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A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECONDARY TEACHER SATISFACTION AND ATTITUDE TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Teacher unrest and collective action to secure changes in the terms and conditions of employment are of recent origin. Prior to the 1960's teachers accepted the terms and conditions provided by school boards and administrators. This traditional passive role changed, however, with the advent of collective legislation at the state level and the activist American Federation of Teacher's challenge to the National Education Association membership. Many teachers were unwilling to accept the take-it-or-leave-it approach by contracting school boards and became more assertive. Teachers have withheld services, struck, sanctioned and boycotted to support their demands for greater control over terms and conditions of their employment.

In 1962 Smith and McLaughlin, among others, observed conflicts developing in public employment and issued an urgent plea for relevant research.¹ The literature at the time had made only general references to teacher negotiations and a need for improving staff relations.

Since this time little research has been conducted on teacher negotiations.

As teachers become more accepting of collective negotiations, school boards and administrators are forced to re-evaluate their relationships with teachers. Boards and administrators must be aware of the nature of teacher dissatisfaction. It is appropriate that research be conducted on the relationship between teacher dissatisfaction with the school environment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. The present research was conducted to provide school boards and administrators with information upon which to base decisions affecting contracting relationships.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

During the decade of the sixties employee-employer relations in public education underwent significant changes. There arose a wave of teacher unrest characterized by aggressive collective action by teachers to bargain with boards of education on salaries, hours, and other conditions of employment. A discussion of sources of teacher unrest will provide a background for the present study. According to Lieberman and Moskow, changing characteristics of teachers as a group have been a crucial source of teacher
unrest. For years, teaching staffs were stereotyped as circles of spinsters, who were placebound, rigid, professionally static, and innocent of any role in administrative decision making. Many changes have recently occurred within the teaching population. More men have entered the field; the average age of teachers has markedly declined; more married women are engaged in teaching; and more teachers are becoming "professionalized" in terms of training and career commitment.

According to Heald and Moore, no longer are teachers satisfied with being among the lowest paid professional groups. No longer are they willing to accept a token voice in determining how they will be allowed to perform on the job. No longer will they accept treatment perceived as subprofessional. Their "group personality" has undergone massive transformation. This transformation has been bewildering to a public accustomed to the stereotype of those comprising the teaching profession.3


Another major source of teacher unrest has been the gradual loss of teacher identity resulting from enlargement and consolidation of school divisions and within divisions.\textsuperscript{4} Recent years have seen a reduction of small, inefficient units. This process has resulted in increasing organizational size and thus impersonality in the nature of the job setting. Many teachers, as a result, have increasingly turned for social and professional contact to organizations such as professional associations, the prime breeding ground for dissatisfaction and teacher collective action.\textsuperscript{5} In the preface to a collection of readings on collective negotiations, Elam, Lieberman and Moskow reported:

> It is characteristic of twentieth-century United States that occupational groups organize in order to strengthen their position. Teachers have built significant organizations to protect and advance their interests only within the past forty to fifty years, and often these organizations have subordinated salary and welfare to other professional concerns. But this is not the case in the sixties. In this decade teachers have grown more militant. They are making themselves felt as a pressure group in an increasingly


professionalized and bureaucratized society. A third source of teacher unrest has been the transformation of the professional environment to a more "unionized" setting. This transformation has occurred largely due to the effect of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) upon the National Education Association (NEA). This effect can be traced to the beginning of this decade, when the United Federation of Teachers, an American Federation of Teachers affiliate, requested the New York City board of education to hold an election for the purpose of allowing teachers to select a group to represent them in negotiations. Although the board agreed in principle with the request, it delayed, and a one-day strike was called on November 7, 1960. Teachers numbering 4,600 stayed off the job to force the board to act. This collective action by the United Federation of Teachers culminated in the first comprehensive collective agreement for teachers. With this event the AFT became a rival to the NEA for membership. Since the AFT victory in New York

---

City, membership growth has seriously questioned the former pre-eminence of the NEA.\(^8\)

The success of the AFT and growing dissatisfaction by teachers since 1961 has caused "a complete about face of NEA's position on collective bargaining and the use of strikes and sanctions."\(^9\) The NEA, with 1,082,000 members and representing 52 percent of public school teachers, has moved from a position of opposition to indifference, to passive acceptance, to the present state of enthusiastic and financial support of collective negotiations.\(^10\)

Another influence upon the professional setting factor has been recognition of the right of federal government employees to form, join, and participate in employee organizations. In 1961, the Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, was commissioned by the President to review the problems of public sector employment. The results of this investigation led President Kennedy to issue Executive Order 10988 on January 20, 1962.\(^11\) The Order contained provisions permitting public sector

---

\(^8\) Doherty and Oberer, op.cit., pp. 31-38; Neirynck, op.cit., p. 294; Elam, op.cit., p. 15.


\(^10\) Ibid., pp. 625-627.

\(^11\) Lieberman, and Moskow, op.cit., p. 495.
employees to negotiate written contracts and it allowed advisory mediation for federal employees.\textsuperscript{12} Although this Order was restricted to federal employees, it was issued at a time when state legislatures were considering legislation on negotiations by public employees. Certain states passed legislation favorable to teachers.

Wisconsin, in 1962, was the first state to enact legislation authorizing collective negotiations for teachers. Wisconsin was followed in 1965 by Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, and Washington. During the next six and a half year period, twenty-three additional states passed similar legislation as presented in Table 1.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
States Enacting Legislation Authorizing Collective Negotiations for Teachers & & & & \\
January, 1966 to April, 1972 & & & & \\
\hline
Alaska & Idaho & Montana & New York & Rhode Island \\
California & Kansas & Nebraska & North Dakota & South Dakota \\
Delaware & Maine & Nevada & Oklahoma & Texas \\
Florida & Maryland & New Hampshire & Pennsylvania & Vermont \\
Hawaii & Minnesota & New Jersey & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{States Enacting Legislation Authorizing Collective Negotiations for Teachers}
\end{table}

Three states, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Nevada, enacted legislation substantially revising existing statutes. Currently (April, 1972), twenty-nine states have enacted legislation which permits the practice of collective

negotiations by teachers.\textsuperscript{13}

Virginia has no such statutes. There is little collective negotiations activity, except in and about the large cities. Ten written agreements have been negotiated. Five school divisions, King George, Page, Powhatan, Virginia Beach, and Waynesboro possess recognition agreements.\textsuperscript{14} Recognition agreements provide for formal acceptance by the school board of a negotiating representative, establish rules governing negotiations, frequently contain procedures for resolving individual teacher grievances and sometimes include provisions for resolving impasses over terms and conditions of employment.\textsuperscript{15} Five school divisions, Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William, and Newport News operate under master contracts with teachers.\textsuperscript{16} The master contract includes a recognition agreement and comprehensive policies with respect to the terms and conditions of employment.\textsuperscript{17}


\textsuperscript{14}Virginia Education Association, \textit{Professional Negotiation Agreements} (Richmond, Virginia: Virginia Education Association, 1971), p. i.


\textsuperscript{16}Virginia Education Association, \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{17}Wollett and Chanin, \textit{loc. cit.}
Several probable sources of teacher unrest have been discussed including changing characteristics of teachers, loss of teacher identity, and the development of a more "unionized" professional setting. Examination of general sources is not sufficient in itself, however, to offer administrators sufficient guidance for informed action when faced with such activism. For this reason it was judged appropriate to collect and analyze empirical data on selected teacher responses.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Although a body of relevant literature is developing, inadequate empirical evidence exists on relations between teacher satisfaction with the school environment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Changes in the field are occurring so rapidly that parties involved must continuously adjust without an opportunity to conduct appropriate research.

The purpose of the present study was to determine the relationship between secondary teacher extrinsic satisfaction and secondary teacher attitude toward collective

---

negotiations to develop a better understanding of teacher satisfaction factors which could become important to parties involved in collective negotiations if the process becomes legalized in Virginia.

Three pertinent research questions clarify the scope and direction of this study. Initially, what are secondary teacher attitudes toward collective negotiations? Secondly, what is the level of teacher satisfaction or dissatisfaction as to elements of school environment? Finally, what are the relationships between teacher attitude toward collective negotiations and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the school environment?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Toward contributing to the body of empirical research in the developing field of collective negotiations, the present study will address three significant areas:

1. To test hypotheses relating two of the twelve variables of Hellriegel's Conceptual Model of Factors Related to Teachers' Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations.¹⁹

2. To increase knowledge of attitude toward collective negotiations and sources of dissatisfaction which could contribute to teacher collective action. If a legal structure for teacher collective negotiations becomes a reality in Virginia, this knowledge of dissatisfaction should aid school divisions in preparing for the transition to a formal negotiation process.

¹⁹Hellriegel, op.cit., p. 23.
To contribute toward a better understanding of teacher behavior, it is hoped that administrators may gain more accurate perception of teacher involvement in collective negotiations and thus promote more harmonious relations as the involved parties engage in the negotiations process.

These three areas will comprise the focus of the present study.

DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTS USED IN THE STUDY

An understanding of frequently used terms is important for the comprehension and interpretation of the present study. Definitions of attitude, collective negotiations, satisfaction, and secondary teachers as well as a discussion of the concepts perception and motivation will be provided. This section has been included to contribute to a more complete understanding of terms used as well as to clarify a theoretical base for the present study.

Attitude

Attitude was defined according to Katz as "the predisposition of the individual to evaluate some symbol or object or aspect of the world in a favorable and unfavorable manner." Edwards and Thurstone have defined an attitude more functionally as "the degree of positive or negative

affect associated with some psychological object."²¹

Edwards states:

By a psychological object, Thurstone means any symbol, phrase, slogan, person, institution, ideal or idea toward which people can differ with respect to positive or negative affect.²²

The definition of Edwards and Thurstone will be used in the present study.

Perception

The importance of a knowledge of attitudes for understanding an individual's inclination to behave in a certain manner was indicated by the relationship between perceptions and attitudes. Hare interprets the relationship between the two concepts. "The perceptions which remain the same over a long period of time are here called attitudes."²³ Hare considers an attitude to be a type of a percept. Berelson and Steiner expand the meaning beyond a mere phenomenon or event to that of


²²Ibid.

the more complex process by which people select, organize, and interpret sensory stimulation into a meaningful and coherent picture of the world.\textsuperscript{24}

Campbell offers concise statements as to how one arrives at a perceptual "picture of the world" as well as relating it to an individual's behavior. He states:

In a sense, each person may be said to function in a world of his own making. His attitudes and views serve as a perceptual screen; he interprets his environment according to the way he perceives it; and he reacts to that environment in accordance with his interpretations.\textsuperscript{25}

A knowledge of secondary teacher attitudes may provide at least a partial basis for understanding, if not, indeed, predicting, how they are likely to perceive situations such as those related to collective negotiations. The perceptions of individuals are assumed to affect motivation toward some form of overt behavior.

Motivation

Motivation is an inferred explanatory construct related to the "why" of behavior. Individuals are deemed to experience needs and wants which impel them to action. This action, or behavior, in Siegel's analysis, is directed


in two ways, "by causing the individual to seek one of several goals and by causing him to seek certain goals not present at the moment." 26

A model of motivation has been developed by Dunnette and Kirchner from the work of Vroom.

It is assumed that a person behaves in response to stimuli associated with a hypothesized internal state of disequilibrium. The behavior is directed at attaining an incentive or goal which the individual anticipates will be satisfying the sense of restoring equilibrium. . . . The attainment of the goal. . . leads to a change in the level of the force impelling the individual toward action. 27

The importance of studying the sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of secondary teachers was to gain an understanding of the sources of their attitude toward collective negotiations and their motivations. According to Stagner of the private sector and Christrup of the public sector, unions are composed of dissatisfied employees. If unions were devoid of dissatisfaction, they would lack significant cause for collectively bargaining with their employer. 28

Porter and Lawler clarify the importance of studying attitudes.


It is because the study of attitudes is so closely tied to the study of motivation and motivation theory that one can draw upon a considerably body of basic psychological theory to build a model of the relationship between job attitudes and job behavior.\textsuperscript{29}

However, caution must be exercised in assuming that overt behavior may be predicted from attitudes. In a review of the literature on the relationship between attitudes and behavior, Fishbein concludes:

After more than seventy-five years of attitude research, there is still little, if any, consistent evidence supporting the hypothesis that knowledge of an individual's attitude toward some object will allow one to predict the way he will behave with respect to the object.\textsuperscript{30}

Hellriegel indicated that within a given social context, the concepts of attitude, perception, and motivation are partially related to each other. Attitudes affect the nature and direction of the perceptual process, which, in turn, is related to particular motivational dispositions. These dispositions may be reflected through overt behavior.\textsuperscript{31}

This review has attempted to define and synthesize important elements in the concepts of attitude, perception, and motivation to provide a background for understanding


\textsuperscript{31}Hellriegel, op.cit., p. 12.
how teacher attitude toward collective negotiations is related to teacher satisfaction with the school environment.

**Collective Negotiations**

The terms "collective bargaining," "professional negotiations," and "collective negotiations" have frequently been used interchangeably. Historically, collective bargaining has been used to define the negotiating process in the private sector. "Collective negotiations" was coined by the American Federation of Teachers and "professional negotiations" was originated by the National Education Association to distinguish the process for professional educators from the labor-oriented precedent. Since the term collective negotiations represents a compromise term, it was chosen for use in this study.

Collective negotiations are defined as any form of group action used by teachers formally to bring about desired changes in the employee-employer relationship in a school system. Consistent with this definition, the present study defined attitude toward collective negotiations through individuals' scores on a modification

---

Satisfaction

Satisfaction was defined as:

The extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceived satisfaction as stemming from his total job situation.

In support of this definition Coughlan states that the definition contains two important elements. First, it related motivational processes to organizational structure by assuming that individuals have inherent and acquired needs and that some of these needs can be gratified, within the perception of the individual, by specific dimensions of the school environment. Second, it assumes that satisfaction is a multidimensional construct with dimensions identifiable through factor analysis. Satisfaction may therefore be defined in terms of specific human needs and individual perceptions of the environmental sources of gratification of these needs.

---


34 A copy of the Collective Negotiations Survey used in the present study is contained in Appendix B.


37 Ibid.
Satisfaction was defined operationally with the above through a score on the dimensions of the School Survey. These dimensions are discussed below in four groupings.

I. General Administration

Administrative Practices

This dimension measures the respondent's evaluation of the work of the top echelon in the school system. It includes both human relations and administrative aspects of the work at this level. It is designed to assess the more general aspects of the administrator-teacher relationship.

Professional Work Load

This dimension is concerned with the quality and quantity of professional work the respondent is required to do. Also included are items concerning the cooperation given teachers by the administration in relation to the work load.

Non-Professional Work Load

This dimension assesses the respondent's opinion of the amount and type of non-professional duties performed as well as administrative practices in this area.

Materials and Equipment

This dimension provides information on the respondent's opinions about the selection, quality, quantity, and use of instructional materials, aids and equipment in the school.

Buildings and Facilities

This dimension assesses the physical working conditions within and immediately surrounding the school. It also measures the respondent's feelings

---

38. Industrial Relations Center, "An Overview of the School Survey Program" (Chicago: Industrial Relations Center, 1968), pp. 7-14. (Mimeoographed.)
about the adequacy of facilities and administrative interest in maintaining and improving them.

II. Educational Program

Educational Effectiveness

This dimension deals with the effectiveness of the school program in meeting appropriate educational needs of the community and the support given the school by members of the community. It attempts to determine whether the respondent feels that the school is fulfilling its responsibilities to the community.

Evaluation of Students

This dimension attempts to assess the respondent's attitude toward the process of evaluating and reporting student progress. It also includes the school's policy of promotion, retention, and the provisions made for teacher-student consultation following the progress report.

Special Services

The purpose of this dimension is to determine whether the school provides special services which are adequate to meet the needs of students. It deals both with the availability of programs and the interpersonal relations between teachers and special service personnel.

III. Interpersonal Relations

School-Community Relations

This dimension reflects the respondent's understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the administration, school board, and community in the operations of the school system. It seeks his opinion as to whether existing relationships are adequate to provide an effectively functioning school system.

Supervisory Relations

This dimension is concerned with the respondent's evaluation of his immediate supervisor as a group leader. It focuses on work organization and improvement, communication effectiveness, and supervisory practices dealing with the work problems and potential of professional personnel.
Colleague Relations

This dimension deals with the friendliness of people in the respondent's work group and with relations between groups in the school. It is concerned with both professional and social relations in the school.

IV. Career Fulfillment

Voice in Educational Program

The purpose of this dimension is to measure the respondent's satisfaction with planning the school's educational program. It deals primarily with curriculum development and choice of materials.

Performance and Development

This dimension assesses the effectiveness of procedures used to evaluate performance and stimulate the professional growth and development of individuals in the system.

Financial Incentives

This dimension is designed to assess the respondent's attitudes toward the salary and benefit program and its administration in the school system.

The School Survey measured teacher satisfaction needs as to these fourteen dimensions.\(^{39}\)

Secondary Teachers

This term refers to school employees certified by the Commonwealth of Virginia to teach in the eighth through the twelfth grades.

HYPOTHESES

The major hypothesis of the study was: there is a

\(^{39}\) A copy of the School Survey used in the present study is contained in Appendix C.
significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with the school environment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Since teacher satisfaction as defined was categorized into different subscales, this hypothesis was evaluated by testing subhypotheses. By subhypothesizing, it was deemed possible to obtain findings with respect to the nature of the relationship between the dimensions of teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 1. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with higher administrative practices and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with the professional work load and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with the non-professional work load and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 4. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with materials and equipment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 5. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with physical working conditions and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 6. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with educational effectiveness and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.
Hypothesis 7. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with the evaluation of students and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 8. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with special services and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 9. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with school-community relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 10. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with supervisory practices and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 11. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with colleague relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 12. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with involvement in the educational program and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 13. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with professional growth factors and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Hypothesis 14. There is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with financial incentives and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

These subhypotheses state certain measurable independent relationships between the dimensions of teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations as defined in the present study.
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The first chapter has presented the statement of the problem, background of the study, significance of the study and the hypotheses tested. In addition, a number of definitions and concepts were presented to provide a theoretical basis for understanding and interpreting the study.

In Chapter 2, an outline of Hellriegel's Conceptual Model of Factors Related to Teachers' Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations will be presented. Also a review of the literature with respect to major variables of concern to the present study will be given.

Chapter 3 will present the methodology of the research study. The discussion will include the types and limitations of the research instruments utilized, selection of the sample population, and the research design.

In Chapter 4 a summary will be provided of the findings obtained from each of the research instruments and the results of the tested hypotheses.

The final chapter will present a review of major conclusions, implications of the study for administrators and school board members, and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2

CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND REVIEW
OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will include a modification of Hellriegel's conceptual model and a review of related literature regarding attitudes toward collective negotiations and teacher satisfaction.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL

A modification of Hellriegel's conceptual model was proposed to aid initial thought in visualizing the study. The model conveys functional relationships and was "deductively derived with only partial verification through the inductive process."¹ Hellriegel developed the model as a means of

1. Identifying and portraying the assumed relationships among the key variables considered to provide the behavioral framework of teachers vis-a-vis collective negotiations;² and

2. Integrating the findings from the empirical investigation and to help

¹Hellriegel, op.cit., p. 18.

identify those dimensions of the model which need further research.  

Analytically the modification of Hellriegel's model depicted in Figure 1 is a system operating within an environment. This environment is the organizational context. Sergiovanni and Starratt describe this context as consisting of three interrelated but conceptually distinct sets of variables.

One set, the organizational success variables, represents the output which results from school efforts and activities. Another set, the initiating variables, represents those assumptions, actions, belief patterns, and modes of operation which are best described as administrative and organizational. The third set, the mediating variables, constitutes the fabric of the humanization of the school.

Sergiovanni and Starratt have defined the variables which compose each of the three sets. They are explained below.

Initiating Variables

1. The performance goals of the school and their emerging patterns of implementation

2. Basic assumptions concerning the "nature of man" held by all employees

3. The arrangement and interworking of the structural elements of the school composing the organizational style

---

3 Hellriegel, op.cit., p. 19.


5 Ibid., pp. 16-17.
Conceptual Model of Factors Related to Teachers' Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations

*Sources: Don Hellriegel, "Collective Negotiations and Teachers: A Behavioral Analytical Approach" (unpub.)
4. Administrative and supervisory behavior pattern functioning in the school

5. The nature and implementation of the authority system operating in the school

Mediating Variables

1. Employee attitudes toward their job and each other
2. Level of extrinsic and intrinsic employee satisfaction
3. Level of commitment to the performance goals of the school
4. Level of loyalty and commitment within and between the employees of the school
5. Level of trust and confidence that exists within themselves and between each other
6. The extent to which employees feel involved in their school
7. The degree of horizontal and vertical communication in the school

Organization Success Variables

1. Growth, performance, and development of employees as measured against the established performance goals
2. Growth, performance, and development of students as measured against the established performance goals
3. The amount of increase in the worth of the human organization
4. Absence and turnover rates of the staff
5. Absence and dropout rates of the students
6. Quality of school-community relations
7. Quality of personnel relations

Sergiovanni and Starratt have summarized how these variables interact to affect school effectiveness, as follows:
The human organization of schools, which includes the quality of communications, group loyalty, levels of job satisfaction, and commitment to task, for example, exerts a direct influence in determining the nature and quality of school success. In turn, these mediating variables are influenced and determined by the nature and quality of attitudes, practices, and conditions which compose the initiating variables.

Working to effect change in the mediating variables will in the long run increase the school's effectiveness.  

The "mediating variables", which Hellriegel terms "intervening variables", are central to the present study. The modified model includes all of the variables originally identified by Hellriegel, including the two selected for study: teacher satisfaction and collective negotiations.

As depicted by the model, teachers enter the institutional context through three personnel processes: recruitment, selection, and placement. In recruiting, the personnel staff attempts to interest prospective teachers to apply for employment in the particular school division. In selection, the personnel staff determines

---

6Ibid., pp. 17-18.


which teachers fit best into vacant positions in the school division. In placement, teachers deciding to join the division are assigned specific organizational roles.

**Teacher Satisfaction**

Variable 1 in the modified model refers to the perceived satisfactions or dissatisfactions of secondary teachers as to fourteen different dimensions of their environmental setting. These dimensions of teacher satisfaction include administrative practices, professional work loads, non-professional work load, materials and equipment, building and facilities, educational effectiveness, evaluation of students, special services, school-community relations, supervisory relations, colleague relations, voice in educational program, performance and development, and financial incentives.

Hellriegel's conceptual model was modified as to the dimensions of the satisfaction variable. Hellriegel employed the *Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire* to define his dimensions operationally. The present study defined the dimensions operationally using the *School Survey*, an instrument to be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

---


10 Industrial Relations Center, op.cit., pp. 7-13.
**Professionalism**

Variable 2 refers to the extent to which secondary teachers support "professional" standards of behavior, E.g., individual teacher compliance with administrative direction. Professionalism is shown as having a mediating effect on satisfaction as well as the attitude toward collective negotiations. This former relationship is identified by the feedback loop to the satisfaction variable.\(^{11}\)

**Socio-Economic Factors**

Variable 3 refers to socio-economic influences upon the population. Socio-economic factors are shown as having a mediating effect on satisfaction as well as the attitude toward collective negotiations. This relationship is identified by the feedback loop to the satisfaction variable.\(^{12}\)

**Collective Negotiations**

Variable 4, collective negotiations, refers to secondary teacher attitude toward collective negotiations in terms of support for the negotiating process itself and for sufficient coercive force to assure equal party strength.\(^{13}\) The model assumes that satisfaction,

---

\(^{11}\) Hellriegel, op.cit., pp. 24-26.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., p. 27.

professionalism and socio-economic factors have a relationship to attitude toward collective negotiations. Neither Hellriegel's nor the present study investigates the relationship as cause-effect. It must be recognized, however, that such a cause-effect relationship, if established, might modify the findings of the present study. The feedback loop from collective negotiations to the institutional context indicates that the process may affect parties in the educational system who are not teachers, as to decision, communication, planning, control, and organization processes. 14

**Power and Control**

Variable 5 refers to the degree to which collective negotiations provides a means for teachers to increase in collective power and control within the organizational context. 15 As Horvat explains:

Negotiations is a rapidly growing force in American education because it is a method by which teachers can gain some real control over decision making in the schools. No longer can administrators and board members choose to, or afford to, reject out of hand or ignore the requests and demands of teacher groups. Collective negotiations processes create political, psychological, and in some cases legal pressures which force boards and administrators to listen to and respond to the demands of teachers of their districts. 16

---

14 Hellriegel, French, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 383.

15 Ibid., pp. 27-28.

The model indicates that when an increase in power and control occurs, rewards result for teachers.

Rewards

Variable 6 refers to the political result of an increase in power and control. These rewards are viewed as desirable outcomes and returns. They serve to reinforce the value of the collective negotiations process for teachers.\(^{17}\)

Aspiration Level

Variable 7 refers to the degree to which higher goals are anticipated as the result of collective negotiations grow more beneficial. The feedback loop from aspiration level to teacher satisfaction indicates this relationship. Hypothetically, teachers conceive collective negotiations may yield primarily increased extrinsic satisfaction rewards. Eventually, their attention may focus on intrinsic satisfaction rewards.\(^{18}\)

Reinforcements of Negotiations

Variable 8 refers to internal and external forces which have impact on attitude toward collective negotiations. These forces may produce a positive or negative attitude. The model depicts four such forces. There is

\(^{17}\)Hellriegel, op.cit., p. 28.

\(^{18}\)Ibid., pp. 28-29.
one internal variable, rewards (Variable 6). There are three external variables (Variable 9, 10, and 11): teacher experiences with collective negotiations, competition between NEA and AFT, and legislation.

Variable 9, assumed to have a reinforcing effect, is the degree of success displayed by teachers in other divisions using the process. Variable 10 is competition between NEA and AFT. Variable 11 is legislation.¹⁹

This discussion of a modification of Hellriegel's conceptual model has included: the research purposes, the environmental context of operation, and the elements.

COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

This portion of the chapter will consist of an introduction, major arguments for and against collective negotiations, and a review of the research on attitude toward collective negotiations.

Collective negotiations in the present study was viewed as a unidimensional variable composed of two integrated formal group actions: the bilateral bargaining process and the coercive activities which assure party equality. Collective negotiations has been viewed in other studies as a multidimensional variable composed of factors such as: causes of teacher collective action, results anticipated from collective negotiations, composition of

¹⁹Hellriegel, French, and Peterson, op.cit., p. 387.
the teacher bargaining team, role of superintendent in the process, role of the school board, issues which are negotiable, alternatives at impasse, and scope and substance of state legislation. Since the sample for the present study resided in a state without explicit collective negotiations legislation, no attempt was made to draw conclusions as to dimensions which have not yet been defined for the state.

**Major Arguments for Collective Negotiations**

This discussion of major arguments in favor of collective negotiations includes a listing of six basic assumptions. They are as follows:

1. Conflict must be generated continually, artificially if necessary, so that adversaries will be forced to change positions.

2. Progress occurs frequently when conflict is stimulated because uncompromising parties are stimulated to alter positions.

3. Laws, the social culture, and the membership of political bodies are imbalanced in favor of the establishment. The adversary relationship is necessary to restore equal standing between or among the parties.

4. Teachers and school boards seek different goals which are largely irreconcilable. Domination and compromise offer the only solution to this conflict. This forces each party to distrust the other.

5. Each party views the other as providing minimal contributions to educational improvement. If the other party's power were reduced, the schools would be better.
6. Each party perceives itself as providing major contributions for educational improvement. It should be permitted the leadership role.\(^\text{20}\)

Under these assumptions, the following arguments are advanced in support of collective negotiations.

From the teacher standpoint, one of the arguments for collective negotiations is that it provides a "counter-vailing force to the monopsonistic or oligopsonistic power of school systems."\(^\text{21}\) Several authorities state that the establishment of collective negotiations alters the distribution of power among various groups with school-centered interests and in some cases produces veto power for teachers in the decision making process. The substitution of groups for individual dominance or dominance by a few is basic to the alternative of distribution of power. The emergence of group power serves to increase the rational, political, and economic power of teachers.\(^\text{22}\)

Perry and Wildman further indicate that collective negotiations assure teachers access to the source of the


\(^{21}\)Hellriegel, op.cit., pp. 80-81.

decision making process within a particular school system. The acquisition of this access results from agreement as to procedural arrangements governing the bargaining relationship. Since decisions in this relationship are arrived at through consensus, teachers gain a measure of persuasive power through joining the administrator and school board.23

Teacher salaries is one of the most important areas where teachers have needed a countervailing force.24 As Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware state:

The mounting impatience of teachers with what they consider to be economic injustice is a factor of considerable significance. The point of view here is that teacher salaries have historically lagged behind the returns to other comparable groups, and often behind the pay of unskilled workers. Teachers dislike the resistance of the public to reasonable adjustments in their pay in an affluent society which they had a significant part in creating. As a quite general practice, soothing phrases about the importance of teachers has been proffered them in lieu of increased economic rewards.25

Teachers have discovered that they must wield more power if they are to receive more equitable remuneration.

Hall and Carroll report that in recent years there has appeared a growing literature on the effect of

---


collective negotiations on teacher salaries. In one study Kasper was unable to find a constant relationship between teacher organizations and teacher salaries. There were serious weaknesses in his methods, however, which two later studies attempted to remedy. In both of these, statistically significant results were obtained. Hall and Carroll indicated that several design weaknesses in these studies left the issue still in doubt. After correcting these deficiencies, Hall and Carroll found that teacher organizations increased salaries.

Another area related to teacher salaries where teachers have needed a countervailing force is adequate financial support for quality education. Resentment among some teachers has mounted at the neglect of schools by our perceived affluent society. Teachers have become disturbed over obsolete school buildings, inadequate


29 Hall and Carroll, op.cit., pp. 840-841.
facilities and supplies, overloaded classrooms, and general deterioration in the quality of education offered children. The public appears to expect schools to provide quality services, but supports financial priorities directly opposed to this expectation. In order to establish consistency between teacher priorities and public expectations, teachers have found a need to exert force on those groups controlling the financial future of public education.

A second argument for collective negotiations arises from teacher lack of opportunity to communicate with school boards and administrators in spite of their rising level of professional competence. With increasing teacher competence, teachers are demanding more authority and responsibility for decision making. Davis and Nickerson stated:

As any individual becomes more competent in his field he feels compelled to assume a larger role in the decisions regarding policies and procedures in that field.

In tracing the history and development of teaching and the influence of more specialized teacher education,

---


32 Davis and Nickerson, op.cit., p. 84.
Callahan concluded that teachers have gained greater competence through specialized preparation, but still face no commensurate gain in professional involvement in decision making.\textsuperscript{33}

Principals and supervisors with less directly relevant knowledge and skill perceive themselves as competent enough to make important curricular decisions. Many teachers assert that they are themselves better qualified to make curricular decisions and organizational plans.\textsuperscript{34} Campbell cited the need for administrators to involve teachers with specific competence and expertise in the decision making process.\textsuperscript{35} Corwin found from his investigations that to gain control over their profession and increase their participation in decision making teachers must utilize a "militant process" of involvement.\textsuperscript{36}

A third argument for collective negotiations is


\textsuperscript{35} Roald F. Campbell, and Donald H. Layton, \textit{Policy Making For American Education} (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1969), pp. 99-100.

that it provides a solution to the administrative problem of reconciling the conflict created by the demand for compliance and impersonality imposed by the bureaucratic organizations and the demand for freedom and autonomy associated with professionalism.\textsuperscript{37} Bidwell indicated that an understanding of the authority structure is crucial to an understanding of the conflict created by teachers as professionals functioning in a bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{38}

According to Parsons, the source of conflict can be seen when distinguishing between bureaucratic authority and professional authority. Bureaucratic authority is described as a rational distribution of power over a hierarchy of positions. Professional authority is described as a rational distribution of power over a hierarchy of positions. Professional authority is described as a collegial, rather than a hierarchical, relationship in which the distribution of authority resides with demonstrated knowledge and competence.\textsuperscript{39}


Blau and Scott further clarify:

The source of discipline within a bureaucracy is not the colleague group, but the hierarchy of authority. Performance is controlled by directives received from one's superiors rather than by self-imposed standards and peer group surveillance, as is the case among professionals. This difference in social control, which is related to that between expertness and discipline, constitutes the basic distinguishing feature between professional and bureaucratic institutions, which have otherwise many similar characteristics. The significance of this difference is brought into sharp relief if one examines people who are subject to both forms of social control; that is, professionals in a bureaucracy.  

The traditional authority structure of a school has been viewed as a mixture of administrative and supervisory dimensions of authority. Administrative authority is referred to as power to issue rules and regulations to govern the organizational behavior of the members. Supervisory authority is referred to as power to define, influence and assess the level of task performance of members of the organization. Principals have traditionally exercised both dimensions of authority. According to Blau and Scott, the administrative dimension of authority rests on the social control of organizational discipline and the supervisory dimension of authority rests on the social control of expertness.

It is at the points of difference between the social control of discipline and the social control of


41 Boyan, op.cit., p. 293.
expertness that conflict is created for professional teachers functioning in a bureaucratic environment. The traditional structure assumes a difference between expertness of teacher and administrator which justifies the exercises of both administrative and supervisory dimensions of authority. As teachers perceive the difference in expertness diminishing, however, they tend to support a separation of the two dimensions of authority.

Current research on the teacher as a professional in a bureaucracy supplies qualified support for collective negotiations. Washburne found that the administrator either ignores or punishes professional teacher behavior. He anticipated the development of teacher unrest from administrative attempts to resolve the conflict between bureaucratic and professional authority. Corwin found that increased teacher professionalism stimulated teacher unrest because teacher demand for greater freedom and autonomy resulted in resistance by school boards and administrators. He also found that "initiative-prone" teachers, who were professionally and less bureaucratically oriented than "compliance-prone" teachers, exhibited consistently higher rates of conflict with administrative authority.


\[\text{43}\] Corwin, loc. cit.
Blanke has identified six "social forces" which support the emergence of collective negotiations. They were: antagonism toward traditional paternalistic administrative relationships, the dehumanizing effects of increased size and bureaucratization of school divisions, increased insecurity and anxiety due to organizational complexity, public resistance to increased taxes for public education, and the rivalry for membership between the NEA and the AFT.\(^{44}\)

In summary, the major arguments for collective negotiations have been proposed from various standpoints. The following arguments have been used:

1. It provides a countervailing force to other vested groups regarding teacher salaries and financial support for quality education.

2. It provides channels for increasingly competent teachers to gain a significant voice in the decision making process.

3. It provides a solution to the conflict created by professionals functioning within a bureaucratic structure.

These three arguments comprise support for collective negotiations.

**Major Arguments Against Collective Negotiations**

This discussion of major arguments against collective negotiations includes a listing of six basic assumptions.\(^{45}\)


\(^{45}\) Wynn, loc. cit.
They are as follows:

1. A democratic society is built upon laws, values, and an ethos permitting decision making by assumed rational persons.

2. Teachers, administrators, and board members are honorable people desirous of discharging their responsibilities capably.

3. Teachers, administrators, and school board members possess the common goal of improving humanity through education, and this basic unanimity transcends their differences.

4. Teachers, administrators, and school board members possess unique capabilities for making improvements in education. The quality of education is enhanced when the knowledge, experience and power of teachers, administrators, and school board members function interactively.

5. When teachers, administrators, and school board members share in the development of policies and procedures, the commitment to common educational objectives becomes more unified.

6. Cooperative decision making by teachers, administrators, and school board members offers a sound approach to integrating organizational goals and employee needs and thereby maximizing the satisfaction of all parties.

Under these assumptions, the following arguments are advanced against collective negotiations.

Wollett and Chanin identify five of the most frequently used legal arguments opposing collective negotiations.

In the first legal argument the school is a "body politic and corporate" created by state legislation to implement administration of the state educational system.\(^46\) The

school board possesses duties which are governmental in nature. As a public body, the board has only those powers conferred upon it by law. This legal basis has been referred to as the "doctrine of sovereign immunity".\textsuperscript{47} For a school board to engage in collective negotiations would be illegal due to its sovereign powers.

In a typical collective bargaining relationship in the private sector, management would possess the power to make binding commitments with respect to financial and other matters affecting terms and conditions of employment. However, in the public sector, a school board frequently lacks this authority. Since the financial resources are often determined by another branch of local government, a school board cannot enter into meaningful collective negotiations on salaries, hours, and terms and conditions which possess budget implications.\textsuperscript{48}

A second legal argument cites a doctrine that the legislative and executive responsibilities of the school board may not be relinquished or delegated. For a school board to make concessions at the bargaining table on salaries and conditions of employment would be illegally delegating its power. Further, for a school board to share the formulation of public policy through collective

---

\textsuperscript{47} Wollett and Chanin, loc. cit.

negotiations would be an illegal abdication of legal responsibility. The rights and responsibilities of the board are for it exclusively, and cannot be delegated to or shared with a teacher organization through collective negotiations.\(^4^9\)

In states without collective negotiations statutes, the doctrines of sovereign immunity and of illegal delegation of power form the core arguments which school boards cite to avoid recognition of a teacher agent or teacher agents to bargain collectively. However, once favorable legislation has been enacted these arguments have little or no validity.

The following counter-arguments have been used to oppose the previous legal arguments. According to Moskow, more than half of the school boards are fiscally independent and thus determine their budget without approval of a local governing body. The others are fiscally dependent. Studies have shown that some fiscally dependent school boards which engage in collective negotiations have modified the school board representative relationship to include the local governing body. The governing body participates in three way negotiations, or the school board maintains continuous informal contact with the governing body as negotiations progress. School boards

\(^4^9\)Wollett and Chanin, loc. cit.; Seitz, loc. cit.
have thus engaged in collective negotiations resulting in binding commitments on financial matters and conditions of work.50

Niemyck indicates that there is no evidence of detrimental effects upon the public schools from collective negotiations by teachers. He concludes, rather, that collective negotiations should cultivate harmonious relations between school boards and teachers.51

A letter from a teacher representative to a school board offers the following view of collective negotiations. He stated:

Negotiations do not require concessions by either party. The power to formulate policy carries with it the power to consider policy proposals made by other persons, including teacher representatives, to reject some proposals and accept others, and to adopt the latter as board policy. This is no more abdication of responsibility than choosing proposals of architect A over those made by architect B. 52

A legal third argument against collective negotiations assumes that collective negotiations may be viewed as directly related to private sector collective bargaining. Private sector bargaining has guaranteed private employees the right to strike. Public employees are generally forbidden to strike. In addition to its illegality, the teacher strike is not a fair or equitable instrument for


52Wollett and Charnin, op.cit., p. 1:10.
imposing teacher demands upon public schools. To strike against a school board is to "strike against the children and the people" and after a period of time risks "immediate damage to children." Since collective negotiations are directly related to the right to strike, teachers do not have the right to bargain collectively. 53

Seitz adds that all courts and authorities agree that the right to strike does not exist for public sector employees. The reasoning supporting this conclusion has been expressed in various ways. According to Seitz:

Woodrow Wilson called strikes by public employees 'an intolerable crime against civilization.'

The Norwalk Case quotes Franklin D. Roosevelt . . . as saying, 'a strike of public employees manifests nothing less than an intent on their part to prevent or obstruct the operation of government and such action is unthinkable and intolerable.' 54

Wirtz advances the following argument in support of the illegality strikes for public employees. He stated:

The occasional attempt to distinguish between governmental functions in terms of their 'essentiality' is fruitless. Policemen and firemen are no more essential than school teachers; it is only that the costs and losses from doing without the police and fire departments are more dramatic and immediate. Every government function is essential in the broadest sense, or the government shouldn't be doing it. In almost every instance, the government is the only supplier of the service involved—and there is serious question about the legitimacy

53 Ibid., pp. 1:9 - 1:12.
54 Seitz, op. cit., p. 504.
of any strike which deprives the public of something it needs and can't get from somebody else.\textsuperscript{55}

Opponents to the argument that teachers should have the right to strike counter that without it, teachers possess no effective way to advance their cause against an uncompromising school board. It is further contended that strikes should not be condemned for all public employees but only those whose services if withheld would create a critical emergency.\textsuperscript{56}

The literature reveals there has been an increasing number of teacher strikes recently without the imposition of penalties upon the strikers. Public sector legislation in recent years has permitted the use of strikes under certain circumstances. These factors tend to weaken arguments opposing collective negotiations due to its direct relation with private sector strikes.\textsuperscript{57}

The fourth legal argument against collective negotiations states that teacher work conditions are to a large extent fixed by statute. Such conditions are


\textsuperscript{56} Seitz, op.cit., p. 505.

tenure, hiring and terminating procedures, pensions and retirement provisions, disability benefits, medical insurance, sick leave, and minimum salaries. These matters cannot be the subject of collective negotiations without limit, since modification of the provisions of a statute is illegal.\textsuperscript{58}

Finally, the school board, as a public employer performing duties which are governmental in nature, cannot legally negotiate exclusively with an agent of a portion of teachers regarding school division business. As a legal matter, school board action must deal with all teachers. A board cannot recognize a teacher organization chosen by a majority of teachers as their exclusive negotiating representative.\textsuperscript{59}

In addition to the legal arguments against collective negotiations, Wollett and Chanin cite school board oriented arguments extracted from a letter sent by a school board to its teachers.

\textldots Teachers, administrators, and boards of education have as their only goal the fulfillment of children through the schools. The adversary relationship is unnatural and inconsistent in education, \ldots By its nature, education is a cooperative process, resting heavily upon the sharing of many complex responsibilities. By injecting the unnatural adversary relationship, neither teacher nor administrator can be wholly effective. Where teachers should participate actively in policy formulation in cooperation

\textsuperscript{58} Wollett and Chanin, op.cit., p. 1:12.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
with administrators and boards, the bargaining procedure would separate them.

The constant presence of the membership drive among competing teacher organizations introduces an element of antagonism in school faculties. That is incompatible with sound school practices. A good school rests heavily upon the voluntary sharing of responsibilities and professional services among its staff members. An aggressive membership recruitment has resulted in open hostility towards now complying teachers to the point of social and professional isolation. Good teaching cannot prevail under this condition of stress.

The school board opposed collective negotiations because the process injects an adversary relationship into an educational environment where all should share common goals, and because the teacher membership drive creates strife in the school environment. Perry and Wildman substantiate that adversary bargaining relationships stimulate group conflict. 61

Radke offered the possibility of weakening lay board control as a third opposing argument.

We recognize many areas of mutual concern, but not of joint responsibility with teacher organizations. We believe that if we are to retain our unique American system of citizen-controlled public education, the board must protect its right to determine policy. We see any action which diminishes the decision-making power of the board as weakening local lay

60Ibid., pp. 1:9 - 1:10.

responsibility for education because it removes control over policy that much further from the public's hands.\textsuperscript{62}

A final argument against collective negotiations states that the process stimulates the development and forces the implementation by the school board of an "elaborate network of rules and regulations." The elements of the network would consist of a grievance procedure, impasse procedure, and comprehensive job descriptions. This network of rules and regulations in an already over bureaucratized system would heighten the level of conflict between administrative enforcers and professionally oriented teachers. Williams states that an industrial relations approach such as collective negotiations will not satisfy teacher-demanded departures from the traditional bureaucratic system.\textsuperscript{63}

In summary, the major arguments against teacher collective negotiations have been argued as to law, and from the perspective of the school board. The legal arguments consist of:

1. The doctrine of sovereign immunity.

2. The doctrine of illegal delegation of power.

3. The assumption that bargaining requires a right to strike.


Many issues which teachers wish to negotiate are statutorily fixed.

Public employers cannot legally bargain exclusively with a representative of a portion of the employees.

The arguments developed from the school board perspective consist of:

1. Negotiations create an adversary relationship which hinders the accomplishment of the mutual goals of education.

2. Negotiations promote competition between teacher organizations which stimulates internal conflict.


4. Negotiations set up rules and regulations which increases bureaucratization.

These arguments comprise opposition to collective negotiations.

Review of Research on Teacher Attitude Toward Collective Negotiations

The empirical research on teacher attitude toward collective negotiations has been grouped into three categories:

1. Research on attitude toward collective negotiations viewed it as a unidimensional variable.

2. Research on the attitude toward collective negotiations viewed it as a multidimensional variable.

3. Studies of the relation between some variable or variables and the attitude toward collective negotiations viewed as unidimensional or a multidimensional variable.
Three purposes will be served through the review of this literature. First, the relevance of the present study to the developing literature on teacher satisfaction needs and attitude toward collective negotiations will be shown. Second, the significant findings will be reported on attitude toward collective negotiations viewed undimensionally. Third, a report will be made of attitude literature on collective negotiations viewed multidimensionally.

One of the earliest studies of attitude toward collective negotiations was performed by Carlton, whose major purposes were to develop a collective negotiations instrument and to determine the attitude of North Carolina teachers and principals toward collective negotiations. His collective negotiations instrument gave impetus to the early development of research on attitude toward collective negotiations. He found that principals were less receptive to collective negotiations than teachers. Phillip's study revealed a significant difference between the attitude of elementary and secondary teachers toward collective negotiations. Both studies indicated

---


that attitude differed with regard to position and sex. Male teachers were found to be the stronger supporters of collective negotiations.

Fisher, using Carlton's instrument, separately studied attitude toward the collective negotiations process and toward sanction activities in relation to Oregon educators' sex, position, and grade level. Fisher found that teachers taken as a whole were favorable to the negotiations process, but had a neutral response to sanction activities. Male teachers supported sanctions more favorably than female teachers. Principals were unfavorable to sanctions. He found a significant difference between teacher and principal attitude toward collective negotiations. With respect to their level, elementary teachers were less supportive of collective negotiations than secondary teachers. 66

In another study, utilizing a portion of the instrument Fisher used to measure attitude toward sanction activities, Giandomenico investigated the relationship between perceived need deficiency and "militancy" or attitude toward sanction activities, among public school teachers in Pennsylvania. 67 Perceived need deficiency was


measured through use of an instrument developed by Porter and adapted for teachers by Trusty and Sergiovanni. 68 These needs may be characterized as intrinsic satisfaction needs.

Giandomenico found a significant relationship between perceived need deficiency and "militancy." However, his findings did not support the hypothesis that higher order needs (intrinsic satisfaction needs) were more highly related to "militancy" than those of the lower order needs (extrinsic satisfaction needs). Two of the better predictors of "militancy" were feelings of self-fulfillment of teaching from self actualization category and opportunity for participation from the autonomy category. 69

From the previous studies Carlton's Collective Action Scale was employed partially or totally. The present study utilized the total Collective Action Scale to determine if there was a significant relationship between extrinsic satisfaction and attitude toward collective negotiations. The present study attempted to continue the developing research identifying satisfaction needs which might be related to attitude toward collective negotiations.


69 Giandomenico, loc. cit.
Among studies investigating attitude toward collective negotiations viewed as a unidimensional variable, Schaffer found significant differences in the attitude of teachers and superintendents in nineteen Northwestern Ohio counties toward collective negotiations as well as significant male-female differences among teachers. Cooper studied teacher attitude toward collective negotiations in Southern California and found that teachers endorsed collective negotiations, but that this support decreased as more participation was demanded of them. Cooper also found secondary teachers to be more bargaining oriented than elementary teachers.

Ball investigated the attitude of educators, school board members, and parents in two suburban school districts in six major metropolitan areas in the three states of Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. He found that the majority in each of the groups favored granting teachers the right to negotiate collectively, but no consensus was established as to the method of implementing the process.


In a national survey of teachers undertaken by the NEA Research Division each year from 1965 to 1971, sampled teachers were asked if they believed public school teachers should ever strike. The responses received indicated the following.

1. The percentage of teachers who thought they should have the right to strike increased from 53 percent in 1965 to 73 percent in 1970.

2. Sixty-three percent of the respondents in 1970 stated that teachers should have the right to strike only under extreme conditions.

3. Twenty-one percent in 1970 stated that teachers should never strike, and six percent were undecided.

4. Male teachers showed a more favorable attitude toward strikes than female teachers, the latter have substantially increased their strike support from 1965.

From these findings, those teachers approving strikes indicated the following as justifiable reasons:

- to remedy unsafe conditions for pupils;
- to obtain higher salaries;
- to achieve satisfactory teaching conditions, such as reasonable class size;
- to improve the instructional program;
- or to obtain a negotiation agreement with the school board.

Summarizing the findings on collective negotiations viewed as a unidimensional variable, teachers regard collective negotiations positively. In contrast, school boards generally oppose the process. Administrators generally accept the attitude of the more influential

---


74Ibid.
group. As findings on attitude toward collective negotiations viewed as a unidimensional variable accumulated, multidimensional surveys became the research trend in the area. From several previously cited studies completed in states without legislation authorizing collective negotiations, findings revealed that elementary teachers were not avid supporters of the bargaining process. In twelve Michigan school districts where negotiations had been occurring, Marquardt studied more specifically the perception of elementary teachers toward collective negotiations. In an abstract of his study, he reported

the degree of impact of negotiations is conditional upon internal conditions of the district, location of the district and the professional organization.

Teachers were found to perceive collective negotiations to bring greater participation in curriculum development, in-service work and policy on work conditions; smaller financial benefits; greater parental influence; improvement in the status of teachers; and a lessening of principal control.76

Wurster and Sinicropi have each studied attitudes toward the perceived need for state legislation and the provisions for a statutory framework. Sinicropi found that


76Ibid.
teachers and superintendents saw need for a statute in Iowa, but that school board members disagreed.\textsuperscript{77} In New Mexico, Wurster found that school board presidents and superintendents opposed a legislative act, while teacher association presidents and teachers saw need for a statute.\textsuperscript{78} The three groups in Sinicropi's study perceived different needs. Wurster's four groups agreed that two elements were basic to collective negotiations legislation: provisions for formal recognition and for bilateral determination of educational policy.

Shell, in a study of Oklahoma teachers and superintendents, found that both groups perceived that school board members would not support favorable state legislation. As to the role of the superintendent, both groups saw him as the major decision maker concerning personnel, finance and property, but not negotiations. Teachers perceived a need for teacher involvement in decisions relating to the learning process and conditions of employment.\textsuperscript{79}


Three studies have dealt with the composition of negotiating units and the scope of negotiable issues. Napolitano surveyed teacher association presidents and school board chairmen and found that acceptance by the school board was considered desirable for the selection of unit representatives. He further found that salary and fringe benefits were the only agreed on topics for negotiations. O'Hare found both teachers and superintendents in Iowa agreed that teachers should have the right to negotiate collectively over salary and wages but differed on the content of negotiations.

Queen compared the attitude of teachers, superintendents, and school board members concerning the recognition and items to be negotiated. Queen found that superintendents and teachers favored the recognition of a single unit, but the board refused to commit itself on the issue. Finally, the superintendent and the board were in agreement as to items to be negotiated.

---


In a study of teacher attitude in St. Louis, Missouri, Oker found teachers were consistently supportive of collective negotiations. Teachers judged that the most important subject for negotiations was salary.\footnote{83}{Robert Oker, "A Study of Attitudes of Teachers in St. Louis County, Missouri School Districts Toward Negotiation," \textit{Dissertation Abstracts}, 30A: 1372, October, 1969.}

In a study investigating the amount of agreement among school personnel in Iowa concerning the negotiating role of the superintendent, and the structure and scope of the collective negotiations process, Urich identified two district groups: one predominantly from rural and urban school districts and the other from central city school districts. He found the rural and urban school personnel had common attitudes toward the process while central city school personnel shared a different attitude.\footnote{84}{Ted R. Urich, "A Q Sort Analysis of Attitudes of School Personnel in Iowa Toward Collective Negotiations," \textit{Journal of Educational Research}, 63: 74-77, October, 1969.}

In a study of Indiana secondary teacher attitude toward items for negotiation in school divisions negotiating under comprehensive agreements, Wertz found that salary and fringe benefits were perceived as best resolved through collective negotiations; working conditions were best resolved through teacher-administrator dialogue; and personnel policies were best resolved either
through negotiators or dialogue. 85

Moreschi found, in a study of Pennsylvania teachers, school board members, and superintendents, that the three groups agreed that the board should negotiate with all personnel units using a professional negotiator and that in teacher bargaining, teachers should define the items for negotiations. The three groups felt that specific legislation was needed for education. 86

In a study of school board chairmen, superintendents, principals, elementary teachers, and secondary teachers in Virginia, Cloninger surveyed such issues as the desirability of an authorizing collective negotiations statute, the scope of bargaining, bargaining unit composition, impasse resolutions, legalization of the right to strike, selection of teacher bargaining representatives, and desirable stipulations in the written agreements. He found that secondary teachers supported a collective negotiations statute for Virginia; race, community type, and geographical location were important factors affecting attitude


concerning the other aspects of collective negotiations; and sex, years of experience, and degree of advanced training were not found to be important factors. 87

TEACHER SATISFACTION

This portion of the chapter will consist of an introduction and a review of research on identified dimensions of teacher satisfaction.

In the present study teacher satisfaction was conceived as a multidimensional variable. It was assumed that no single factor could be used to describe teacher attitude toward the school environment. The multidimensional nature of satisfaction is widely supported in the literature. 88

Each of the fourteen dimensions of teacher satisfaction examined in the present study was assumed to be measurable along a continuum between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. A dimension could thus be a source of


dissatisfaction or a source of satisfaction.\textsuperscript{89}

\textbf{Review of Research on Teacher Satisfaction}

The research on teacher satisfaction has focused predominantly on teacher dissatisfaction. Most researchers have discussed sources and forms of teacher dissatisfaction rather than its cause or causes. The present review emphasized perceived sources of teacher dissatisfaction which might be relevant to teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

Check, in a brief review of the research, found dissatisfaction with particular aspects of teaching present years ago as well as today. His study investigated, through questionnaire, items of major dissatisfaction with teaching among career teachers. The following were identified in order of importance:

1. Excessive outside work,
2. Excessive unrelated tasks,
3. Rudeness and inconsiderateness of parents,
4. Excessive clerical work,
5. Inadequate cooperation between the home and the school,
6. Inadequate salary,
7. Inadequate administrative cooperation,
8. Poor attendance policies,
9. Insufficient parental interest,
10. Excessive meetings,

\textsuperscript{89}Sergiovanni and Starratt, op.cit., p. 143.
11. Excessive pressure on teacher,
12. Excessive babysitting tasks,
13. Inadequate public respect for the profession,
14. Non-professionalism among teachers,
15. Decreasing authority given to teacher,
16. Demand for specialization in too many areas,
17. Insufficient professional unity,
18. Overcrowded conditions,
19. Insufficient community interest, and

In a survey of teacher morale in North Carolina, Strickland identified the following ten items related to teacher dissatisfaction in order to importance. They are:

1. Insufficient relief from pupil contact during the school day,
2. Clerical duties,
3. Failure of cooperation and support from the principal,
4. Inadequate school facilities,
5. Inadequate staff cooperation,
6. Excessive teaching load,
7. Low salary,
8. Inadequate parent cooperation and interest,
9. Poor pupil discipline, and
10. Insufficient materials and supplies.\(^9^1\)

In a national analysis of local educational association grievances, Provus identified four major areas of teacher dissatisfaction with the instructional program: poor organization due to inadequate curriculum planning and selection of materials, excessive non-teaching responsibilities, insufficient planning time, and administrative interference.\(^9^2\)

Bishop has identified dimensions of teacher satisfaction using the Porter need deficiency approach. Members of AFT and NEA responded to the need deficiency questionnaire. Bishop found both groups to be least satisfied by the following items: school policies and rules, recognition, quality of supervision, and salary.\(^9^3\)

The Herzberg approach has also been used to study dimensions of teacher satisfaction.\(^9^4\) In this approach teachers are asked to think of a time when they feel exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their job,

---


\(^9^4\) Herzberg, Mauser, Synderman, \textit{loc. cit.}
or about being a teacher, and then to tell what brought on this feeling. Wickstrom, Simmons, Adair, Savage, and Sergiovanni came to substantially the same conclusions. Some dimensions were intrinsic satisfiers related to the school environment. These factors were not dissatisfiers when they were absent. They were: achievement, recognition, work itself, and responsibility. The other dimensions were extrinsic dissatisfiers related to the school environment. These factors were positive motivators when they were eliminated. They were: interpersonal relations with members of the community, students, peers and supervisors; salary; working conditions; quality of policy and administration; and quality of personal life.

The purpose of this review was to reveal the variety of dissatisfaction dimensions which teachers perceive

---


within the school environment. This variation provided a basis for understanding that different teachers are likely to have different reasons for their attitude toward collective negotiations.

It is essential to point out that the present study examined only the collective negotiations approach to the reduction of teacher dissatisfaction. Several other alternatives exist. Teachers may work through the established school or system structure to make modifications, work from outside the school or system for change, request transfer within the school system, move from the school system or leave the teaching profession altogether. It appears from this research that as teachers progress toward collective negotiations to modify dissatisfaction, they move from focusing on intrinsic needs to focusing on extrinsic needs which are more readily perceived and which might be more readily resolved through increased spending and increased teacher participation.

Two satisfaction dimensions were consistently identified and will be discussed in more detail. These were teacher salary and participation in the decision making process.

As to salary, Wildman found that while teacher concern for increases was real, it was more a symptom than a cause of dissatisfaction; it was easier to articulate demands for salary increases than for less tangible items
which were a part of a teacher "quest for power." Carlton, contrasting teacher salaries with those of employees in the private sector with comparable levels of education, found teacher salaries to be low; nearly all public school teachers are on single salary schedules which provide low maximum salaries and lack performance criteria to substantiate increases. When contrasted with industry, teaching offers few promotional opportunities within teaching ranks. Teachers are forced to move out of the classroom to guidance, administration, or supervision for advancement. Since there are no performance criteria for promotion, competent teachers frequently leave the classroom, the profession, or go without recognition of their merits.

The NEA has compared the earnings of teachers with those of members of other occupations. The mean annual salary for beginning teachers for 1971-72 was $7,061. The average for secondary teachers was $9,540. Approximately 57 percent of all public school teachers earned $8,500 per year or more. Of the balance, nine percent earned less than $6,500 per year.


The average male teacher beginning teaching in September 1972 received $7,061 for the calendar year. For the same period a male liberal arts graduate could expect to average an estimated $8,292; as a sales marketing employee, $8,736; and as an engineer, $10,608. The estimated average of the three fields studied, was $9,534. The average beginning annual salary for the three fields was approximately 38 percent above the average beginning salary for teachers. The average female teacher's beginning salary of $6,850 in 1971-72 was considerably lower than that of women liberal arts graduates, $8,184; business finance, $8,400; and engineering, $10,128.  

Teacher salaries have increased since this time, but relative to those of other comparable occupations, the increase is minimal. Hipp challenged education associations to accept responsibility for improving members' financial benefit status, arguing that low salaries and second class treatment of teachers contributed to teacher dissatisfaction.  

As to participation in the decision making process several studies revealed lack of teacher participation as a source of teacher dissatisfaction. Chase conducted a

---

103 Ibid.

study involving interviews with 400 teachers from different parts of the country and found that school systems where satisfaction was high were differentiable from low satisfaction systems by greater opportunity for teachers to share in planning. 105

Sharma investigated the relationship between teacher participation in decision making and satisfaction. The study involved 568 teachers from eighteen states and examined several categories of decisions, such as those pertaining to instructional materials, learning objectives and curriculum content, teacher loads, other assignments, salary and other welfare items, pupil evaluation, reporting pupil progress, teacher selection, evaluation and tenure orientation, and others. Sharma found that teachers wanted to assume total responsibility for all activities concerned with instruction. 106

Leiman investigated the relationship between teacher satisfaction and participation in decision making and found that participators possess a higher level of satisfaction, a more positive attitude toward the principal and more self-esteem that nonparticipators. 107


includes studies by McClintock, Shutz, Bridges, and Murray as similarly pointing toward teacher participation in decision making. Teachers want to participate in the decision making process of the school and to play a significant role in decisions which affect them. In a related study Davies hypothesized that as teacher participation in the collective negotiations process intensified, there would be corresponding increases in teacher satisfaction. In his survey 1,800 Indiana teachers completed the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire to measure teacher satisfaction. Teacher participation in collective negotiations was measured by assignment to three categories: traditional, procedural, and comprehensive. He found no relationship between overall teacher satisfaction and participation category. No relationship was found between the satisfaction factors and bargaining group classification, except with respect to teacher rapport with principal, rapport among teachers, and teacher salary. Davies also found that the traditional bargaining group had higher overall satisfaction scores than the comprehensive bargaining group. He concluded that participation in collective negotiations was not a vehicle

for improving teachers satisfaction.\textsuperscript{109}

\textbf{REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH ON ATTITUDE TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND TEACHER SATISFACTION}

In this literature review, research dealing with the relationship between attitude toward collective negotiations and teacher satisfaction was studied.

Sullen investigated sources of teacher dissatisfaction between secondary teacher supporters and non-supporters of collective negotiations. The following were mentioned by both supporter and nonsupporter of collective negotiations as sources of teacher dissatisfactions. They were: class size, teaching load, inadequate facilities and equipment, inefficiency in administration, politically motivated promotion policy, inadequate salaries, insufficient teacher involvement in decision making at the central office level, state political influence on the local education scene, and leadership of local professional organizations. Sullens found no differentiating relationship between the dissatisfaction dimensions and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.\textsuperscript{110}


Dull, in a study of teacher "militancy" in secondary schools, hypothesized that there was a relationship between perceptions of job satisfaction and attitude toward collective negotiations. The job satisfaction factors selected were "material inducement," support and recognition of the community, physical conditions, pride of workmanship, social relations with peers, agreement with district goals and policy, ability to influence school policy, and school plant maintenance. He found a significant relationship between attitude toward collective negotiations and "material inducement" (benefits other than salary, including sick leave, provisions for medical care and retirement benefits), agreement with district goals and policy, and ability to influence school policy.  

Towers surveyed South Carolina teacher attitude toward collective negotiations and determined its relationship to such selected characteristics as dissatisfaction. Towers found a significant relationship between attitude towards collective negotiations and teacher dissatisfaction as measured by whether or not a teacher checked from a list of problem areas, three or more areas as major problems.  

Hellriegel, while dealing with other attitude

\footnote{Dull, op.cit., pp. 93-97.}

variables, investigated the relationship between attitude toward collective negotiations, and dimensions of teacher satisfaction. Ten satisfaction dimensions were measured. These satisfaction dimensions were related to the multi-dimensions of collective negotiations. The two measured collective negotiations dimensions of interest and of any statistical significance were attitude toward the process and attitude toward the use of sanction activities. Hellriegel found that the satisfaction dimensions of salary and professional status were not found to be significantly related to attitude toward the collective negotiations process. However, the two satisfaction dimensions and attitude toward the use of sanction activities were significantly related. No other significant relationships were found between the two sets of variables.\(^{113}\)

Previous research on the relationship between teacher satisfaction and attitude toward collective negotiations has not yielded conclusive findings. The present study investigated dimensions of teacher satisfaction either not studied by Sullens or Dull, or measured differently. A more precise measuring technique was applied for measuring teacher satisfaction than was applied by Towers. Although Hellriegel's conceptual model provided a basic structure for investigation of the relationship between teacher satisfaction and attitude

\(^{113}\) Hellriegel, op.cit., pp. 166-173.
toward collective negotiations, the present study measured
the former more broadly and the latter more specifically.
The present study attempted through accurate measurement
of variables to provide school administrators and school
board members with a more sophisticated view of the nature
of teacher satisfaction and a more unified concept as to
the nature of the developing issue of collective negotiations.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss the types and limitations of the research instruments utilized, selection of the sample population, and the research design.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Two research instruments were used to collect data for the present study. Each is described in the following subsections.

Collective Negotiations Instrument

The Collective Negotiations Survey, a self report instrument, was used to measure teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. The Collective Action Scale, from which it was derived, was developed by Carlton.\(^1\) The Collective Negotiations Survey represents a modification of Carlton's instrument. Its title was changed to reflect more specifically to subjects the area under investigation.

The change also reflects a revision of the wording of two items for readability, as suggested by subjects during a pilot study of the present research instruments.

The Collective Action Scale, described by Carlton,

was a 30-item, Likert-Type scale designed to elicit attitudes of educators toward collective action by teachers. The scale was developed based on the following assumptions: (1) that attitudes are quantitatively identifiable and therefore can be assigned score values, (2) that attitudes lie along a continuum running from strong disfavor to equally strong favor, (3) that an undecided or neutral attitude occupies a middle position on the aforementioned continuum, (4) that collective negotiation is made up of at least two complementary facets, the negotiatory process, and sufficient coercive force to assure near equality of the parties involved. These were assumed to be non-separable characteristics.

Each of the randomly organized statements is evaluated by respondents on a five point scale. For statements favorable to collective negotiations the "strongly agree" response is given a weight of 5, the "agree" response a weight of 4, the "undecided" response a weight of 3, the "disagree" response a weight of 2, and the "strongly disagree" response a weight of 1. For statements unfavorable to collective negotiations, the scoring system is reversed, with the "strongly disagree" response given a weight of 5.

---

and the "strongly agree" response a weight of 1.\(^3\)

The statements included in the **Collective Action Scale** were selected so that half would be favorable to collective negotiations and the other half unfavorable to collective negotiations. Edwards has stated:

> The advantage of having both kinds of statements represented in the final scale is to minimize possible response sets of subjects that might be generated if only favorable or unfavorable statements were included in the scale.\(^4\)

The maximum possible score on the **Collective Action Scale** is 150 points. The minimum is 30 points. The median or neutral point of the **Collective Action Scale** is a score of 90. High scores indicated the respondent was supportive of collective negotiations and low scores indicated non-support for collective negotiations.\(^5\)

The instrument was developed from 104 items expressing opinions about collective negotiations drawn from the literature on the subject.\(^6\) A jury of 100 educators responded to the items and wrote critical analyses of them. Through item analysis, thirty items

---

\(^3\)Edwards, op. cit., p. 151.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 155.


which discriminated at or beyond the .01 level were selected for the final scale.  

Carlton employed the **Collective Action Scale** in a pilot study involving 100 teachers and 50 administrators who were students at the University of North Carolina. The following results were reported:

Analysis of variance showed significant differences in response between teachers and administrators. \((F = 16.95; \ p \ .001)\). A significant difference in the responses of male and female teachers was also identified. \((F = 7.38; \ p \ .01)\). The split-half reliability of the scale was found to be .84.  

These results support reliability of the **Collective Negotiations Survey**.

**Teacher Satisfaction Instrument**

The **School Survey**, a 120-item school environment attitude self report instrument, was used to measure teacher satisfaction. It enabled analysis of responses as to fourteen dimensions of the school environment. These dimensions were classified in four groupings: general administration, educational program, interpersonal relations, and career fulfillment.

The **School Survey** was developed by Coughlan to assess teacher morale. However, the present definition of satisfaction makes the two terms interchangeable.

---

7 Carlton, "The Attitudes Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiation and 'Sanction',' pp. 69-70.

8 Ibid., p. 70.
The background of the School Survey was described by Coughlan as follows:

The School Survey was modeled in concept, design, and procedure after instruments developed by Burns, et al., Baehr, and Baehr and Renck to measure the morale of personnel in industrial organizations. The approach essentially assesses respondent attitudes in a quantitative form. Previous research indicates that work attitudes are the result of a complex configuration of many personal and social forces and view of his work environment. The instrument resulting from this approach is literally an inventory of items covering significant elements of the work environment which the respondent can have feelings about and which, he may express in the form of measurable attitudes.

In identifying dimensions of the teacher work environment, Coughlan undertook a survey of the literature on "teacher job satisfaction" and "morale". Relatively unstructured interviews with teachers were conducted in several Chicago suburban high schools and views were solicited from students and faculty in the Department of Education at the University of Chicago. From these investigations a pilot questionnaire was developed. After revisions of the School Survey, publishing rights were granted to the Industrial Relations Center at the University of Chicago, from which permission was given to reproduce the School Survey for this study.

The final version of the School Survey consisted

---


10Ibid., pp. 158-159.
of 120 randomly organized items, half indicating satisfaction and half indicating dissatisfaction to avoid a response bias. Following each item was a three-point response scale consisting of: "Agree", "?" and "Disagree." In completing the self report instrument, teachers were instructed to respond in terms of either "Agree" or "Disagree" and to use the "?" (undecided) only if they could not definitely make up their minds.\^{11}\ Substantiating the decision to use a three-point scale and randomized items Coughlan cites Baehr. Baehr stated:

\[\ldots\] the use of the three-point scale with randomized items would result in profiles of scores which could be interpreted in exactly the same way as those resulting from more complicated procedures, e.g. five-point scale; weighted items, etc.\^{12}\n
In scoring the School Survey, a total score for each of the fourteen dimensions is computed. For items, indicating satisfaction the "agree" response is given a weight of 1, the "?" response is given a weight of 2, and the "disagree" response is given a weight of 3. For items indicating dissatisfaction, the scoring is reversed. After each item is evaluated by the subjects, dimension total scores are computed. A high dimensional score indicated dissatisfaction with that aspect of the school environment and low scores denoted satisfaction.

\^{11}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 162-163.

\^{12}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 163-164.
Two tests of reliability for the School Survey were obtained in the course of the present study. A split-half reliability of 0.937 was computed using APL/360 Program at the College of William and Mary Computer Center as presented in Table 2.\textsuperscript{13} Internal consistency

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lccc}
\hline
Variables & M & SD & R \\
\hline
Odd Scores & 99.45 & 20.324 & 0.9372463286 \\
Even Scores & 103.56 & 20.781 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Split-Half Reliability for School Survey}
\end{table}

between the fourteen dimensions was computed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences at the College of William and Mary Computer Center.\textsuperscript{14} These correlations are presented in Table 3. The two tests indicated a high level reliability for the School Survey.

\textbf{SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE}

The population for the present study was the secondary teachers of the four school divisions on the Peninsula region of Virginia: Hampton, Newport News, York


County, and Williamsburg-James City County. The extent of collective negotiations activity varies in each of these divisions. Newport News has seven years of negotiating experience, and a signed master contract for the past two years. Hampton's School Board negotiates but without a formal recognition agreement. York County and Williamsburg-James City County discuss suggestions formally submitted from the local associations. In the private sector, the communities possess a mixture of strong labor union, "company" union, and weak labor union and non-union employees.

The four communities contain many economic, geographic, and demographic features found throughout the state. The divisions contain urban, inner city, suburban, and rural population centers. All the divisions contain a spectrum of social, ethnic, and racial elements. Transient military residents are well represented.

Between November 23, 1972, and December 23, 1972, permission was obtained to conduct the present study in the four school divisions, the sample of teacher subjects was selected, and these teachers were contacted to establish their willingness to participate.

The superintendents of the two county divisions and assistant superintendents of the two city divisions were contacted to obtain permission to conduct the study and to request a roster of their secondary teachers.
Each superintendent or assistant superintendent had an opportunity to read the research proposal and pose questions. Each meeting concluded with permission, support, and encouragement as well as an offer to inform principals concerning the nature of cooperation promised.

Sample size was set at 110 subjects. These were selected in such number from each division as to assure proportionate representation of the secondary teachers in each of the four school divisions. Individual subjects were selected systematically from the rosters of secondary teachers provided by division administrators.¹⁵

The division sample allotment was obtained by multiplying the fraction of the number of teachers in the total population to the number of teachers in the division by the total number of teachers in the sample. The allotment by division was: Hampton 50, Newport News 37, York 15, and Williamsburg-James City County 8.

Based on the division sample allotments, intervals for systematically selecting subjects from the division rosters were computed. The interval was obtained by dividing the number of teachers in the division by the division sample allotment. The names of the subjects were selected from the rosters by counting off at the computed intervals. It was assumed that the alphabetical listing

of secondary teachers by school had no relationship with attitude toward collective negotiations or with satisfaction with the school environment.

With the sample established, each school principal was contacted by letter or telephone to arrange a time when the researcher would contact subject teachers to determine if they were available and willing to participate in the study. When the researcher arrived at the school, he immediately contacted the principal or his assistant to explain the study briefly, and establish how teachers could be contacted, what would be said to each teacher, and whether they were available.

Teachers were contacted individually between classes, during free periods, before or after school, or during classes when the principal suggested this procedure. In two instances teachers were not contacted individually, and a small group meeting was held. The researcher stated the following upon contacting each teacher:

1. He identified himself and indicated he was a graduate student at the College of William and Mary working on a doctoral study.

2. He indicated he was doing an attitudinal study using as his sample a number of secondary teachers from the four school divisions on the Peninsula: Hampton, Newport News, Williamsburg-James City County, and York County.

3. He disclosed that subjects were chosen through a systematic selection process.
4. He asked if they were willing to participate in the study by completing two attitude scales, which he would mail to them during the Christmas holiday, one dealing with the work environment and the other dealing with collective negotiations.

5. He stopped at this point to await responses or questions of clarification.

Following these conferences all 110 teachers expressed willingness to participate in the study.

COLLECTION OF DATA

The two research instruments, with a cover letter and stamped self-addressed envelope for return, were mailed to each participant on December 23, 1972. Two weeks after the self report instruments were received all participants who had not responded were contacted by telephone and urged to complete the instruments and return them as soon as possible. A one hundred percent response was obtained.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The School Survey yielded scores for fourteen dimensions of teacher satisfaction, and the Collective Negotiations Survey yielded a single collective negotiations attitude score. The statistical analysis of these data

---

16 Copies of the cover letter and research instrument used in the present study are contained in Appendixes A, B, and C.
included computation of a Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation between scores on each dimension of teacher satisfaction and the collective negotiations attitude score. The analysis was accomplished through the use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences at the College of William and Mary Computer Center.\textsuperscript{17} A confidence level of .05 was selected as minimum criterion for acceptance of hypotheses.

This chapter included a discussion of the research instruments used, selection of the sample population, the research design, and limitation of the study.

\textsuperscript{17}Nie, Bent, and Hall, op.cit., pp. 157-169.
Chapter 4

FINDINGS

This chapter will focus on the findings obtained in testing the hypotheses, and it will include a descriptive report of the results obtained from each research instrument, a report of the results obtained from correlation of the variables, and a summary of the findings.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The following two subsections will report responses obtained from each of the research instruments. This report will provide descriptive measurements as to teacher satisfaction and attitude toward collective negotiations followed by the relationship between the two variables.

Collective Negotiations

Collective negotiations scores were obtained from responses to the Collective Negotiations Survey. The range, mean, standard deviation, and t-ratio for these scores are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective Negotiations</td>
<td>30-150</td>
<td>102.8545</td>
<td>18.0534</td>
<td>7.4678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the data, a mean level of 102.8545 was obtained from the Collective Negotiations Survey. The dispersion of scores on the instrument was identified by a standard deviation of 18.0534. On the attitude continuum between strongly favoring and strongly disfavoring collective negotiations, a t-ratio of 7.4678 indicated that there was a significant difference between the computed mean and Carlton's assumed mean. The significant results from responses to the Collective Negotiations Survey revealed teachers had a relatively low but favorable attitude toward collective negotiations.

Teacher Satisfaction

Satisfaction dimension scores were obtained from responses to the fourteen satisfaction subscales of the School Survey. Items comprising each subscale were summed to provide a subscale score. For each subscale, the range, mean, standard deviation, and t-ratio for scores were computed. They are presented in Table 5. Figure 2 displays a profile of the percentage of the maximum possible score represented by the mean of each subscale.

Teacher satisfaction was pronounced in the area of interpersonal relations. Low teacher satisfaction was found in the areas of educational program, career fulfillment and general administration. As to specific satisfaction

\[1\]Items included in each subscale may be identified by referring to Appendix C.
Table 5

Range, Mean, Standard Deviation, and t-Ratio
of Teacher Satisfaction Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Subscale</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practice</td>
<td>9-27</td>
<td>15.1363</td>
<td>4.3630</td>
<td>-6.8837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Load</td>
<td>9-27</td>
<td>15.2272</td>
<td>3.8970</td>
<td>-7.4624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional</td>
<td>6-18</td>
<td>9.9454</td>
<td>3.1297</td>
<td>-6.8850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Load</td>
<td>8-24</td>
<td>14.9727</td>
<td>4.6223</td>
<td>-2.3309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Equipment</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>12.6000</td>
<td>3.8509</td>
<td>-3.8130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>17.8000</td>
<td>4.709</td>
<td>-4.8772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Students</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>18.5182</td>
<td>4.5368</td>
<td>-3.4257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>8-24</td>
<td>15.3727</td>
<td>4.1637</td>
<td>-1.5800*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>11.2454</td>
<td>2.8773</td>
<td>-10.0408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Relations</td>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>11.4364</td>
<td>3.5801</td>
<td>-7.5103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAREER FULFILLMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice in Educational Program</td>
<td>8-24</td>
<td>13.7818</td>
<td>3.5072</td>
<td>-6.6333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td>9-27</td>
<td>17.7545</td>
<td>4.8238</td>
<td>-0.5337*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No significant difference at the .01 level or better
Figure 2
School Survey Profile of the Percentage of Maximum Possible Score Represented
By Mean of Each Teacher Satisfaction Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Subscale</th>
<th>Minimum Possible Score</th>
<th>% of Maximum Possible Score Represented by Mean</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Load</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional Work Load</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER FULFILLMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice in Educational Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dimensions compared across groupings, extremely high satisfaction was revealed as to school-community relations, colleague relations, and non-professional work load. Teachers indicated moderate satisfaction with administrative practices, professional work load, voice in educational program, and performance and development. Extremely low satisfaction was revealed as to financial incentives and special services. Table 5 shows that t-ratios for all subscales except financial incentives and special services indicated that there was a significant difference between subscale means and the assumed neutral mean on the continuum between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The significant results from School Survey satisfaction subscales revealed teachers were relatively satisfied with their school environment.

COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND TEACHER SATISFACTION

The purpose of the present study was to determine the relationship between teacher satisfaction with the school environment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Since teacher satisfaction was categorized into fourteen subscales, the major hypothesis was evaluated by testing fourteen subhypotheses.

The results of the test of fourteen hypotheses are presented in Table 6. The table indicates for each
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Correlation Between Satisfaction Dimensions and Attitude Toward Collective Negotiations</th>
<th>Level of Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative Practices 0.2925</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional Work Load 0.3609</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-professional Work Load 0.3097</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Materials and Equipment 0.3349</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Buildings and Facilities 0.1355</td>
<td>0.079*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness 0.0681</td>
<td>0.240*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evaluation of Students 0.1674</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Special Services 0.2978</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School-Community Relations 0.2341</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Supervisory Relations 0.2189</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Colleague Relations 0.2136</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Voice in Educational Program 0.2196</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Performance and Development 0.2275</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Financial Incentives 0.3561</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation was not significant at criterion .05 level or better
hypothesis the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation (r) between the teacher satisfaction dimensions and attitude toward collective negotiations, and the level of confidence of this coefficient.

Hypothesis 1 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with higher administrative practices and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with higher administrative practices and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 1 was accepted.

Hypothesis 2 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with professional work load and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively moderate positive relationship was found between professional work load and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

Hypothesis 3 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with non-professional work load and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between non-professional work load and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 3 was accepted.
Hypothesis 4 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with materials and equipment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with materials and equipment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 4 was accepted.

Hypothesis 5 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with building and facilities and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that this relationship between teacher satisfaction with building and facilities and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations was not significant at the criterion .05 level of significance. Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

Hypothesis 6 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with educational effectiveness and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that this relationship between teacher satisfaction with educational effectiveness and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations was not significant at the criterion .05 level of significance. Hypothesis 6 was rejected.

Hypothesis 7 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with evaluation of students
and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with evaluation of students and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 7 was accepted.

Hypothesis 8 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with special services and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with special services and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 8 was accepted.

Hypothesis 9 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with school-community relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with school-community relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 9 was accepted.

Hypothesis 10 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with supervisory relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with supervisory relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 10 was accepted.
Hypothesis 11 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with colleague relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with colleague relations and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 11 was accepted.

Hypothesis 12 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with voice in educational program and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with voice in educational program and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 12 was accepted.

Hypothesis 13 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with performance and development and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6 shows that a statistically significant but relatively low positive relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with performance and development and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 13 was accepted.

Hypothesis 14 proposed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with financial incentives and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Table 6
shows that a statistically significant but relatively low correlation was found between teacher satisfaction with financial incentives and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Hypothesis 14 was accepted.

Based on the data above, there is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with the school environment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. The major hypothesis of the study was supported. Twelve of the fourteen subhypotheses yielded statistically significant findings. The coefficients of correlation found as to the subhypotheses were uniformly positive, but not high.

In an attempt to test the appropriateness of the present conceptualization of attitude toward collective negotiations as a unidimensional variable, a second data analysis was performed. The first proposed that there is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward the bargaining process itself. The second proposed that there is a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward the use of coercive activities. The specific purpose of testing these relationships was to determine whether teacher satisfaction correlates more highly with either of the two components than did attitude toward collective negotiations taken as a whole.

The responses from Collective Negotiations Survey were used to test the two ad hoc hypotheses. According
to studies by Giandomenico\(^2\) and Carlton,\(^3\) the Collective Negotiations Survey was divided into two sets of fifteen items concerning attitudes toward these two components: negotiation process itself and coercive activities.\(^4\)
The instrument was recomputed to provide subscales scores for the two components.

The tested results of the two ad hoc hypotheses are reported in Table 7 and Table 8. From Table 7, the findings revealed a statistically significant but relatively low positive correlation between teacher attitude toward coercive activities and the following teacher satisfaction dimensions: administrative practices, professional work load, non-professional work load, materials and equipment, evaluation of students, special services, school-community relations, supervisory relations, colleague relations, voice in educational program, performance and development, and financial incentives. There was no statistically significant relationship between teacher attitude toward


\(^4\)Items included in both subscales may be identified by referring to Appendix B.
Table 7
The Degree of Correlation Between Satisfaction Dimensions and Attitude Toward Coercive Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Dimensions</th>
<th>Correlation Between Satisfaction Dimensions and Attitude Toward Coercive Activities</th>
<th>Level of Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>0.2819</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Load</td>
<td>0.3434</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional Work Load</td>
<td>0.2882</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Equipment</td>
<td>0.3077</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Facilities</td>
<td>0.1259</td>
<td>.095*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>0.0694</td>
<td>.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Students</td>
<td>0.1967</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>0.2919</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td>0.2789</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Relations</td>
<td>0.1887</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Relations</td>
<td>0.1907</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice in Education Program</td>
<td>0.1942</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Development</td>
<td>0.1773</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td>0.3222</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation was not significant at criterion .05 level or better
coercive activities and teacher satisfaction with building and facilities and educational effectiveness. The results taken as a whole showed lower correlations at less frequently significant levels of confidence than did attitude toward collective negotiations viewed as a unidimensional variable. The first ad hoc hypothesis was accepted.

From Table 8, the findings revealed a statistically significant but relatively low positive correlation between teacher attitude toward negotiations and teacher satisfaction dimensions: administrative practices, professional work load, non-professional work load, materials and equipment, special services, colleague relations, voice in educational program, performance and development, and financial incentives. There was no statistically significant relationship between teacher attitude toward collective negotiations and teacher satisfaction with building and facilities, educational effectiveness, evaluation of students, and school-community relations. The results taken as a whole indicated lower correlations at less significant levels of confidence than did attitude toward collective negotiations viewed as a unidimensional variable and attitude toward coercive activities. The second ad hoc hypothesis was accepted.

Although both ad hoc hypotheses were accepted, the magnitude of the coefficients of correlation indicated that attitude toward collective negotiations was appropriately investigated in the main study as a unidimensional variable.
Table 8

The Degree of Correlation Between Satisfaction Dimensions and Attitude Toward the Negotiations Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Dimensions</th>
<th>Correlation Between Satisfaction Dimensions and Attitude Toward Collective Negotiations</th>
<th>Level of Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>0.2280</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Load</td>
<td>0.2983</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional Work Load</td>
<td>0.2640</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Equipment</td>
<td>0.2902</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Facilities</td>
<td>0.1144</td>
<td>.117*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>.341*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Students</td>
<td>0.0843</td>
<td>.191*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>0.2385</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td>0.1122</td>
<td>.112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Relations</td>
<td>0.1933</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Relations</td>
<td>0.1888</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice in Education Program</td>
<td>0.1806</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Development</td>
<td>0.2307</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td>0.3162</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation was not significant at criterion .05 level or better
SUMMARY

This chapter reported study findings in three sections. The first two sections included a descriptive report of the results obtained from each research instrument. The third section was a report of the results obtained from correlation of fourteen teacher satisfaction dimensions and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

The results from the Collective Negotiations Survey suggest that teachers had a relatively low but favorable attitude toward collective negotiations.

The results from the School Survey suggest that teachers were relatively satisfied with their school environment. They were most highly satisfied with supervisory relations; highly satisfied with school-community relations, colleague relations, and non-professional work load; moderately satisfied with administrative practices, professional work load, voice in educational program, and performance and development; and least satisfied with financial incentives and special services.

The results from correlation of teacher satisfaction dimensions and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations suggest:

1. The major hypothesis of the study proposed a statistically significant relationship between the two variables: attitude toward collective negotiations and teacher satisfaction. Twelve
of the fourteen subhypotheses established a significant relationship between the two variables. The coefficients of correlation found as to the subhypotheses were uniformly positive, but not high.

2. Two ad hoc hypotheses proposed a statistically significant relationship between teacher satisfaction subscales with teacher attitude toward the negotiations process itself and with teacher attitude toward the use of coercive activities. The magnitude of the coefficients of correlation indicate that attitude toward collective negotiations was appropriately investigated in the main study as a unidimensional variable.

The descriptive results from each research instrument and the correlation results of the variables form the basis for the next chapter.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter will include the conclusions and implications of the findings of the present study. In addition, recommendations for further research will be presented.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study provided empirical evidence that there is a relationship between teacher satisfaction with the school environment and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. This relationship was tested in the context of Hellriegel's Conceptual Model of Factors Related to Teachers' Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations. The present study examined fourteen dimensions of secondary teacher satisfaction with the school environment and verified Hellriegel's assumed significant relationship by supporting twelve hypotheses as to the relationship between teacher satisfaction dimensions and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. The correlations found revealed a relatively low positive relationship between the two variables.
It may be concluded that teachers who are dissatisfied with certain elements of the school environment may look favorably upon collective negotiations. Given appropriate conditions this attitude may foster collective negotiations activities or possibly serve to maintain them.

IMPLICATIONS

Early in the previous decade, teacher dissatisfaction with the school environment apparently provided the impetus for the collective negotiations movement for teachers. The collective negotiations movement now appears to be an irreversible trend. Teachers currently view collective negotiations as a viable option in altering teacher-school board relationships.

Certain implications for administrators and school board members are apparent. School officials must accept involvement in some form of collective negotiations with teachers as a reality. They should begin to study what the evolutionary nature of negotiations indicates to be the scope of bargaining now and for the future. Such understanding will enable administrators and school board members to be prepared to meet the opportunities and limitations posed by secondary teachers.

Since the findings of the present study revealed a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations,
school officials should understand this relationship, differentiate the dimensions of teacher dissatisfaction, and respond to those dimensions which are more highly related to teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. If these officials are aware that teacher dissatisfaction with the professional work load, financial incentives, material and equipment, special services, and non-professional work load are more highly related to collective negotiations, they can be perceptive of the state of teacher needs and possibly facilitate collective negotiations.

A possible implication exists for building-level administration. Principals who are sensitized to situational variables may be able to resolve teacher dissatisfaction without sacrificing productivity.

School officials should enable teachers to become more conversant with the intricacies of school finance. School district budgets have been traditionally accorded a low visibility. Once teachers become more aware of the multiple demands imposed by the publics whom the schools serve, they should also become more involved in the budget preparation process. Teachers may then more easily recognize the limitations resulting from economic inability to achieve all desirable goals and objectives.

Administrators and school board members should recognize teacher organizations as an influential force in negotiated processes. Teacher organizations partially justify their existence through providing teachers an outlet
for dissatisfaction. If dissatisfaction elements become important issues to teachers they frequently use teacher organizations for satisfaction. When teacher needs are satisfied within the school environment, the teacher organizations have a lessening relevance to teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Sources of recommendations for further research include the area of teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations as well as general teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

The present study suggested that further research could proceed in the area of teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations: (1) by addition to or deletion from the variables of the present study, (2) by study of the subgroups of these variables, or (3) by examination of the components of the individual variables in greater depth. The socio-economic variable and the teacher professional role conception variable from Hellriegel's model could be investigated to determine if either is significantly related to the relationship between teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. The items comprising each teacher satisfaction dimension could be analyzed to determine simpler and more precise predictors of teacher attitudes toward collective negotiations.
Further research also was suggested by the present study in the general area of teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. An investigation could determine whether legislation authorizing collective negotiations contributes to teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. A study could also determine the effects of teacher association membership on teacher attitude toward collective negotiations.

The area of teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations as well as the general area of teacher attitude toward collective negotiations provide recommended sources for further research.
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APPENDIX
Dear Research Team Member:

It was a pleasure to have had the opportunity to visit with you recently and to know of your willingness to cooperate with me on my project.

The questionnaires we discussed are enclosed. I would certainly appreciate your completing them and returning them in the enclosed self addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. You are one of a hundred selected for participation and I need total participation to validate the study.

Please remember your responses are guaranteed anonymity. There will be no effort to identify individual responses or the participants' schools.

In addition to your service to me, I hope you will view your participation as an opportunity to voice your opinion on current issues in education of concern to us all.

Upon completion and approval of the study, I would like to invite you to attend its defense before the examining committee. I will notify you of the time and place.

Once again, thank you for your assistance. Best wishes for a happy holiday season.

Sincerely,

David R. Corley
APPENDIX B

COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS SURVEY

The two collective negotiations subscales are listed on this page. Adjacent to the subscales are the statement numbers corresponding to the particular subscales in the Collective Negotiations Survey. Each statement was weighed equally in determining the total score for each subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral Bargaining Process</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Activities for Power Equality</td>
<td>3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS SURVEY

Introduction

This questionnaire is designed to provide you with the opportunity to express opinion on issues related to collective negotiations involving secondary school teachers.

A sample of teachers in your school system are being requested to complete this questionnaire. Further, no one in your school or school system will see any of the individual responses.

Directions

Please read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), are undecided (U), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with each statement. Mark your answer by circling the response which best fits how you actually feel about the statement. For example, if you strongly agree with a statement you would circle SA next to the statement.

Definitions of Terms

Collective Negotiations - The "family" name for various forms of group action used by teachers in attaining their goals. Under this term are included collective bargaining and professional negotiation.

Collective Bargaining - A form of collective negotiations, generally associated with the organized labor movement. Some teacher groups practice collective bargaining.

Professional Negotiation - A form of collective negotiations developed by the National Education Association as an "alternative" to collective bargaining.

"Sanctions" - A term applied to coercive acts of various kinds, varying in intensity from verbal warning to withholding of services. Sanctions of all types are used to gain concessions from the employer.

Strike - A severe form of sanction involving concerted work stoppage by employees. The strike is normally associated with organized labor, although it has been used fairly frequently by teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers organizations should participate with the school board in policy determination.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers organizations should have responsibility in the choice of new principals.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organizations and the school board cannot be reached.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collective negotiations should omit the threat of withholding of services.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers should be able to organize freely and to bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers organizations at local, state and national levels should publicize unfair school board practices through the media, such as TV, radio, newspapers, and magazines.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I believe that collective negotiations by teachers is a conspiracy against the country.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel that strikes on the part of teachers are an undesirable consequence of collective bargaining.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe militant teachers groups are made up almost entirely of malcontents and misfits.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teachers should not strike in order to enforce their demands.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel that the good teacher can always get the salary he needs without resorting to collective negotiations.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe that collective bargaining, alias professional negotiation, is beneath the dignity of the teacher.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel that the teacher cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel that collective negotiations is chipping away by inches at local control and should be resisted.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I think collective negotiations can help to unite the teaching profession into a cohesive body.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I think collective negotiations by teachers organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship by the teachers.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I think collective negotiations can provide a vehicle whereby teachers gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their functions.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective negotiations are insincere power seekers who do not have the best interests of education at heart.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The local teachers organization should seek to regulate standards for hiring of new teachers.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I think teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of teachers ability for self discipline and for insistence upon conditions conducive to a quality education program.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I believe sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I believe that censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special study reports, newspapers, or other mass media is a legitimate technique for teachers to use.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel that the traditional position that teachers, as public employees, may not strike is the only defensible position for a sensible school district to take.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I feel the services of teachers are not so necessary to the public welfare to necessitate the forfeiture of their right to strike.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I believe that any teacher sanction or other coercive measure is completely unprofessional.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. All attempts to infringe upon school board authority in the selection and adoption of textbooks and other curricular materials should be resisted.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I believe that when the school board denies the reasonable requests of the teachers, the teachers have a right to present the facts to the public and to their professional associates in other school districts.</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. I think collective negotiations can prevent paternalism and provide for joint decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think collective negotiations can prevent paternalism and provide for joint decision making.</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

The teacher satisfaction subscales are listed on this page. Adjacent to the subscales are the statement numbers corresponding to the particular subscales in the School Survey. Each statement was weighted equally in determining the total score for each subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Practices</td>
<td>7, 27, 68, 50, 36, 19, 73, 62, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Load</td>
<td>64, 95, 71, 81, 33, 85, 11, 98, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional Work Load</td>
<td>66, 75, 92, 31, 8, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Equipment</td>
<td>23, 45, 18, 24, 35, 30, 26, 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Facilities</td>
<td>14, 86, 79, 90, 74, 97, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>39, 1, 40, 32, 52, 77, 63, 56, 103, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Students</td>
<td>82, 72, 48, 29, 42, 96, 104, 112, 116, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>94, 58, 60, 9, 54, 80, 22, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td>70, 6, 57, 47, 17, 34, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Relations</td>
<td>78, 51, 83, 28, 89, 13, 61, 55, 106, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague Relations</td>
<td>88, 2, 91, 84, 76, 69, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice in Educational Program</td>
<td>93, 65, 59, 46, 87, 49, 16, 3, 109, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td>67, 53, 12, 15, 20, 38, 4, 110, 115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS. This inventory contains 120 statements covering your opinions and attitudes about your work. Read each one carefully, and decide how you feel about it. You will agree with some statements and disagree with others. You may be undecided about some. To help you express your opinion, three possible responses are given beside each statement. All you have to do is circle the response that most nearly reflects your opinion.

WORK RAPIDLY, BUT ANSWER ALL STATEMENTS. Do not spend too much time on any one statement. Some of the statements may not be worded exactly the way you would like them to be. However, answer them as best you can. Be sure to respond to every statement.

GENERAL INFORMATION. Statements about "immediate supervisor" refer to the person to whom you are immediately accountable in the performance of your duties. "Administration" refers to all persons who are one step above your immediate supervisor, all the way up to and including the superintendent and central office personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ? D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. People in this community are "education-oriented."                        | A ? D     |
2. Many staff people here are more concerned with their own personal interests than with the over-all welfare of the school.  | A ? D     |
3. My work here provides me with ample opportunity for personal growth and development. | A ? D     |
4. I have plenty of opportunity here to express my ideas about salary matters. | A ? D     |
5. This school assumes too many educational responsibilities that properly belong in the home or to other community agencies. | A ? D     |
6. It seems to me that the school board should reconsider the amount of authority it has delegated to the top administration. | A ? D     |
7. Insofar as they affect me, decisions made by the administration are fair and equitable.  

8. I am asked to read too many communications from higher-ups in this school system.  

9. Our library services for students are very satisfactory.  

10. The work of staff specialists in this school (guidance counselors, librarians, social workers, nurses, etc.) is well coordinated with the work of the classroom teachers.  

11. I am asked to spend too much time in meetings around here.  

12. Our salary system fails to compensate us sufficiently for years of service.  

13. My immediate supervisor backs me up in my dealings with parents.  

14. Physical facilities for our personal use (lounge, washroom, etc.) need to be greatly improved.  

15. The salary schedule here gives me little incentive to seek advanced training.  

16. From all I can gather, people who get promotions around here deserve them.  

17. Certain community pressure groups exert too much influence on the professional work of this school.  

18. The quality of supplementary materials for student use here needs to be greatly improved.  

19. The school board seems more concerned about keeping costs down than about building an effective school program.  

20. I feel our salary system adequately rewards outstanding work.  

21. I think my work performance is judged fairly here.
22. The curriculum and methods assistance provided classroom teachers in this school is clearly effective.  A ? D
23. The instructional materials provided for me here are very satisfactory.  A ? D
24. A student here sometimes has to do without needed supplementary materials.  A ? D
25. Little effort is made here to evaluate the effectiveness of our instructional program.  A ? D
26. The school library and reference materials are adequate to meet instructional needs.  A ? D
27. I think the school board does all it can to help build an effective educational program.  A ? D
28. My immediate supervisor seldom tries to get my ideas about things.  A ? D
29. School policy here for student promotion and retention is sound.  A ? D
30. The content of the textbooks my students use is poor.  A ? D
31. As far as I'm concerned, extracurricular duties (sponsoring student clubs and activities, etc.) are distributed fairly here.  A ? D
32. Most of the students I work with are at the grade level that is best for them.  A ? D
33. I would prefer a different work assignment (grade level, subject matter, etc.) from the one I now have.  A ? D
34. In general, I approve of school board policies.  A ? D
35. It seems to me that the school board fails to concern itself with some really important educational matters.  A ? D
36. It is easy and convenient to get teaching aids and equipment into the classroom here.  A ? D
37. The procedures for judging my performance are helpful to me in improving my work. A ? D

38. Employee benefits here (sick leave, tuition refunds, personal leave, etc.) fail to fit our needs. A ? D

39. Almost all students here seem well prepared for advancement to the next grade level. A ? D

40. In general, the parents of the students here are interested in helping us educate their children. A ? D

41. I'm rarely told whether or not I'm doing good work. A ? D

42. There is an adequate program of student-teacher consultation here after each reporting period. A ? D

43. I am seldom encouraged to attend outside professional conferences and workshops. A ? D

44. I fail to understand how my work performance is evaluated. A ? D

45. I have sufficient supplies for my work. A ? D

46. I have adequate opportunity to express my viewpoints about the philosophy and goals of this school. A ? D

47. The parents of students exert too great an influence on educational matters in this school. A ? D

48. Our system for reporting student progress to parents needs considerable improvement. A ? D

49. We are permitted to discuss controversial matters with students as long as we remain objective and factual. A ? D

50. The administration seems to be willing to give careful consideration to our ideas and suggestions. A ? D

51. My immediate supervisor keeps me well informed about matters affecting my work. A ? D
52. This school lacks an "atmosphere of learning."  
53. My salary is sufficient to give me a reasonable amount of security.  
54. The specialized programs here (music, art, drama, physical education, etc.) need to be greatly improved.  
55. My immediate supervisor seems to have sufficient influence with his superior in deciding what goes on in our work.  
56. Relations between the parents of students and the staff of this school need to be improved.  
57. The superintendent seems to have an effective working relationship with the school board.  
58. Relations between the parents of students and the staff of this school need to be improved.  
59. I should have a greater voice in selecting student textbooks and reference materials.  
60. There is a spirit of willingness to experiment with new curriculum ideas in this school.  
61. I seldom get the help I need in handling difficult discipline cases.  
62. The school board seems to recognize the professional character of our work in the schools.  
63. The emphasis on academic subjects in this district sometimes operates to the detriment of students who will not be pursuing academic programs later.  
64. The number of students I have to work with makes it difficult for me to do a good job.  
65. The school board seems to be interested in obtaining our ideas and suggestions.
66. I am required to do too much administrative paper work (attendance reports, tardy slips, statistical reports, etc.)

67. For my level of professional competence, I am adequately rewarded financially.

68. The administration seems to lack interest in the personal welfare of the faculty of this school.

69. Most of the time it's safe to say what you think around here.

70. In my opinion, the school board seems to be divided on too many issues.

71. In working with my students, I have adequate opportunity to allow for their individual differences.

72. We lack satisfactory procedures here for evaluating student progress.

73. Administrative matters seem to get more attention here than the educational program.

74. There is adequate space and equipment for carrying out my work—including desk space, drawers, bookshelves, and the like.

75. I am required to perform too many non-professional duties here (yard, hall, stair, lunchroom, and study hall duties.)

76. People in this school cooperate well.

77. The students I work with seem to need an unusual amount of discipline.

78. My immediate supervisor fails to "go to bat" for us with his superiors.

79. The buildings and grounds where I work are kept as clean and attractive as possible.

80. In my opinion, our specialized services (EMH, speech therapy, guidance counseling, social work, etc.) fail to effectively meet the needs of students.
81. Generally speaking, I feel I could do far better work with students different from those usually assigned to me.  
   A ? D

82. Our standards for giving grades to students are satisfactory.  
   A ? D

83. My immediate supervisor seldom shows initiative in seeking ways to help us in our work.  
   A ? D

84. There are many cliques or groups in this school that create an unfriendly atmosphere.  
   A ? D

85. Interruptions (messages, monitors, intercom bulletins) are kept to a minimum here.  
   A ? D

86. Adequate facilities are available for my use during off-periods for grading papers, meeting with students and parents, and the like.  
   A ? D

87. The administration usually tries to take action on faculty complaints.  
   A ? D

88. The poor work performance of some people on this school staff makes it difficult to achieve adequate instructional goals.  
   A ? D

89. My immediate supervisor is fair in his dealings with me.  
   A ? D

90. The general physical condition of my work place (lighting, temperature, ventilation, etc.) hamper me in doing a good job.  
   A ? D

91. A few of the people in this school think they run the place.  
   A ? D

92. I receive sufficient clerical assistance to do my job effectively.  
   A ? D

93. There is little opportunity for me to take part in the development of the curriculum of this school.  
   A ? D

94. This school system fails to provide adequately for the needs of exceptional students (slow learners, gifted students, the handicapped).  
   A ? D
95. My professional work load is fair and reasonable.

96. Too many students here seem to be more interested in getting grades than in learning.

97. The classrooms, offices, and other work areas here need considerable improvement.

98. Most of the meetings I am required to attend here are worthwhile.

99. There seems to be too much friction between administrators in this district.

100. Too often we are asked to work on committees whose efforts and reports are subsequently ignored.

101. This school district lags behind other districts of comparable size and financial resources in introducing up-to-date materials and equipment.

102. The layout of this school is inconvenient for the staff.

103. Even when you take into account differences in student ability, other schools in this locality seem to be ahead of this one in educational effectiveness.

104. My recommendations about promoting and retaining students are usually followed.

105. I feel our school system is one big reason why people choose to live in this community.

106. My immediate supervisor seems to take suggestions for improvement as a personal criticism.

107. We are seldom kept informed about what the school board and top administration are thinking.
108. I would rate this district as one of the best for those who want to work in education. A ?? D

109. This district's in-service educational program helps me improve my professional skills. A ?? D

110. Jobs in this school district seem to be graded fairly with respect to salary. A ?? D

111. In my opinion, adequate educational standards are being upheld in this school. A ?? D

112. I'm essentially in agreement with the school's student retention policy. A ?? D

113. My immediate supervisor has an unrealistic view of what goes on in my work situation. A ?? D

114. Teachers and other professional personnel in this school freely share ideas and materials. A ?? D

115. Compared with other school districts in this locality, our salary scale here is okay. A ?? D

116. My students show normal consideration, courtesy, and respect. A ?? D

117. Student absences are excessive in this school. A ?? D

118. I would definitely recommend this school to prospective teachers as a good place to work. A ?? D

119. Filling in this survey questionnaire is a poor way of finding out how I feel about my work in this district. A ?? D

120. Some good may come out of filling in this questionnaire. A ?? D

COMMENTS.
ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECONDARY TEACHER SATISFACTION AND ATTITUDE TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

by

David Ray Corley

The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between secondary teacher extrinsic satisfaction and secondary teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. One major hypothesis and fourteen subhypotheses were tested. The conceptual framework for the study was derived from Hellriegel's Conceptual Model of Factors Related to Teachers Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations. The two research instruments used to collect the data were: a modification of Carlton's Collective Action Scale, which measured teacher attitude toward collective negotiations and Coughlan's School Survey, which measured fourteen teacher satisfaction dimensions of the school environment. The statistical analysis of the data included computation of a Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation between scores on each of the fourteen dimensions of teacher satisfaction and collective negotiations attitude scores. The sample of 110 secondary teachers were systematically selected to represent secondary schools in the four school divisions in the Peninsula region of Tidewater Virginia. A one hundred percent response rate was obtained.

An analysis of the data indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between secondary teacher satisfaction with the school environment and secondary teacher attitude toward collective negotiations. Twelve of the fourteen subhypotheses revealed a significant relationship between the two variables. The twelve teacher satisfaction dimensions revealing this relationship were: administrative practices, professional work load, non-professional work load, materials and equipment, evaluation of students, special services, school-community relations, supervisory relations, colleague relations, voice in educational program, performance and development, and financial incentives.

The empirical evidence from testing of the two variables, teacher satisfaction and teacher attitude toward collective negotiations, supported a positive relationship between the variables.
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