dissertation. Chapter II is a review of the pertinent literature and Chapter III presents the methodology for the study. Chapter IV describes the hypothesis testing and results. The final chapter presents the findings and the conclusions of the study. The appendices are included after Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

Chapter II informs the reader of research concerning the concepts of group relations, labor peace, a theory of labor peace, and their application to public sector collective bargaining. Each of the factors presented in Chapter II builds the foundation for the three major hypotheses.

An On Line Automated Reference Service (OARS) search which included an Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) search and a bibliography provided by Donald Herring of the State University of New York (SUNY) provided appropriate sources for the review of literature. Dissertation abstracts were also examined including the latest issues. The University of Michigan and Saginaw Valley State College libraries in addition to the Western Michigan University library proved to be valuable in locating information.

While many studies have concentrated on collective bargaining, few have focused on the attitudes of participants within the collective bargaining structure, especially in public sector bargaining. The few studies on the attitudes within the collective bargaining structure help show a disparity in the review of literature. Martin and Smith (1980) concluded that to date no literature has examined relationships between cooperative union-management ventures in the public sector and the perceptions and attitudes of employees.
in a single bargaining unit.

Lewin, Feuille, and Kochan (1977) maintained that public sector labor relations literature consisted largely of authoritative opinion, conventional wisdom, logical arguments, case studies, classification studies, and ad hoc surveys. This review of literature presents the reader with information regarding the history, development, and dynamics of collective bargaining as it relates to labor peace.

History

Collective bargaining, a term introduced by Beatrice Potter Webb in 1891, was traditionally associated with the trade union movement (Richardson, 1977). Trade union bargaining remains the most common form of collective bargaining in terms of the number of individuals included and the number of contracts negotiated. In recent years an increasing number of professional and state associations in the public sector were involved in the collective bargaining process. While blue collar union membership has been leveling off and even declining as a percentage of the labor force in trade and industrial unions over the last decade, white collar collective bargaining in professional and state associations has significantly increased. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (1979) suggests that today approximately 21,171,000 employees are represented by unions and associations. The memberships may be broken down as follows: (a) white collar workers represent approximately 4,000,000 members, (b) blue collar workers represent approximately 17,000,000 members, (c) associations represent approximately 3,000,000 members, and (d) approximately 2,300,000
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members are represented by education associations.

Conflict Within Group Relations

Conflict may be a part of group relations within any organization and may be either positive or negative. Group relations and interactions are related to conflict or opposing sides according to Schelling (1966). He pointed out that among theories of conflict the main dividing line exists between those that treat conflict as a pathological state and seek its causes and treatment, and those that take conflict for granted and study the behavior associated with it.

There are writers who express concern with conflict, especially those who purport that positive reactions may come from the conflict of group relations. Such writers hold that conflict is a behavior to be expected at work and that positive behaviors resulting from the group conflict may result and be helpful to group relations (Crandall, 1976).

Simmel (1955) maintained that the outcomes of interaction between the positive and negative forces of conflict would be positive in nature itself:

Our opposition makes us feel that we are not completely victims of the circumstances. It allows us to prove our strength consciously and only thus gives vitality and reciprocity to conditions from which, without such corrective, we would withdraw at any cost. (p. 19)

Coser (1964) defines the interaction of positive and negative forces in groups as follows:

No group can be entirely harmonious for it would then be devoid of process and structure. Groups require disharmony as well as harmony, disassociation within them

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
are by no means altogether disruptive factors. Group formation is the result of both types of processes. The belief that one process tears down what the other builds up, so that what finally remains in the result of subtracting the one from the other is based on misconception. On the contrary, both positive and negative factors build group relations. Far from being necessarily dysfunctional, a certain degree of conflict is an essential element in group formation and the persistence of group life. (p. 31)

McGregor (1967) identified the need to change and develop a new theory of management in order to meet the needs of humans as demonstrated by their conflicts and behaviors. McGregor's Theory Y of management relied heavily on an individual's self-direction and self-control within an organization. Self-direction and self-control were human characteristics found in everyone. McGregor (1967) identified Theory Y as a way to work within a close conventional organization and for workers to satisfy their own ego needs. If an organization could reach this point there would be an absence or at least a lesser degree of conflict in group relations.

Likert (1967) developed a research based systems analysis of organizations which is applicable to schools. The system is based on the development of effective work groups committed to the goals of the organization as a means of professional growth, development, and self-fulfillment. In studying the System 4 theory of Likert (1967), it was found that the resulting evidence was parallel to the theories to be utilized and developed in this study. This was especially true of the operating characteristics of organizations outlined by Likert and of particular importance were the operating characteristics for Likert's System 4, or the participative group. These characteristics
included economic rewards based on a compensation system developed through participation, favorable organizational attitudes, mutual trust, and confidence.

Positive Relations and Conflict

In writing about conflict and its resolution, Deutsch (1971) mentioned some of the variables which affect conflict. Variables which affect conflict are the characteristics of the parties in conflict, the nature of the issue giving rise to the conflict, the social environment, audiences involved in the conflict, strategies used by parties in the conflict, consequences, and the most important for this study, the relationship of one party to another including attitudes, beliefs, expectations about one another, and degree of polarization.

Deutsch (1971) mentioned the negotiations process in terms of conflict resolution and referred to the findings of the National Planning Association. He also discussed studies completed showing that a mutually cooperative orientation between parties elicits highly predictable trusting behavior and honest communication. The major points of Deutsch's work are summarized as follows:

There are two major types of conflict resolution processes: cooperative and competitive--one type or the other will usually predominate and will give rise to characteristic manifestations in communication, attitudes, perception, task orientation and outcomes--one way of eliciting a cooperative process is to attempt to induce the communication patterns, attitudes and so forth which help to support such a process.

... the stronger and more salient the cooperative bonds are, the less likely it is that they will engage in
Conflict is likely to be resolved cooperatively in situations where the parties have less at stake in a conflict than they have in the ongoing relationship between them or in the community which has generated rules and procedures for regulating conflict. (pp. 54-55)

According to Coser (1964), the conflict occurring between groups can bring about a vital and healthy change to the organized system. An example used by Coser was the conflict and resulting change that led the Middle Ages into the creative period of the Renaissance civilization. His basic point was that conflict, through group action, may be vital for economic and technological change within a system. Coser (1964) stated: "If feelings of dissatisfaction, instead of being suppressed or diverted are allowed expression against 'vested interest,' an emergence of genuine transvaluations is likely to occur" (p. 65).

Levi (1969) expanded upon the notion of community in union management relations. He suggested labor peace occurs when a community in which violence as a norm disappears. Levi (1969) stated:

Its members (the community) habitually act in conformity with a sense of solidarity, unity, and cohesion which normally excludes violence as a means for the solution of conflicts between them . . . an organization has evolved which reinforces from without the habit of peaceful relations originating in the attitudes within the members, with a continual interaction between the two. (p. 23)

Etzioni (1961) suggested that peaceful competition rather than containment and allowing no "zero sum games" are ways to de-escalate a bipolar world. If the parties give up the notion of complete winning and losing and if they compete with each other rather than try to contain each other, a condition of peace may exist between them.
Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) suggested the success of any human relationship depends upon the existence of some common attitudes to the parties. A few of the attitudes Golden found which seem to have special significance are: mutual security and predictability, satisfaction with the relationship, and a preference for intelligent compromise.

Labor Peace

Labor peace has been investigated by several writers in the private sector and a few in the public sector. One of the most comprehensive works that deals with labor peace in the business world is Walton and McKersie's work of 1965. This work goes further in the development of a theory applicable to the negotiation process than any other available at this time (LaMonica, 1973). Walton and McKersie (1965) developed the Attitude Structuring Model which was important to this study because: "The attitudes of each party toward the other, taken together, define the relationship pattern between them" (p. 184).

Five propositions were set forth by Walton and McKersie (1965) to show the importance of the Attitude Structuring Model and they are as follows:

a. The agenda and outcomes of bargaining might be influenced by the relationship pattern.

b. Competitive relationships may heighten a party's aspirations on distributive issues.

c. The level of mutual trust at any point affects one's assessment of the value of a given clause.
d. The relationship may have a most direct influence on the outcome.

e. There is a tendency for the parties, in the co-operative relationship, to feel that negotiations has been a success for both parties if they have settled somewhere near the middle of the distributive bargaining range. (pp. 203-204)

The propositions presented by Walton and McKersie (1965) seem to confirm the findings of the National Planning Association (NPA) from 1947 to 1953. The NPA Committee on the Causes of Industrial Peace had a goal to discover the causes of labor peace, not the causes of conflict. A total of 30 firms were studied and in the final report condensations of 13 case studies were included along with identification of the basic causes of industrial peace formulated by the committee (Golden & Parker, 1955). The nine causes of industrial peace referred to attitudes and approaches which the parties themselves had consciously adopted or helped to achieve. Furthermore, each was important in explaining the degree of industrial peace found in the specific case (Golden & Parker, 1955, p. 47).

Davey (1959) found the NPA findings were invaluable to the study of industrial peace. He went beyond the NPA findings to include the fact that many union-management relationships did not satisfy the NPA findings, yet kept peaceful relations. Davey concluded that there appeared to be a growing recognition by both management and union leadership of the desirability of avoiding economic force whenever and wherever possible.

Mutual Survival, presented by Bakke (1966), was the issue of antagonistic cooperation. Bakke suggested when people resolve
fundamental differences on the operational level antagonistic cooperation should be expected. Unions and management need the cooperation of each other. Bakke maintained the maintenance and improvement of antagonistic cooperation formed the basis of mutual survival for free unions, free management, and free society.

Selekman (1947) presented industrial conflict as a characteristic of human relations and the organization was a community. This created a situation in which conflict and cooperation were always present in the organization.Selekman characterized cooperation as interdependent human activities carried forward in a given place and circumstances. The organization furnished the context—the place and the ever-changing circumstances within which management and men would interact.

Cheyfitz (1947) suggested companies move from collective bargaining to cooperative planning. After World War II many industrial leaders accepted the concept of labor's creative participation in the production process. According to Cheyfitz, America may accept nothing less than the maturing of collective bargaining to the higher stage of cooperative planning.

Douglas (1962) wrote about the problem of industrial peace versus industrial conflict. She suggested it was a very difficult relationship to grapple with because the relationship in American society was never fully developed. The implication was that the parties must become involved in confronting the relationships of conflict and peace if results are to be obtained. She wrote:
A society which is not prepared to recognize and to grapple openly with conflict is not apt, either, to have developed a forthright position on the issues of peace and peacemaking as separable from the absence of conflict or conflict held in check. Democracy in this society, taken either as practical or promulgated, has never been notable for a strong, decisive advocacy of peaceful human relations. The uneasy status of peacemaking in the industrial system borrows from a broader societal reservation about the proper limits for tolerating unregulated conflict, for it is not clearly unequivocal that peaceful means to terminate disputes are strongly preferred in contemporary American society over combative measures. (p. 18)

Wallen (cited in Crandall, 1976) wrote about a formula for New England prosperity in 1945 in which he mentioned the good relationship which must exist between management and labor.

Industrial relations must be grounded upon proper philosophical concepts. During this period of reconversion of plants and production, it would be well for industry and labor to reexamine their philosophy that dealing with organized workmen is as much a part of the economic process in a modern industrial society as dealing with customers, with raw material suppliers, or with financial institutions is widely, but not universally accepted by industry. Only if this philosophy is firmly rooted in the mind of management will the emotionalism that in the past has been detrimental to industrial relations be eliminated. . . . Similarly, labor must preach and live the philosophy that its dealings with management must be conducted so as not to deprive management of those functions and prerogatives in operating the enterprise that properly belong to it. (p. 19)

Rosenthal (1969) did not share the confidence that peaceful negotiations between boards of education and teacher organizations were possible. It was Rosenthal's contention that the only way teacher groups gain power was through conflict. The marginal role that teacher groups play in educational policy-making decisions emphasized the need for militant action.
Wellington and Winter (1970) concluded that public sector collective bargaining should not model itself after the private sector. They stated market restraints were different in the two sectors and the political process would be undesirable.

Based on the previous statements by Rosenthal (1969) and Wellington and Winter (1970), it is appropriate to cite what Randles (1973) had to say about collective bargaining. Randles suggested that the experience of both employee and management groups in the private sector led them to behave in more sophisticated ways than their less experienced counterparts in the public sector. Tracy, Cnelly, and Peterson (1980), in surveying chief negotiators in the private sector, found conditions of trust, respect, friendliness, legitimacy, and cooperative action tendencies were crucial for success in bargaining.

Model of Labor Peace

In order to fully understand the notions of industrial peace, group conflict, and the positive relations that may come from them and the negotiations process, it was necessary to review a behavioral model of negotiations. Since the Walton and McKersie (1965) model was the underlying model of this study it is explained in greater detail.

According to Walton and McKersie (1965), their study had three segments: the field of study of collective bargaining, the emerging field of conflict resolution, and the underlying disciplines of economics, psychology, and sociology.

In terms of conflict resolution Walton and McKersie (1965) wrote:
The agenda in labor negotiations usually contains a mixture of conflictful and collaborative items. The need to defend one's self interest and at the same time engage in joint problem solving vastly complicates the selection of bargaining strategies and tactics. . . . Labor negotiations involve more than a transaction of substantive items. Attitudes, feelings, and indeed the tone of the relationship represent an extremely important dimension of labor negotiations. . . . The negotiations of interest to constituent members are very important to what goes on at the bargaining table and have some influence over the negotiations. (p. 3)

The Walton and McKersie (1965) framework was divided into four parts or subprocesses. These were distributive bargaining, integrative bargaining, attitudinal structuring, and intraorganizational bargaining.

For the purposes of this study attitudinal structuring was the most important element of the Walton and McKersie (1965) theory. They postulate that an additional major function of negotiations was the influencing of the relationships between parties, in particular such attitudes as friendliness-hostility, trust, respect, and the motivational orientation of competiveness-cooperativeness. Although the existing relationship pattern was acknowledged to be influenced by many more enduring forces, the negotiators took advantage of the interaction system of negotiations to produce attitudinal change.

Walton and McKersie (1965) wrote the following about attitudinal structuring:

Attitudinal structuring is our term for the system of activities instrumental to the attainment of desired relationship patterns between the parties. Desired relationship patterns usually give content to this process in a way comparable to that of issues and problems of distributive and integrative processes. The distinction among the process is that whereas the first two are joint decision-making processes, attitudinal
structuring is a socio-emotional interpersonal process
designed to change attitudes and relationships. (p. 5)

Van Tine (1971) elaborated on the Walton–Mckersie framework
calling it a "mixed bag of several elements." The previous Walton
and Mckersie quote comprised the "mixed bag of several elements" of
negotiations which two negotiating parties would avail themselves of
in trying to reach an agreement.

In discussing a theory of labor peace, Walton and Mckersie (1965)
suggested that:

Labor negotiations involve important human values, ful-
fillment of contract terms is strongly contingent upon
attitudes—the relationship between the parties is an
exclusive and continuing one. These factors suggest
that attitudes and relationship patterns play an impor-
tant role in labor negotiations—Bargaining theorists
ordinarily do not pay attention to the attitudinal dimen-
sions of negotiations. It is also fair to say that prob-
lem solving theorists have not attempted to take into
account all of the above aspects of social or political
decision-making. (p. 184)

Public Sector Bargaining

Considering what has been written to this point, it should be
apparent that different understandings have been developed concerning
the areas of group relations, positive relations, labor peace, and a
theory of labor peace. Randles (1973) stated that at a time when
labor troubles are being publicized, more peaceful resolutions tend
to go unnoticed. The conclusion was that the understandings and
skills acquired by private sector personnel need to become a part of
the behaviors of public sector personnel to help them to move from
immaturity to sophistication.
Richards (1969), Leberknight (1973), Knighton (1972), LaMonica (1973), and Crandall (1976) attempted to study negotiations in the public sector. Their findings and conclusions are summarized in the next few paragraphs.

Richards (1969) completed a survey intended to describe educational negotiations in California. Questionnaires were sent to teacher association presidents and to superintendents. Richards used the behavioral negotiations model of Walton and McKersie (1965) as a basis for his survey material and for the analysis of the survey. Richards (1969) found in California, which had just passed the Winton Act allowing some negotiations to occur, that the Walton-McKersie model was appropriate if one viewed it as a "growth" model passing through various stages of maturity. Richards' hypotheses included two which were important for this study: (a) As the negotiating relationship was firmly established and as basic goals were achieved, militancy, marked by intense conflict in bargaining generally declined; (b) frequent cooperative interaction which focused on problems of mutual interest and was carried out within a relationship of equality characterized by a strong organization and negotiating relationship. A limitation associated with the study by Richards (1969) was that it took place just after the collective bargaining process began in California. Therefore, attitudes both positive and negative may not have had time to develop.

Knighton (1972) completed a study in Michigan which investigated the negotiation relationships of boards of education, superintendents, and management negotiating teams. He attempted to identify
labor-management attitudes on the part of school board presidents, superintendents, and management chief negotiators, and compared these relationships to occurrence or lack of occurrence of teacher strikes. Knighton (1972) observed that school management respondents in non-strike school districts tended to be less management oriented than those in strike districts. He suggested that labor-management attitudes may be a factor in the occurrence of teacher strikes. Knighton (1972) suggested further research should be undertaken to compare the factors involved in the attitudes of key personnel from both labor and management. A limitation associated with Knighton's study was that it was limited to board presidents, superintendents, and chief negotiators. He did not survey teachers.

Leberknight (1973) investigated the cases of impasse in Colorado prior to 1971 in which a formal negotiations process was in use and where there was third party intervention. His population consisted of the superintendent, teacher association president, and the third party to the impasse for each impasse district. The respondents were asked to identify those factors of impasse which were important in their own district. Although Leberknight (1973) found that the causal factors of impasse are primarily unique to each situation, he also found that the greatest single cause of impasse was probably the perceptual and attitudinal disagreement between the local parties.

Leberknight (1973) suggested that the attitudes of the parties involved in the collective bargaining process had an impact on the outcome of the process. He stated:
Both the association president and the superintendent groups demonstrate very little objectivity in analyzing themselves, the other side, or the situation as a whole. Both show a degree of paranoia and closed vision. This attitudinal disagreement is probably the greatest obstacle to reaching reasonable agreements without impasse. (pp. 95-96)

A limitation associated with Leberknight's (1973) study was that it was limited to districts which were involved in impasse situations.

The studies of Richards (1969), Knighton (1972), and Leberknight (1973) implied the following:

1. The Walton-McKersie model, including the Attitudinal Structuring Model, was appropriate for use in analyzing school negotiations.

2. That negative attitudes were present in impasse situations in school districts.

3. There seemed to be a lack of cooperation.

The previous findings by Richards (1969), Knighton (1972), and Leberknight (1973) provided support for the first research hypothesis of this study which was stated as: Differences exist among the attitudes of school board members, administrators, and teacher organization bargaining team members between the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups.

Since there were four subscales with the Crandall Attitude Scale Test (CAST) instrument representing the four attitudinal dimensions (cooperation, trust, legitimacy, and friendliness) of the Walton and McKersie Attitude Structuring Model, the previously stated hypothesis was applied to each of the four subscales and the overall scores.
Thus the previously stated hypothesis actually generated five hypotheses. This was also true of the hypotheses stated on pages 28 and 29.

The LaMonica (1973) study from the state of New York described the quality of the relationships between employer and employee groups in the public sector. It dealt with a number of school districts in central New York State some of which experienced an impasse situation in their contract negotiations, while others had settled their contracts with no third party assistance.

LaMonica (1973), using the relationship patterns in the Walton and McKersie (1965) Attitudinal Structuring Model, interviewed the chief school officer and the president of the teachers' association in each of the school districts. They were asked to respond to their perception of the relationships with the other parties in their district by marking a continuum line ranging from conflict to cooperation for each of the four attitudinal dimensions illustrated by the Walton-McKersie model.

LaMonica (1973) concluded that the Attitudinal Structuring Model was appropriate to identify relationships between the school board and the teachers' association in a school district. He also concluded that the attitude dimensions of action tendencies, trust, friendliness, and legitimacy were appropriate for the educational setting with legitimacy being the least appropriate dimension.

LaMonica's (1973) conclusions concerning the Attitudinal Structuring Model and its relation to labor peace were as follows:

1. The Walton-McKersie classification system may be used to identify a relationship pattern between the school board and the teacher association in a school district.
2. The attitudinal dimensions of action tendencies, levels of trust in conducting affairs, and degree of friendliness were appropriate for the educational setting.

3. The least appropriate dimension, the belief about legitimacy may be the result of the forced bargaining relationship.

4. The relationship patterns were in a state of flux. Walton and McKersie (1965) described the relationship between two bargaining groups as exclusive and continuing. This exclusive and continuing relationship is carried over in the day-to-day operation of the district and is reflected in the interactions of teachers and administrators.

5. Actions of either which disturb the dynamic balance of the relationship tend to be viewed as a hostile action and result in a similar reaction from the other groups.

6. There was an obvious distrust among school boards for the bargaining process. This distrust increased when boards are initially separated from direct participation in the process. (pp. 157-159)

A limitation associated with the LaMonica (1973) study may be that he interviewed only superintendents and teacher association presidents. Extending the findings of LaMonica (1973), Knighton (1972), Leberknight (1973), and Richards (1969) that the Attitudinal Structuring Model was appropriate to identify relationships between the school board, administrators, and the teachers' association and that there were differences in the attitudes of the members of the bargaining relationship, the second research hypothesis of this study may be stated as follows: Differences exist in the attitudes among school board members, administrators, and teacher organization bargaining teams.

Crandall (1976) constructed an instrument based on the Walton and McKersie (1965) Attitude Structuring Model that indicated the
most positive attitudes were represented by the highest cumulative scores. Through the use of this instrument Crandall (1976) found:

1. Attitudes of trust, cooperation et al. do appear to have a relationship to the efforts of the negotiating parties to reach peaceful relationships.

2. The most positive of the relationship factors in relation to the dimensions of the model was the belief in the legitimacy of the other parties. The least positive of the relationship factors in relationship to the dimensions of the model was cooperation. (pp. 69-70)

A limitation of the Crandall (1976) study was that the population came from a select group known as the Central New York School Study Council. The findings of Crandall provide the basis for the third research hypothesis of this study which is stated as follows: Differences exist in the attitudes among the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups.

Summary

The review of literature has been concerned with the concepts of group relations, positive relations, labor peace, theory of labor peace, and a synthesis of the previous concepts. Each of these concepts helped to examine group and individual attitudes as they relate to collective bargaining. The review of literature helped to develop the statement of the problem and the hypotheses presented in Chapter III.

The design, population, sample, validation, and analysis techniques employed are presented in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate relationships which may improve the collective bargaining process in public education. The relationship pattern of the Walton and McKersie (1965) Attitude Structuring Model and the Crandall (1976) Attitude Scale Test (CAST) were utilized. The two-way analysis of variance was utilized to examine the relationships between the variables in question. The remainder of the chapter includes information about the purpose, population and sample, validation of instruments, data, and hypotheses.

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was to provide evidence for the proposition that positive attitudes, among the participants within the collective bargaining process, lead to labor peace using the criteria adopted from Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) and the Attitude Structuring Model from Walton and McKersie (1965). The Attitude Structuring Model from Walton and McKersie (1965) was examined through the use of a questionnaire prepared by Crandall (1976). The school districts exhibiting labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace were identified using the criteria adopted from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies of 1955 (see Appendix B).
Population and Sample

One hundred and three school districts in southwest Lower Michigan, representing approximately 20% of all school districts in Michigan, were selected as the population for this study. Districts were then identified as having labor peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace. Identification was accomplished using the criteria adopted from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies with the judgment of intermediate school district superintendents and the Michigan Education Association zone director who serves as the supervisor for the union representatives to local school districts. Both intermediate superintendents and the zone director were asked to place school districts in one of the following three categories: (a) labor peace, (b) no labor peace, or (c) neither labor peace nor no labor peace. Districts which were identified as having labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace by both intermediate superintendents and the zone directors were then assigned numbers and through the use of a table of random numbers five districts from each category were chosen for the "Pilot Study."

Superintendents from 11 of the 15 pilot districts were contacted by phone and asked if they would participate in the study. All 11 superintendents or their designees refused. Unfortunately, this system for selecting participating districts did not work due to lack of cooperation of local school administrators who declined to participate in this study. At that point a decision was made to survey all
districts with common identification by both the intermediate superintendent and the zone director. Therefore, the sample was not random.

The sample population consisted of three school board members, three administrators, and three members of the teachers' bargaining teams from each selected district. Each school board member, administrator, and teacher organization bargaining team member was asked to fill out the questionnaire for the selected school districts.

Validation for Identification Instrument

Kerlinger (1974) pointed out that there is no one validity. A test or scale is valid for the scientific or practical purpose of its user. It also was stated by Kerlinger that content validation becomes very judgmental. The items of an instrument are studied and verified in relation to a presumed representativeness of the universe. Competent judges are usually asked to do this, and the judgments are then pooled.

For the purposes of this study five competent judges in the field of public sector collective bargaining were chosen to validate the criteria adopted from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies. One judge represented labor, two represented management, one judge was a professional negotiator, and one judge was a college professor. The credentials of each judge may be found in Appendix A.

The judges examined each item and weighed its representativeness in relation to positive attitudes leading to labor peace (Appendix B). When this step was completed the results of all judges were pooled. It should be noted that there was not 100% agreement by the judges.
But using the validation process of Kerlinger (1974) and by pooling the responses the final version of the identification instrument was developed (Appendix C). This was accomplished by combining the responses for each statement and accepting only the statements which had approval by a majority of all judges. The identification instrument was then sent to intermediate superintendents and the MEA zone director. They in turn designated districts as having labor peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace (Appendices D and E).

Validation for CAST Questionnaire

The validation of the Crandall Attitude Scale Test questionnaire was completed by Crandall in 1976. His findings are contained in a through e with the findings from this study in the following paragraph. Crandall's (1976) findings are as follows:

[a] The instrument was a summated rating scale, commonly called a Likert-type scale, where the scores of the items are summed, or summed and averaged, to yield an individual's attitude score.

[b] There were 30 items on the final instrument and an individual's score may range from 30 to 150.

[c] The validity was accomplished through the use of 10 competent judges.

[d] Analysis techniques were employed through the use of 90 test instruments selected at random.

[e] Reliability was completed through the use of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient with $r$ equal to .760 and was found to be significant at the .01 level of significance. (p. 40)
The reliability of the instrument was further tested by adding four additional questions, each relating to one of the four subscales. This was completed due to concern by dissertation committee members that the CAST questionnaire was validated in New York and not Michigan and concern over some selected items. The instrument was then given to three board members, three administrators, and three teachers with the results of the Pearson $r$ correlation as follows:

Cooperation $r$ = .94
Trust $r$ = .98
Friendliness $r$ = .77
Legitimacy $r$ = .94

Items on the CAST questionnaire relating to the four subscales were as follows:

Cooperation: 1, 4, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 26.
Trust: 11, 13, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30.
Friendliness: 2, 3, 8, 15, 16.
Legitimacy: 5, 6, 7, 10, 18, 23, 24, 25.

The four subscales (cooperation, legitimacy, friendliness, and trust) and the total score form the dependent variable. The identification criteria for labor peace was the independent variable. The total scores on the CAST questionnaire could range from 30 to 150. The cooperation subscale could range from 9 to 45, trust from 8 to 40, friendliness from 5 to 25, and legitimacy from 8 to 40.
Data Gathering Procedures

On May 19, 1980, cover letters and supportative documents were mailed to superintendents and teacher association presidents in the selected school districts (Appendices F-J). CAST questionnaires and stamped return envelopes were also sent in the same mailing. Two additional items were added to the questionnaire to help participants understand the demographics of the population including an item for comments and an item for number of years of experience in collective bargaining. Each respondent was asked to complete the instrument and to return it as soon as possible. Another item included requested the size of the school districts, and this information was found in the Michigan Educational Directory (1979).

A second mailing was sent on June 26, 1980, with questionnaires to be completed by those who had not responded to the first mailing. On July 8 and 9, 1980, nonrespondents were contacted by phone (see Appendices K and L).

Data Analysis

The facilities of the Western Michigan University Computer Center were used for purposes of analysis of the data collected. An IBM sheet was coded for each respondent and included the score for each item, district size, years of bargaining experience, designation as board member, administration, or teacher and designation as labor peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace. A total score for the CAST questionnaire and totals for each subscale (cooperation, legitimacy, trust, and friendliness) were obtained.
Two-way ANOVA techniques were employed to test the two main effect hypotheses and the interaction effect hypothesis for the total scores and the subscale scores on the CAST questionnaire. This represented a total of 10 hypotheses for the main effects and five hypotheses for the interaction effect.

Hypotheses

There were three assumptions underlying this study and they were as follows: (a) positive attitudes lead to labor peace; (b) differences exist among the attitudes of the participants in the collective bargaining process; and (c) differences in attitudes exist among school districts which may be classified as labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace. These assumptions formed the basis for the research hypotheses from which the following null hypotheses were generated:

1. No differences exist among the attitudes of school board members, administrators, and teacher organization bargaining members between the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups (interaction effect).

2. No differences exist in the attitudes among school board members, administrators, and teacher organization bargaining team members (main effect).

3. No differences exist in the attitudes among the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups (main effect).

The fixed model for testing the null hypotheses was as follows:
X_{ijk} = M + P_i + R_j + PR_{ij} + EK (i,j).

M represents the grand mean

P represents the type of labor peace

R represents the type of position

PR represents the interaction of type of labor peace and type of position

E represents the error variance

i = 1 . . . 2 (column/type of labor peace)

j = 1 . . . 3 (row/type of position)

k = 1 . . . n (n represents cell size)

Symbolically, the three null hypotheses were represented in the following way (Glass & Stanley, 1970):

Null Hypothesis 1 (H_0): M_i. = . . . = M_I.

Null Hypothesis 2 (H_0): M_1 = M_2 = . . . = M_J

Null Hypothesis 3 (H_0): all (M_{ij} - M_i. - M_.j + M) = 0

M_i. represents the population mean of reported scores for the ith level type of labor peace.

M_.j represents the population mean of reported scores for the jth level of type of position.

M_{ij} represents the population mean of reported scores for the ijth level of interaction between type of labor peace and type of position.

Summary

In Chapter III the purpose of the investigation, population, sample, validation, data gathering procedures, and the research hypotheses were discussed in relation to the problem of this study, its background, and the review of literature. Chapter IV contains the results of the study.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this investigation was to provide evidence for the proposition that when positive attitudes exist between the parties of the collective bargaining process, labor peace exists. In addition, the study was to provide evidence for the use of the Walton and McKersie (1965) Attitude Structuring Model and the criteria from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies as methods of determining labor peace. Chapter I provided the framework for the problem and research questions while Chapter II was a review of pertinent literature. In Chapter III the methodology for this study was presented.

Chapter IV begins with a summary of the survey response from both participants and nonrespondents. The results of the null hypothesis testing are discussed with the level of significance set at the .05 level and a summation of the findings is found at the end of the chapter.

Description of the Survey Response

There were 103 school districts in southwest Lower Michigan which the intermediate superintendents and the Michigan Education Association (MEA) zone directors were asked to identify as having
labor peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace. These districts made up the population for this study and the area of the state of Michigan they represent may be found in Figure 2 outlined by the dark line in southwest Lower Michigan. The criteria for identification were adopted and modified from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies of 1955 (Appendix C). From these districts the intermediate superintendents and the MEA zone directors commonly identified 30 school districts from the selected population of southwest Lower Michigan.

Eight school districts were identified as having labor peace, 13 districts as no labor peace, and nine districts were identified as having neither labor peace nor no labor peace. These 30 districts were sent cover letters and surveys with 21 districts deciding to participate in the study. Of the nine districts not participating, one returned a letter stating they did not wish to participate and six districts were contacted by phone because they did not respond to the survey (Appendix M). Totally, responses were received from 28 out of 30 districts representing over 93% of the sample districts.

Table 1 represents a categorical breakdown of the districts participating in this study. Of the 21 districts participating, six were designated as labor peace, eight were designated as neither labor peace nor no labor peace, and seven were designated as no labor peace. These 21 districts were from a total of 30 which were commonly identified by the MEA zone director and the intermediate superintendents which provided a usable response rate of 70%.
Figure 2
Intermediate School Districts in Lower Michigan
Table 1

Participation of Districts by Labor Peace, No Labor Peace, and Neither Labor Peace Nor No Labor Peace (Between)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labor peace</th>
<th>Between</th>
<th>No labor peace</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 2 information concerning respondents from the participating districts is presented by the type of labor peace the districts were designated as representing. As indicated in Table 2, the total number of responses for the three types of labor peace are nearly the same. It should be noted that there was a larger percentage of teachers (34.0%) in the labor peace group as compared to board members (21.6%) and administrators (23.0%). In the no labor peace group the percentage of responses for administrators (34.7%), board members (37.3%), and teachers (32.0%) was nearly the same. Also, in the neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups the percentage of responses from administrators (42.3%) and board members (41.1%) was very similar, while the percentage of responses from teachers (34.0%) was lower.

The number of possible participants from each category are shown in Table 3 along with the percentage of the total population they represent. Table 3 indicates that there was a lesser percentage of administrators (70.3%) and teachers (65.8%) participating in the study than the percentage of board members (89.5%). The percentage
Table 2

Participation of Respondents by Labor Peace, No Labor Peace, and Neither Labor Peace Nor No Labor Peace (Between)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Labor peace</th>
<th>Between</th>
<th>No labor peace</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Par. = Participants
Pos. Par. = Possible participants
of responses from the labor peace respondents was very nearly the same for administrators (75.0%), board members (78.5%), and teachers (77.3%). The percentage of responses for the no labor peace respondents (administrators 64.3%, board members 90.5%, and teachers 57.1%) and the between respondents (administrators 73.3%, board members 91.3%, and teachers 70.8%) were not similar. Also, it should be noted that the lowest percentage of responses came from teachers in the no labor peace group.

Table 4 presents information on districts which were non-participants. For instance, more no labor peace districts decided not to participate in the study than labor peace or neither labor peace nor no labor peace districts. This may be due to the lack of trust and suspicion within the no labor peace districts. If any bias was present, it may be that more no labor peace districts decided not to participate in the study than labor peace or neither labor peace nor no labor peace districts. The effect of this bias would probably present greater differences in the hypothesis testing. The assumption being that the scores from the no labor peace districts would continue to be low and would provide even lower mean scores.

Demographics of Districts and Participants

The demographics of the districts and respondents are presented in the following tables for the purposes of assisting persons reading the study to interpret the results. Also, the demographics may be helpful if future replication finds similar or dissimilar results. Table 5 presents information concerning the years of
collective bargaining experience by respondent position (administrator, board member, teacher).

Table 4

Statements Given by School Districts That Were Nonparticipants by Frequency and Type of Labor Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason given</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not wish to participate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Frequency, Percentage, and Respondent Position by Years of Collective Bargaining Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent position</th>
<th>2 years or less</th>
<th>3 to 6 years</th>
<th>Over 6 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
As shown in Table 5, the largest percentage of administrators (55.8%) and board members (39.2%) participating in the study had over 6 years of collective bargaining experience, while the largest percentage of teachers (46.0%) had between 3 and 6 years of collective bargaining experience. The largest number of respondents (64) had over 6 years of collective bargaining experience. This represented 41.8% of the total respondents.

Table 6 represents the years of collective bargaining experience for the respondents by type of labor peace (labor peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace). In Table 6 it may be observed that the highest percentage of respondents from the districts designated as having labor peace (42.5%) had between 3 and 6 years of collective bargaining experience. The districts designated as no labor peace (43.3%) or neither labor peace nor no labor peace (50.0%) had the highest percentage of participants with over 6 years of collective bargaining experience.

Table 6

Frequency, Percentage, and Type of Labor Peace for Respondents by Years of Collective Bargaining Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor peace</th>
<th>2 years or less</th>
<th>3 to 6 years</th>
<th>Over 6 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 presents information on the size of the districts by the respondents' position (administrator, board member, teacher). The highest number of respondents in all three categories was from districts with a population of between 1,001 and 2,500. This represents 45.8% of the total number of respondents and is consistent with the size of the largest number of districts (1,001 to 2,500 = 47.6%) from the original sample.

The information presented in Table 8 represents the type of labor peace by the size of the district. This information will help to alleviate some of the concerns about bias entering into the study, as there are respondents from districts representing both large and small student populations in all categories of labor peace. There were 16 respondents from districts with a population of less than 1,000 students, 70 respondents from districts with a population of between 1,001 and 2,500 students, 41 respondents from districts with a population of between 2,501 and 5,500 students, and 27 respondents from districts with a population of over 5,500 students.

Respondents represented two districts with student populations of less than 1,000, 10 districts with populations of between 1,001 and 2,500, six districts with populations of between 2,501 and 5,500, and three districts with populations of 5,501 or more. Therefore, it may be observed that the percentage of respondents in the less than 1,000 category was 10.7% and the percentage of districts these respondents represented was 9.5%. The category of 1,001 to 2,500 had 45.8% of the respondent population and represented 10 districts or 47.6%. Forty-one respondents represented 27.2% of the population between
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent position</th>
<th>Less than 1,000</th>
<th>1,001 to 2,500</th>
<th>2,501 to 5,500</th>
<th>5,501 or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n of less than 1,000 (districts) = 2 (9.5%)
n of 1,001 to 2,500 (districts) = 10 (47.6%)
n of 2,501 to 5,500 (districts) = 6 (28.6%)
n of 5,501 or more (districts) = 3 (14.3%)
## Table 8

Frequency, Percentage, and Type of Labor Peace for Respondents by the Size of the Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor peace</th>
<th>Less than 1,000</th>
<th>1,001 to 2,500</th>
<th>2,501 to 5,500</th>
<th>5,501 or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**
- $n$ of less than 1,000 (districts) = 2 (9.5%)
- $n$ of 1,001 to 2,500 (districts) = 10 (47.6%)
- $n$ of 2,501 to 5,500 (districts) = 6 (28.6%)
- $n$ of 5,501 or more (districts) = 3 (14.3%)
2,501 to 5,500 with 28.6% of the districts in this category. The percentage of respondents in the 5,501 or more category was 16.3% and these respondents were from 14.3% of the districts. Therefore, it may be observed that the percentage of respondents from each category was similar to the percentage of districts in that category.

In summary, administrators and board members had the largest percentage of respondents with over 6 years of collective bargaining experience, while the largest percentage of teacher respondents had between 3 and 6 years of experience. In the districts designated as having labor peace the largest percentage of respondents had between 3 and 6 years of collective bargaining experience, while the largest number of the no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace respondents had over 6 years of collective bargaining experience. The largest number of respondents were from districts with student populations of between 1,001 and 2,500 students which was consistent with the original population and should help to alleviate concerns about bias entering into the study.

Analysis of the Null Hypotheses

The null hypotheses which were presented in Chapter III presented a total score hypothesis and four subscale hypotheses (cooperation, friendliness, legitimacy, trust). Therefore, there were a total of five hypotheses for each of the three null hypotheses to be analyzed and they are restated as follows:

1. No differences exist in the interaction effect which is the attitudes of school board members, administrators, and teacher
organization bargaining members between the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups.

2. No differences exist in the attitudes among school board members, administrators, and teacher organization bargaining team members.

3. No differences exist in the attitudes among the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups.

Null Hypotheses: Total Score

The results of the two-way ANOVA for total scores are presented in Table 9. The two-way ANOVA indicates that Null Hypothesis 1 (total scores), which may be found corresponding to the two-way interaction in Table 9, was not rejected at the .05 level of significance. Null Hypothesis 1 stated there would be no interaction effect related to the means of total score to the type of respondents and to the types of labor peace. Further examination of Table 9 indicates Null Hypothesis 2 (total scores) was not rejected at the .05 level of significance. The portion of Table 9 representing Null Hypothesis 2 is the "Main effects" entitled "Respondent position." There were no significant differences in the mean scores of administrators, board members, and teachers.

Finally, an examination of Table 9 indicates Null Hypothesis 3 (total scores) was rejected at the .05 level of significance. Null Hypothesis 3 represented the portion of the "Main effects" entitled "Type of labor peace." Therefore, there were significant differences in the mean scores among the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither
Table 9

Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Total Scores of Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Level of prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(administrator, board member, teacher)</td>
<td>436.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>218.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of labor peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(labor peace, between, no labor peace)</td>
<td>84789.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42394.6</td>
<td>288.0</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
labor peace nor no labor peace groups at the .05 level of significance.

Table 10 presents the frequency, mean, and standard deviation for the type of respondent (administrator, board member, teacher) and type of labor peace (labor peace, no labor peace, neither labor peace nor no labor peace) for the total scores. Respondents from districts designated as labor peace had significantly higher total mean scores than respondents from districts designated as no labor peace or neither labor peace nor no labor peace. Based on the CAST instrument a higher mean score suggests more of the components of labor peace (cooperation, trust, legitimacy, and friendliness).

Total scores may range from 30 to 150, with the median score being 90. It may be noted also that the mean scores by type of respondent are very similar while the mean scores by type of labor peace are not similar. A mean score of 125.9 suggests the total of the four subscales (cooperation, friendliness, legitimacy, and trust) for the labor peace respondents was higher than the mean score for the no labor peace respondents (65.1) and neither labor peace nor no labor peace respondents (90.6). The higher mean score for the labor peace group suggests the districts designated as having labor peace had more of the components (cooperation, trust, legitimacy, and friendliness) of labor peace, while the no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups had fewer of the components of labor peace.
Null Hypotheses: Cooperation Scores

The two-way ANOVA results for cooperation scores are presented in Table 11 and indicate Null Hypothesis 1 (cooperation scores), which may be found corresponding to the two-way interaction in Table 11, was not rejected at the .05 level. Null Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no interaction effect related to the mean scores of cooperation to the type of respondents and to the types of labor peace. Table 11 also indicates Null Hypothesis 2 (cooperation scores) was not rejected at the .05 level. Null Hypothesis 2 is the "Main
Table 11

Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Cooperation Scores by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of labor peace</td>
<td>9264.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4632.0</td>
<td>170.9</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction</td>
<td>192.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3903.7</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13426.6</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
effects" entitled "Respondent position." There were no significant differences of the mean cooperation scores of administrators, board members, and teachers.

Examination of Table 11 indicates Null Hypothesis 3 (cooperation scores) was rejected at the .05 level. This hypothesis represented the portion of the "Main effects" entitled "Type of labor peace." This indicates a significant difference in the mean cooperation scores within the different labor peace groups.

Table 12 presents the frequency, mean, and standard deviation for the type of respondent (administrator, board member, teacher) and type of labor peace (labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace) for the cooperation scores. The labor peace respondents had higher mean scores than the no labor peace or neither labor peace nor no labor peace respondents. Higher mean cooperation scores suggest there are more cooperative tendencies such as settling grievances promptly and widespread consultation to assist and preserve the relationships in labor peace districts.

Cooperation scores may range from 9 to 45 with the median score being 25. It may also be noted that the mean scores by type of respondent are similar while the mean scores by type of labor peace are not similar. Cooperation may be defined from the CAST instrument as follows: the same philosophical goals for education, settling grievances promptly, and widespread consultation. A cooperation score for labor peace districts of 37.1 was higher than scores of 24.9 and 16.9 for the other two groups. This suggests there are more cooperative tendencies associated with the districts designated as having labor
peace than with no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace districts.

Table 12
Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Cooperation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor peace</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypotheses: Friendliness Scores

Null Hypothesis 1, the interaction effect for friendliness, was not rejected at the .05 level for the two-way ANOVA as shown in Table 13 corresponding to the two-way interaction. Table 13 also indicates Null Hypothesis 2 (friendliness scores) was not rejected at the .05 level. Null Hypothesis 2 stated there were no significant differences
Table 13

Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Friendliness Scores by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of labor peace</td>
<td>2993.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1496.5</td>
<td>183.4</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1175.2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4435.5</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
in the mean friendliness scores of administrators, board members, and teachers and may be found in the "Main effects" portion entitled "Type of respondent."

Finally, Table 13 indicates Null Hypothesis 3 (friendliness scores) was rejected at the .05 level. This hypothesis represented the "Type of labor peace" portion of the "Main effects" and suggests significant differences in the mean friendliness scores.

In Table 14 the reader may observe the frequency, mean, and standard deviation for the type of respondent (administrator, board member, teacher) and type of labor peace (labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace) for the friendliness scores. Respondents from districts designated as no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace had significantly different scores than the labor peace respondents. Friendliness scores may be defined by the CAST instrument as follows: the positive attitudes of the parties to the bargaining process and the manner in which issues are resolved. Higher friendliness scores suggest there was a higher degree of positive attitudes and the manner in which issues are resolved among the participants from the labor peace districts. Scores in the friendliness subscale may range from 5 to 25 with a median score being 15.

The mean friendliness scores by type of respondent are similar, while the mean scores by type of labor peace are not similar. A score of 21.1 for labor peace respondents is different than a score of 9.7 and 15.3 for the no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace districts, respectively. These scores suggest there is a
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tendency for more friendliness in the labor peace districts than in the no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace districts.

Table 14
Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Friendliness Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor peace</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypotheses: Legitimacy Scores

As may be observed in Table 15 corresponding to the two-way interaction results, the legitimacy scores indicate Null Hypothesis 1 was not rejected at the .05 level. Null Hypothesis 1 was the interaction effect. Also in Table 15 it may be observed that Null
Table 15

Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Reported Legitimacy Scores
by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of labor peace</td>
<td>5630.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2815.2</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3168.1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8946.2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Hypothesis 2 under the "Main effects," "Type of respondent," was not rejected at the .05 level. There were no significant differences in the mean legitimacy scores of administrators, board members, and teachers on the legitimacy subscale.

Null Hypothesis 3 (legitimacy scores) was rejected at the .05 level as shown in Table 15 under "Type of labor peace" in the "Main effects" portion and suggests significant differences in the mean legitimacy scores.

Table 16 presents the frequency, mean, and standard deviation for the type of respondent (administrator, board member, teacher) and type of labor peace (labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace) legitimacy scores. Labor peace respondents had higher mean scores than respondents from districts designated as no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace. Legitimacy may be defined from the CAST instrument as follows: acceptance of the collective bargaining process, acceptance of each party's part of the educational scene and staying out of the internal affairs of the opposite party. Higher legitimacy scores suggests a greater belief in each organization's existence. The legitimacy subscale scores may range from 8 to 40 with the median score being 24. On the legitimacy subscale the mean scores by type of respondent are similar, while the mean scores by type of labor peace are not similar. A score of 34.8 was higher than the mean scores of 25.9 and 19.0 by the neither labor peace nor no labor peace and no labor peace groups, respectively. Significantly different legitimacy scores were reported for the districts designated as labor peace compared to the
no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace districts.

Table 16
Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Legitimacy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor peace</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Null Hypotheses: Trust Scores**

Table 17 presents the two-way ANOVA results for the trust scores and indicates that Null Hypothesis 1, which may be observed corresponding to the two-way interaction, was not rejected at the .05 level. Null Hypothesis 1 was the interaction effect. It may also be observed in Table 17 that Null Hypothesis 2, which may be found under the "Main effects," "Type of respondent," was not rejected at
Table 17

Two-way Analysis of Variance: Reported Trust Scores by Type of Respondent and Type of Labor Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of labor peace</td>
<td>4310.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2155.0</td>
<td>130.2</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2383.5</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6774.2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
the .05 level. There were no significant differences in the mean scores of administrators, board members, and teachers on the trust subscale.

Null Hypothesis 3 (trust scores) was rejected at the .05 level and may be observed in Table 17 under "Type of labor peace" in the "Main effects" portion. Null Hypothesis 3 stated that there were no differences between the mean trust scores in the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups. Therefore, there are significant differences in the mean score for the types of labor peace groups.

The frequency, mean, and standard deviation may be observed in Table 18 for the type of respondent (administrator, board member, teacher) and type of labor peace (labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace) for the trust scores. Trust scores were significantly different from the labor peace group as compared to the no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups. Trust may be defined from the CAST instrument as follows: no fear in submitting grievances, flexibility, and informality in the grievance procedure, internal consensus, and belief in each party's word. The trust subscale may range from 8 to 40 with the median score being 24. On the trust subscale the mean scores by type of respondent are similar while the mean scores by type of labor peace are not similar. A score of 33.0 was higher than mean scores of 19.4 and 24.4 for the no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups. These mean scores suggest more trust exists in the labor peace districts than in the no labor peace and neither
labor peace nor no labor peace districts.

Table 18
Descriptive Statistics for Type of Respondent and Labor Peace for the Trust Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor peace</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor peace</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No labor peace</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Chapter IV reviewed the demographics of the study and it was observed that administrators and board members had the largest percentage of respondents with over 6 years of experience. It was observed also that the largest number of respondents from the districts designated as labor peace had between 3 and 6 years of collective bargaining experience, while the largest number of the no labor peace
and neither labor peace nor no labor peace districts had over 6 years of collective bargaining experience. Districts with a student population of between 1,001 and 2,500 students made up the majority of the sample. Districts of this size also had the largest number of respondents.

Chapter IV also reviewed the results of the two-way ANOVA for the three total score null hypotheses and for the 12 subscale null hypotheses (cooperation, friendliness, legitimacy, trust). It was found that there were no interaction effects for the total score or subscale scores for Null Hypothesis 1 related to the means of the types of respondents and the types of labor peace for any of the scores.

Also, total score Null Hypothesis 2 relating to the type of respondent and the four subscale null hypotheses relating to Null Hypothesis 2 were not rejected. There were no significant differences in the scores of administrators, board members, and teacher association members. This was true for all scales studied.

The third null hypothesis relating to the type of labor peace was rejected at the .05 level for the total score null hypothesis and the four subscale null hypotheses. The districts designated as labor peace had significantly higher mean scores than the districts designated as no labor peace and neither labor peace nor no labor peace.

Other items which should be considered, although having no statistical basis, are the comments written at the bottom of the survey instruments. The comments are divided by "type of labor peace" and "type of respondent" and may be found in Appendix 0 which
may be summarized as follows: The most positive comments are from the labor peace districts while the greatest number of negative comments are from the no labor peace districts.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapters I and II presented the foundation and identified the problem statement of this study. Chapter III presented the methodology used in responding to the questions raised in Chapter I. The results of the hypotheses were reviewed and discussed in Chapter IV.

Chapter V is concerned with a summary, conclusions, and implications of the study. There are five major sections in Chapter V and they are as follows: (a) summary of the study, (b) summary of the findings, (c) limitations and conclusions, (d) implications of the study, and (e) recommendations.

Summary of the Study

The summary is divided into three subparts which include: (a) purpose of the study, (b) review of literature and hypotheses generated, and (c) methodology.

Purpose of the Study

Labor unrest and public employee strikes have increased attention on the relationship between the individuals involved in the collective bargaining process and the outcome of the collective bargaining process. The Walton and McKersie study of 1965 and the Golden
(Golden & Parker, 1955) studies of 1955 seem to confirm the means of obtaining labor peace in the private sector but there has not been a comparable study of labor peace in the field of education according to LaMonica (1973), Crandall (1976), and Martin and Smith (1980). Therefore, it seemed appropriate to study labor peace in the field of education.

The purpose of this investigation was to provide evidence for the proposition that when positive attitudes exist between the parties of the collective bargaining process, labor peace exists. Questions towards which this investigation was directed are as follows: Is it possible to develop a criteria to designate school districts as having labor peace? Would school districts designated as having labor peace score higher on an attitude questionnaire than districts designated as not having labor peace?

Review of Literature and Hypotheses Generated

The review of literature indicated that the investigation of labor peace has basically been confined to the private sector with the propositions presented by Walton and McKersie (1965) confirming the findings of the National Planning Association (NPA) from 1947 to 1953. Davey (1959) and Bakke (1966) found that unions and management in the private sector need the cooperation of each other. Others like Selekman (1947), Cheyfitz (1947), and Douglas (1962) studied labor relations in the private sector but the investigation of labor peace in the public sector has been limited.
The review of literature pertaining to the public sector demonstrated an absence of investigations into the attitudes related to labor peace. Studies by Richards (1969), Knighton (1972), and Leberknight (1973) indicated that negative attitudes were present in impasse situations in school districts. LaMonica (1973) found there was an obvious distrust among school boards for the bargaining process and Crandall (1976) found that the attitudes of cooperation, friendliness, legitimacy, and trust improve efforts to reach peaceful settlements.

The findings of Richards (1969), Knighton (1972), and Leberknight (1973) provided support for Hypothesis 1. It stated that there were differences among the attitudes of board members, administrators, and teachers between districts designated as labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace. The findings of LaMonica (1973) stated that the Attitude Structuring Model may be used to identify relationships between the school board, administrators, and teachers. LaMonica's findings helped to develop Hypothesis 2 which stated that differences exist in the attitudes among board members, administrators, and teachers. Hypothesis 3 was provided a basis through the findings of Crandall (1976). It stated that differences exist in the attitudes among the labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace groups.

Methodology

The population investigated for this research was 103 school districts from southwest Lower Michigan. A sample population was
obtained through the mutual designation of school districts as labor
peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace by
intermediate superintendents and the Michigan Education Association
zone director. Their mutual designation amounted to 30 districts.

A set of criteria was developed to designate districts as labor
peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace.
This criteria was adopted from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955)
studies of 1955. Also the survey instrument used was the Crandall
(1976) Attitude Scale Test (CAST) which measured the four subscales
based on the Walton and McKersie (1965) Attitude Structuring Model.

The nulls of the three hypotheses were tested by the two-way
ANOVA. Null Hypothesis 1 was the interaction effect while Null
Hypotheses 2 and 3 represented the main effects.

Summary of the Findings

The findings from Chapter IV are reported under the following
headings: (a) characteristics of the sample and (b) research hypothe­

Characteristics of the Sample

The population investigated for this research was the adminis­
trators, board members, and teacher organization bargaining team
members from the 103 school districts in southwest Lower Michigan.
A sample of 30 school districts were chosen by a mutual designation
by intermediate superintendents and the MEA zone director. Responses
were received from 93% of the districts represented within the sample.
The respondent sample was composed of 52 administrators, 51 board members, and 50 teachers from the 21 districts participating in the study. As a group, most of the participants had over 6 years of collective bargaining experience and the greatest number of respondents came from districts with a student population of between 1,001 and 2,500 students. The respondent sample represented the respondent population as defined by this study.

Research Hypotheses

A total of 15 hypotheses were generated for this research. There were three total score hypotheses, three cooperation scale hypotheses, three friendliness scale hypotheses, three legitimacy scale hypotheses, and three trust scale hypotheses. The independent variable was the designation of districts into the labor peace categories and the dependent variable was the total score and the four subscales (cooperation, legitimacy, friendliness, and trust). The results of the hypothesis testing indicates that the research hypotheses pertaining to Hypothesis 3, districts designated by type of labor peace, was rejected for the total score and each of the four subscales. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not rejected at the .05 level for the total score or any subscale scores.

Limitations and Conclusions

This section analyzes the limitations of the study and the conclusions from the perspective of the research hypotheses. Discussion will center around the sample, methodology, and the findings of the
study.

Limitations

Although true randomness would have been ideal, it probably did not occur since the superintendents and the teacher association presidents were asked to select bargaining team members to participate in the study. It is certainly within the realm of possibilities that superintendents and teacher association presidents choose participants with attitudes most like their own. Therefore, bias may be present in the sample.

Another limitation may be that the intermediate superintendents and the MEA zone director were able to commonly identify only 30 school districts out of 103. Also, bias may have entered the study because there were more no labor peace districts which decided not to participate, but this does not appear to be a concern because it may have represented only greater differences.

Conclusions

Research Hypothesis 1. Although Research Hypothesis 1 (total, cooperation, friendliness, trust, and legitimacy scores) was given the direction that differences existed among the attitudes of the respondents and among the types of labor peace (interaction effect), the data from the present investigation could not support the acceptance of this position. No evidence was found to exist among the attitudes of the respondents and among the type of labor peace groups. Therefore, it was concluded that although the findings of
Richards (1969), Knighton (1972), and Leberknight (1973) purported differences among the attitudes of the types of respondents and among the type of labor peace groups, these attitude differences were not supported in this study. This was true for the total scores, cooperation scores, friendliness scores, trust scores, and legitimacy scores.

The reason the results from the present study were different from Richards (1969), Knighton (1972), and Leberknight (1973) may have resulted from the following differences:

1. Richards' study took place just after the collective bargaining process began in California.

2. Knighton used only board presidents, superintendents, and management chief negotiators. He did not survey teachers.

3. Leberknight studied only districts which were involved in impasse situations.

The present study took place after approximately 16 years of collective bargaining in Michigan and included administrators, board members, and teachers. The present study was not limited to impasse situations.

Research Hypothesis 2. Research Hypothesis 2 (total, cooperation, friendliness, trust, and legitimacy scores) stated that differences exist in the attitudes among the types of respondents. Data from this study did not support this position. Although the findings of LaMonica (1973) supported this position, the findings from this study did not support the position of differences existing among the attitudes of the respondents. The no-difference finding was
consistent for the total scores, cooperation scores, friendliness scores, trust scores, and legitimacy scores.

It is possible the results of the present study differed from LaMonica's (1973) results because of a difference in methodology. He interviewed participants and had them respond by marking a continuum line ranging from conflict to cooperation. LaMonica only interviewed superintendents and teacher association presidents. This study included board members, administrators, and teacher bargaining team members. This study also included a more diverse population and used a validated attitude instrument.

**Research Hypothesis 3.** Research Hypothesis 3 (total, cooperation, friendliness, trust, and legitimacy scores) stated that differences exist among the attitudes of the type of labor peace groups. Support for this position was generated from the data in this study. Also, the findings of Crandall (1976) supported this position. The differences were consistent for the total score and for each of the four subscales at the .05 level of significance.

It is possible to designate school districts as labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace using the criteria adopted from the Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) studies (Appendix C) and this may be supported through the use of the CAST instrument. Also, the subscales independently and in total suggest different levels of labor peace. Therefore, based on the population and sample used for this study, support was given to the proposition that there are differences in the attitudes corresponding to the
districts designated as labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace.

Implications

The sample from this study presented a profile of school districts which had different student populations, rural and urban schools, and the participants in the study had a wide range of years of collective bargaining experience. Although the school districts were from southwest Lower Michigan, they seemed to represent a cross-section of the population of a larger geographical area.

Each of the groups of participants (administrators, board members, and teachers) answered the survey, generally, in a manner consistent with other members of their groups. It appears that the attitudes of administrators, board members, and teachers as a group are somewhat consistent in the way they perceive the collective bargaining process.

The criteria for designating school districts as labor peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace appears to be valid as Hypothesis 3 was rejected at the .05 level of significance. Also the judgment of intermediate superintendents and the MEA zone director seemed to be appropriate for this study. By using a system whereby both the intermediate superintendents and the MEA zone director had to agree on the correct category of labor peace, the possibility of poor judgment was eliminated.

In summary, the three types of respondents (administrators, board members, and teachers) had consistent responses overall, but
the type of labor peace groups (labor peace, no labor peace, and neither labor peace nor no labor peace) had significantly different attitude responses. Therefore, it appears as though there are factors within individual school districts which foster the type of labor peace displayed by those districts. Some of these factors may be the degree of friendliness, cooperation, trust, and legitimacy within school districts as measured by the CAST instrument.

If labor peace is a desirable trait, it would seem logical to develop or encourage positive attitudes of cooperation, trust, legitimacy, and friendliness. This could be accomplished through in-service programs or classes in collective bargaining offered by universities with an emphasis on labor peace. Programs could also be developed by the school board associations, administrator associations, and the teacher organizations. The previously mentioned programs or classes should include nonemotional grievance handling, conflict resolution, and techniques for instituting labor peace in school districts through programs based on cooperation, friendliness, legitimacy, and trust.

Since labor peace was important in the private sector, as proposed by Walton and McKersie (1965) and Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955), to the smooth running of the organization, it may also be important to the public sector. Therefore, a school district which exhibits labor peace should present a more positive image to the public. Hopefully, this will enable a district to concentrate on providing a quality education and work on long range activities instead of spending energy on insignificant day-to-day confrontations.
This also should help a district to receive the proper financial support from the community. A more recent study has suggested that more militant school districts had higher salaries than less militant districts (Williamson, 1980). This would suggest another reason for striving for labor peace, possibly a way to save money.

A relatively new development may have an impact on the entire study and that is the concept of regional bargaining. Regional bargaining has taken much of the control away from the local teachers' associations and placed the control with the regional teachers' bargaining council. Although this does present problems for local school districts, labor peace may still be accomplished by developing a positive environment through positive attitudes in working with the regional teachers' bargaining council.

In summary, it is the opinion of this author that the leaders of school districts (administrators and teacher association leaders) must lead the way in establishing a relationship of cooperation, trust, friendliness, and legitimacy. If and when labor peace exists in a school district, the image of educators should rise along with the community support.

Recommendations

Further research of this type may prove to be beneficial. There appears to be some underlying factors associated with districts designated as having labor peace, no labor peace, or neither labor peace nor no labor peace. It would appear to be beneficial to apply this study to different geographical areas within the state of
Michigan or even in other parts of the United States. Another consideration may be to use a larger population to increase the size of the sample. Also, it may be valuable to study a state where collective bargaining has just begun.

If it were possible all bargaining team members from school districts should be surveyed. This may be difficult but it would increase the validity of the study. It would also alleviate a concern for not having the "true" decision makers in the sample.

A further recommendation would be an indepth study of some of the school districts from each of the three categories of labor peace. By doing an indepth study, it is possible some common underlying factors may be found in districts which were classified under the three categories of labor peace. This type of study could be accomplished by using questionnaires, attitude surveys, and personal interviews. While the present study did not test for causality, it is apparent that such conditions as cooperation, trust, legitimacy, and friendliness are necessary preconditions for successful bargaining and should be studied indepth. Another recommendation would be to compare districts involved in regional bargaining with districts not involved with regional bargaining.

Finally, a study parallel to the study chaired by Golden (Golden & Parker, 1955) in the early 1950's would probably help to clarify what factors promote labor peace in the public sector. It is probably time that we study what factors promote labor peace in the public sector instead of dwelling on the problems of not having labor peace.
Appendix A

Credentials of Judges
Credentials of Judges

Credentials of the judges used to validate the identification instrument:

Mr. Alan Luce
Professional Negotiator in the public sector
20 years of experience
Bargained over 300 contracts

Mr. Roland Lubbinge
Chief Negotiator for Grand Rapids Public Schools and several other districts in Kent County
17 years of experience
Bargained 56 contracts

Mr. Gerald Hollowell
Michigan Education Association Uniserv Director
13 years of experience
Bargained 19 contracts

Mr. Richard Laninga
Assistant Superintendent Kelloggsville Public Schools
13 years of experience (both union and management)
Bargained 10 contracts

Dr. J. A. Copps
Professor of Economics and Collective Bargaining, Western Michigan University
Appendix B

Survey for Identification of Labor Peace
Survey for Identification of Labor Peace

Please answer the following questions:

1. Number of years of collective bargaining experience. 

2. Number of contracts bargained or assisted in bargaining.

3. Number of different school districts for which you have bargained or assisted in bargaining.

Please check either yes or no depending on whether or not you believe the statements pertaining to collective bargaining are valid in assisting both union and management to achieve labor peace in public sector collective bargaining.

1. There is full acceptance by the school board and administration of the collective bargaining process and of unionism as an institution. The school board and administration consider a strong union an asset to management. 

2. The union fully accepts management's operation of the schools; it recognizes that the welfare of its members depends upon the successful operation of the schools.

3. The union is strong, responsible, and democratic.

4. The school board and administration stay out of the union's internal affairs; they do not seek to alienate the workers' allegiance to the union.

5. Mutual trust and confidence exist between the parties. There have been no serious ideological incompatibilities.

6. Neither party to bargaining has adopted a legalistic approach to the solution of problems in the relationship.

7. Negotiations are problem centered--more time is spent on day-to-day problems than on defining abstract principles.

8. There is widespread union-management consultation and highly developed information sharing.
9. Grievances are settled promptly, at the local level whenever possible. There is flexibility and informality within the procedure. yes___ no___
Appendix C

Criteria for Designation of Labor Peace
Criteria for Designation of Labor Peace

1. There is full acceptance by the school board and administration of the collective bargaining process and of unionism as an institution. The school board and administration consider a strong union an asset to management.

2. The union fully accepts management's operation of the schools; it recognizes that the welfare of its members depends upon the successful operation of the schools.

3. The union is strong, responsible, and democratic.

4. The school board and administration stay out of the union's internal affairs; they do not seek to alienate the workers' allegiance to the union.

5. Mutual trust and confidence exist between the parties. There have been no serious ideological incompatibilities.

6. Neither party to bargaining has adopted a legalistic approach to the solution of problems in the relationship.

7. Negotiations are problem centered—more time is spent on day-to-day problems than on defining abstract principles.

8. There is widespread union-management consultation and highly developed information sharing.

9. Grievances are settled promptly, at the local level whenever possible. There is flexibility and informality within the procedure.
Appendix D

Letter to Intermediate Superintendents
This letter is written to request your assistance in a study of collective bargaining in school districts in southwest Lower Michigan. Specifically, the study will examine the relationship of attitudes to peaceful settlement of negotiated contracts.

Your assistance and expertise is needed to designate school districts within your intermediate as having labor peace, no labor peace, or somewhere in between labor peace and no labor peace. Attached is the criteria for designation and a list of districts within your intermediate. It is likely that most districts will not meet all of the criteria but to be classified as having labor peace they should meet most of the criteria. Please fill out the attached form listing districts within your intermediate and return it to me in the enclosed envelope by Wednesday, April 16, 1980.

You may be assured that no one other than myself will have access to this information and all information will be strictly confidential. Your assistance will be extremely valuable to me.

Please find an enclosed letter from Dr. LaVerne Boss from Kent Intermediate.

Sincerely,

Larry Engel
Researcher
Appendix E

Supportive Letter to Intermediate Superintendents
MEMORANDUM

To: Fellow Intermediate School Superintendents
From: Vern Boss
Re: Survey of Labor Relations Climate

This memorandum is to encourage you to assist Larry Engle, an administrator with the Kelloggsville Public School system, by completing the enclosed survey. Possibly you may wish to designate someone in your intermediate office more familiar with the labor relations climate in constituent school districts to complete the survey.

I have had the opportunity to discuss this research project with Mr. Engle and can assure you he is most sincere in making a contribution in this area of school district management.

The survey form is brief and your cooperation in expediting its completion and return will be greatly appreciated. My personal thanks to you for your assistance.

VB/al

Encl.
Appendix F

Designation Survey for Labor Peace
Designation Survey for Labor Peace

Please designate the following school districts as having labor peace (+), no labor peace (-), and somewhere in between labor peace and no labor peace (0). The criteria to be used for identification is on the attached sheet. It is likely most districts which exhibit labor peace will not meet all of the criteria but will meet a majority of the items.

Kent Intermediate

Byron Center
Caledonia
Cedar Springs
Comstock Park
East Grand Rapids
Forest Hills
Godfrey-Lee
Godwin Heights
Grand Rapids
Grandville
Kelloggsville
Kenowa Hills
Kent City
Kentwood
Lowell
Northview
Rockford
Sparta
Thornapple Kellogg
Wyoming
Appendix G

Cover Letter to Superintendents
May 19, 1980

Dear Superintendent:

This letter is written to request your assistance in a study of collective bargaining in school districts in southwest Lower Michigan. Specifically, the study will examine the relationship of attitude structuring to peaceful labor relations.

The population will consist of teachers, administrators, and school board members in selected districts. The instrument is included with this cover letter and should be completed and returned in the attached envelope by May 30, 1980. Each instrument is coded to provide for a greater response and to identify whether a respondent is a teacher, administrator, or school board member.

Please ask three board members who have been involved in the collective bargaining process to fill out the instruments with the red "B" at the top. Also ask three administrators involved in the collective bargaining process to fill out the instruments with the blue "A" at the top. If you are involved in the collective bargaining process, please fill out one of the instruments for administrators.

This study has the approval of Dr. Jon Reynolds, Superintendent, Kelloggsville Public Schools. Your anonymity and that of your school district will be strictly preserved in reporting the results of this study.

Sincerely,

Larry Engel
Researcher

Dr. Richard Munsterman
W.M.U. Advisor
Appendix H

Supportive Letter to Superintendents
May 19, 1980

Dear Fellow Superintendents:

I would like to encourage you, your fellow administrators and board members to participate in the collective bargaining study by Larry Engel.

Larry is an administrator with Kelloggsville Public Schools and I have known him since I became superintendent. The study will measure attitudes toward collective bargaining. Please make every effort to provide the information necessary for Larry to complete this study.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Jon Reynolds  
Superintendent
Appendix I

Cover Letter to Teacher Association Presidents
May 19, 1980

Dear Teacher Association President:

This letter is written to request your assistance in a study of collective bargaining in school districts in southwest Lower Michigan. Specifically, the study will examine the relationship of attitude structuring to peaceful labor relations.

The population will consist of teachers, administrators, and school board members in selected districts. The instrument is included with this cover letter and should be completed and returned in the attached envelope by May 30, 1980. Each instrument is coded to provide for a greater response and to identify whether a respondent is a teacher, administrator, or school board member.

Please ask three teacher bargaining team members involved in the collective bargaining process to fill out the instruments. If you are involved in the collective bargaining process, please fill out one of the instruments also.

This study has the approval of Mr. Dave Thompson, M.E.A. Zone Director. Your anonymity and that of your school district will be strictly preserved in reporting the results of this study.

Sincerely,

Larry Engel
Researcher

Dr. Richard Munsterman
W.M.U. Advisor
Appendix J

Supportive Letter to Teacher Association Presidents
TO: SELECTED TEACHERS IN SOUTHWESTERN MICHIGAN

FROM: David L. Thompson, Zone III Director, MEA/NEA

DATE: May 20, 1980

RE: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

I would hope that you could find a minute or two to complete the enclosed questionnaire which deals with bargaining and the question of labor peace in selected districts throughout western Michigan. The project is being conducted by Larry Engel as part of a graduate project, but the response is strictly voluntary. We are hopeful that we will have the results by next Fall which we will pass along.

DLT/s
Appendix K

Second Letter to Superintendents
June 26, 1980

Dear Superintendent:

This letter is a subsequent correspondence to a letter dated May 19, 1980. If the three administrators and three board members have not filled out the attached questionnaires, please ask them to do so as soon as possible. I have enclosed the correct number of questionnaires for your district. The rest of the information is the same as in the May 19 letter.

The population will consist of teachers, administrators, and school board members in selected districts. The instrument is included with this cover letter and should be completed and returned in the attached envelope as soon as possible. Each instrument is coded to provide for a greater response and to identify whether a respondent is a teacher, administrator, or school board member.

Please ask three board members who have been involved in the collective bargaining process to fill out the instruments with the red "B" at the top. Also ask three administrators involved in the collective bargaining process to fill out the instruments with the blue "A" at the top. If you are involved in the collective bargaining process, please fill out one of the instruments for administrators.

This study has the approval of Dr. Jon Reynolds, Superintendent, Kelloggsville Public Schools. Your anonymity and that of your school district will be strictly preserved in reporting the results of this study.

Sincerely,

Larry Engel
Researcher

Dr. Richard Munsterman
W.M.U. Advisor
Appendix L

Second Letter to Teacher Association Presidents
June 26, 1980

Dear Teacher Association President:

This letter is a subsequent correspondence to a letter dated May 19, 1980. If the three members of your bargaining team have not filled out the attached questionnaires, please ask them to do so as soon as possible. I have enclosed the correct number of questionnaires for your district. The rest of the information is the same as the May 19 letter.

The population will consist of teachers, administrators, and school board members in selected districts. The instrument is included with this cover letter and should be completed and returned in the attached envelope as soon as possible. Each instrument is coded to provide for a greater response and to identify whether a respondent is a teacher, administrator, or school board member.

Please ask three teacher bargaining team members involved in the collective bargaining process to fill out the instruments. If you are involved in the collective bargaining process, please fill out one of the instruments also.

This study has the approval of Mr. Dave Thompson, M.E.A. Zone Director. Your anonymity and that of your school district will be strictly preserved in reporting the results of this study.

Sincerely,

Larry Engel
Researcher

Dr. Richard Munsterman
W.M.U. Advisor

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix M

Nonrespondents to Surveys
Nonrespondents to Surveys

Ten school districts did not respond. Six districts were from the no labor peace group, one was from the labor peace group, and three were from the neither labor peace nor no labor peace group.

1. One no labor peace district sent a letter stating they did not wish to participate. Four other no labor peace districts were contacted by phone with the following responses:

- District A Administration—"We have a poor relationship with them [union]."
- District A Teachers—"We do not wish to participate in anything the administration does."
- District B Administration—"We do not have time."
- District B Teachers—Unable to contact.
- District C Administration—"There is no cooperation between the administration and teachers."
- District C Teachers—"The board and administration cannot be trusted."
- District D Administration—"We do not wish to participate."
- District D Teachers—"Everyone is on vacation."

2. One labor peace district called me and explained they were currently bargaining and do not wish to participate (Administration).

3. One neither labor peace nor no labor peace district sent a letter stating they "did not wish to participate."
Appendix N

Crandall Attitude Scale Test (CAST)
Questionnaire
Crandall Attitude Scale Test (CAST)
Questionnaire

The following is an attitude questionnaire designed to measure your attitudes based upon experiences in your school district concerning the relationships among School Administrators, the School Board, and the Teacher's Organization.

Please respond by a check mark in the appropriate column indicating your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe that:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Both School Administrators and the Teacher's Organization have the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophical goals in mind for education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a friendly attitude between the School Board and the Teacher's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization during negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Issues are resolved in a friendly manner by the parties during negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrators design grievances to be submitted in order to solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in their district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administrators accept the notion of the collective bargaining process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Administrators accept the Teacher's Organization as an integral part of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational scene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Board members stay out of the internal affairs of the Teacher's Organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There is a friendly attitude between the Teacher's Organization and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators during negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that:

9. Most of the negotiation time is taken up in practical problems such as salary, class size, and school hours.

10. The Teacher's Organization is democratic.

11. There is a mutual trust existing between the School Board and the Teacher's Organization.

12. Grievances are settled promptly in the school district whenever possible.

13. Teachers are not afraid to submit grievances.

14. During negotiations there is frequent widespread Administrator-Teacher's Organization consultation.

15. There is a friendly attitude among all the parties, including the chief negotiators, during negotiations.

16. There is a friendly attitude between the School Board and Administrators during negotiations.

17. Neither the School Board nor the Teacher's Organization attempt to adopt a completely legalistic approach to solving problems during the negotiations process.

18. Board members accept the Teacher's Organization as an integral part of the educational scene.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that:

19. All parties share information willingly during negotiations.

20. Both the School Board and the Teacher's Organization have the same philosophical goals in mind for education.

21. Internal consensus between the Teacher's Organization and its negotiators is fully achieved during negotiations.

22. There is mutual trust existing between Administrators and the Teacher's Organization.

23. Administrators do not seek to alienate teachers in their allegiance to the Teacher's Organization.

24. Administrators stay out of the internal affairs of the Teacher's Organization.

25. The School Board accepts the notion of the collective bargaining process.

26. There is basic cooperation between the opposing chief negotiators during negotiations.

27. Board members and Administrators trust each other.

28. There is internal consensus between the Board's negotiators and Administrators during negotiations.

29. There is flexibility and informality within the grievance procedure.
I believe that:

30. Internal consensus between the School Board and its negotiators is fully achieved during negotiations.

31. There is a high level of trust between the members of the negotiating teams.

32. There is a high level of friendliness between the members of the negotiating teams.

33. There is a high level of cooperation between the members of the negotiating teams.

34. There is a high level of belief in the legitimacy of each bargaining team.

35. The number of years of experience you have had in collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

36. Comments: ____________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix O

Comments From CAST Instrument
Comments From CAST Instrument

Labor Peace

Administrators

Responses are based on the entire span of personal negotiation experience. There have been times and situations when my responses to some questions would have been significantly different.

The statements above were true of our last negotiations. If you would have sent this questionnaire 3 years ago, it would have been answered quite differently.

Board Members

The attitudes and conditions vary so from one experience to another that I question the validity of my own answers!

Our Board of Education has had a good chief negotiator the past two years. I've worked on negotiations several times and really don't mind the many hours spent as we're all seriously striving for a settlement.

Board members made every effort to keep situation from becoming unpleasant.

Teachers

A round of bargaining is never the same. I've been involved with negotiating three contracts and each situation has been different.

Often things seem to progress easily in a small system because everyone is aware of the weaknesses and strengths of each negotiating team.

I have served on a negotiating team four times with the end result being multiple (3) year contracts.

It is important to remember that school board members change from one election to the next, also negotiation teams—this could cause differences in attitudes and philosophies from one bargaining year to the next.
Neither Labor Peace Nor No Labor Peace

Administrators

The relationships often vary depending on individuals assigned to respective negotiating positions.

Many of the questions can be answered agree one year and disagree the other years, or vice-versa.

Your questions are very general and open to interpretation.

Board Members

Negotiating is a game that no one really wins.

Open meetings and the media make the process more and more difficult.

Negotiations is a give and take process, however, that attitude may be lost after agreements are reached.

It is hard to answer in this manner. Some negotiations are more difficult than others. It seems to be more difficult since the teachers have their regional groups.

Teachers

My single year of experience may have generated quite different responses as the Board's chief negotiator and Administrative representation on the team was different for the first time in several years.

Some questions could have been answered in several ways—depending on the individual Board negotiator and particular issues.

In some areas regarding the board and administration it is rather difficult to know exactly where they do stand on issues—on policy. There is also some question as to how much information our board (and administrators in some instances) received on the status of negotiations—and who had actual/final authority on the board's side—their chief negotiator—or the superintendent.

Your questionnaire did not deal with behavior, i.e., appropriate vs. inappropriate, that can have a direct effect on how the negotiations may be perceived as being friendly or not friendly.
Building principals at the 7-12 level are supportive of teachers. If I was responding with only these men in mind, my responses would be more in the agree column.

There are members of the administration in our district which would indicate an agreement, but, other members overcome that positive position.

No Labor Peace

Administrators

Responses are based upon the last contract negotiations period. These responses would vary from contract to contract.

The operation of county wide education association organization has affected local relations.

In 13 years at the table the answers to these statements would vary from year to year because of (1) change in teacher negotiator, (2) change in board, and (3) change in administration.

Collective bargaining is destroying public education.

Board Members

I'm amazed that teachers do not bargain for their peers (as a whole)—they bargain for themselves in salary and supplements.

Collective bargaining used to be a fair system. Under county collective bargaining, we will lose all local control.

Laws need to be changed to protect the taxpayers more and not so much for labor.

We have an unusual situation in this system as compared to other systems. I have never experienced as much mistrust and political maneuvering anywhere else.

The union is going to defeat its purpose by loosing sight of education and hide in respect to where operating dollars come from.

There is always a reasonably good relationship between negotiating teams early on in negotiations but this relationship normally deteriorates as negotiations progress to the money stage, unless there is another sensitive item.
There always exists, to some degree, an advisory relationship between negotiating teams. We have been conditioned to win and if you have opposing teams each will try it's best to win or find a way to rationalize loosing.

Teachers' associations are and should be primarily concerned with improved status for teachers and have only a secondary interest in improving education in general. School boards' and administrators' primary concern is maintaining and improving a quality educational program to meet the needs of all students possible.

Teachers

For any collective bargaining to succeed it is my belief that the administration and school board philosophies must be "open" and realistic to teacher demands. Often times teachers are not realistic to economic demands. Often during negotiations teachers do not really know how much money to deal with. We don't have a service or product to sell for return. So when economic demands are asked for, taxpayers use us as a scape goat and usually defeat millage votes. How much of a school district's budget is waste. I'm talking about teachers as well as all other personnel. We need a stronger voice in budgeting matters and streamlining the educational process.

The major difference between the school and the Association is that the school is more strongly concerned with $s.

Language in the contract for grievances, binding arbitration, etc., have taken more time than school hours, more recently.

I do not feel we are negotiating. It seems more like "begging"!

Board teams come to negotiations sessions without serious preparation to deal with scheduled issues. They take unrealistic inflexible positions.

There has been a total breakdown in communications between board, administration, teachers, teacher organizations, etc., that affects everything including negotiations.

The board's team tends to be lazy and ill-prepared at every meeting.

The board's negotiator runs his side--his team serves little purpose and there is very little information given to administrators.

Friendliness is "put on" and not true feelings between the administrators and teachers' bargaining team.
Most of the time was used to philosophize in order to prevent facing issues mentioned in 9 until school started. This action was generated and perpetuated by the administrator negotiators. Relationship involving mutual trust of administrators and MEA members has slowly disintegrated over the past 6 + years due to publication and sharing of inaccurate and sometimes misinformation shared by administration. Members have begun to not trust due to poor P.R. through negative experience in dealing with problems.

Board helped found alternative union while we petitioned for county-wide bargaining agent change.

New board negotiator on the scene. Attempting to change much and even destroy previous gains and practices. Strike definite possibility.
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