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Although some school improvement literature has suggested that schools will improve when unions are removed from the school system, unions have rarely been isolated in the research. This study involved a mixed method case study approach to explore whether support of the local teacher union affected perceptions of school climate, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory. The study found that teachers who supported the union had more positive perceptions on several of the organizational climate dimensions than teachers who were not supportive of the union.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Since the advent of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and *No Child Left Behind* (2002), elected officials and political agendas have intentionally helped frame a narrow public perception of American public schools and academic achievement (Owens, 2001; Spring, 2002). Important research indicates that the two greatest factors that a school can influence to affect academic achievement are smaller class sizes (Finn, 1998; Finn & Achilles, 1999; Smith, Molnar, & Zahorik, 2003) and quality of teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Heck, 2007). Unfortunately, these are perhaps the two most prohibitively expensive endeavors to which a school can look for improving academic achievement.

School leaders have taken notice however, that there exists a much less expensive factor in helping elevate academic achievement. An enormous and continually growing field of data indicates that a positive school climate will predict many aspects of school improvement (Benninga, Berkowitz, Kuehn, & Smith, 2003; Hoy, 1990; Hoy & Hannum, 1997; Sutherland, 1994). School climate instruments such as the *Organizational Health Inventory* (OHI) are used in order to measure intangible dimensions within the school such as academic emphasis, consideration, and morale. The results of the *OHI* survey are used to determine the differences in school climate perception and overall school health (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991). In turn, school leaders can use the data to help establish policies that will help overcome the challenges of building consensus, elevating the climate, and improving student achievement (Brookover et al., 1978; Edmonds, 1979; Hoy, 1990).
Some research on school reform indicates that schools will improve most when our current governance structure in public schools is replaced with a market system approach (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Urbanski, 2003). The prevailing theme in similar research contends that the current system is solidified in such a way that school leaders and administrators are hampered from affecting school improvement the most by unions and the contract provisions that they create (Adamowski, Therriault, & Cavanna, 2007). Politically charged and philosophically-based opinion pieces, purposefully designed in opposition to unions (Naylor, 2002), have tried to link academic failure (Chubb & Moe, 1990) and teacher-over-administrator control (Moe, 2005) to unions. However the body of evidence regarding student achievement and unionization compel the reader to a different conclusion; schools with union teachers have higher academic results than those schools with nonunion teachers (Carini, 2002; Eberts, 2007; Eberts & Stone, 1987; Nelson, Rosen, & Powell, 1996).

If a positive school climate leads to improved academic success, perhaps there are union factors which affect the school climate and that indirectly affect student achievement. Because unions have a greater role in school improvement than is widely accepted, it may be important for school leaders to alter their opinions of unions as determined adversaries (Carini, 2002; Urbanski, 2003) and personally examine the ways in which faculty values and union initiatives shape the climate of the school.
The Background of the Study

A thorough investigation into the background of this research includes societal, professional, and intellectual research perspectives (Glatthorn, 1998). Combined, they were instrumental in helping develop an idea for this research. The following factors were realized and a more focused area of research emerged.

Most research in education leadership tends to focus on changes from the managerial perspective. As that perspective is understood, there needs to be more freedom for administrators to make necessary improvements in the school. The change process can be difficult, and when administrators encounter barriers to the change process, improvement can be difficult, if not impossible (Adamowski et al., 2007).

Throughout the literature, a consistent theme emerged regarding administrative changes for school improvement; unions hinder administration initiatives and school improvement (Martin, 2007). It would be fairly safe to postulate that administrative initiatives are developed in order to increase academic achievement. However, given the presupposition that unions hinder administrators, many managerial researchers have connected the dots and have arrived at the conclusion that unions hinder academic achievement (Poole, 2001).

There have been however, studies from the teacher perspective regarding unions and academic achievement (Eberts & Stone, 1987; Carini, 2002). The results of those studies indicate that students with union teachers scored better on standardized tests than students with nonunion teachers. In a different study, several tests were conducted on students who took the SAT. It was found that students in schools with union teachers
scored better on the SAT than students in schools without union teachers, regardless of
the type of research test used (Nelson & Gould, 1988).

This perspective stands in complete contrast to the management literature. From
the managerial perspective, researchers surmise that a newly designed system (Chubb &
Moe, 1990; Urbanski, 2003), one with fewer administrative barriers (Adamowski et al.,
2007), will allow administration the leverage necessary for school improvement (Martin,
2007). Immediately, it is assumed that unions are one of the great roadblocks to
improvement (Chubb & Moe, 1990). Some researchers contend that one of these
roadblocks is that union members are able to elect who will be their boss (Moe, 2005).
Although there might be some challenges that unions create, research indicates that
progressive improvement plans by administrators in districts without unions are “not just
ineffective, but even counterproductive” (Eberts & Stone, 1987).

Why then has such a negative image been cast upon unions? Oppositional views
have indicated that unions have outlived their usefulness (Moore, 2003). The political
drama involved in this debate has created a curmudgeon atmosphere, as even United
States Education Secretary, Rodney Paige called the NEA a “terrorist organization”
(King, 2004).

Despite these labels, the NEA has worked at promoting empirical data which
suggest that unions improve academic achievement as well as promoting initiatives that
help raise student achievement and accountability (Eberts, 2007; Weaver, 2006). These
data lead one to ask whether there is evidence to suggest that unions affect other areas of
school improvement. Regardless of personal ideologies, there is a difference in
perception of what unions are and what effect they have on schools. Because it seems
logical that the concept of unions conjures up specific emotions, perhaps the real effect of unions in schools can be measured through another equally intangible element; school climate.

The Problem Statement

School climate studies have become an accepted means of predicting student achievement (Brookover et al., 1978; Sherblom, Marshall, & Sherblom, 2006; Van Horn, 2003). While researchers have shown unions to improve academic achievement, an exhaustive review of the literature has shown that there has only been one climate study to date, comparing climate perceptions of union and nonunion college teachers (Vander Putten, McLendon, & Peterson, 1997). Because many schools and states have laws that require all teachers to belong to unions (National Right to Work Committee, 2008; Walsh, 2007) it is difficult for researchers to isolate union and nonunion teachers and their climate perceptions, as well as correlate their effects on the school climate. However, teachers who do not want to be members of the local teacher union are required by law to pay a “fair share” fee and may have varying levels of support for teacher unions (Florey, 1989; Jacobson, 2005; Thornicroft, 1991).

The design of this study was realized when the predictor variable (support for the local teacher union) was determined from the literature. Given a teacher’s level of support for local education union, does this level of support have an effect on the perception of school climate?
The Professional Significance of the Study

This study is important because most school climate research to date has not accounted for union influences in school improvement (Vander Putten et al., 1997). This is a concern, as the extensive literature in academic achievement indicates that a school with a positive or healthy school climate will foster the elements necessary for school improvement (Brookover et al., 1978).

Research in opposition to union initiatives tends to focus on academic achievement as the outcome variable, by contending that unions and the bureaucracy they create are the cause for academic failings (Adamowski et al., 2007; Fitzgerald, Youngs, & Grootenboer, 2003). Researchers who favor union initiatives have also focused on academic accountability (Weaver, 2006), but indicate that among many things, it is the actual democratic decision making process that unions support, which helps foster the elements necessary for school improvement (Bascia, 2000; Hoover, 1997).

Educational leaders can profit from the data contained in this study. Because the effects of collective bargaining on school climate have not been fully measured, it then becomes important for those whose are responsible for helping improve school climate to investigate more closely factors of school climate which have in the past been overlooked. This may be due in part to the perception that the majority of educational leadership research in school climate and academic achievement tends to take an adversarial approach to union initiatives (Hess & West, 2006). It is suggested though, that when administrators begin to view unions as partners in the change process, some of the positive effects of unions on school climate (Carini, 2002) and academic achievement (Esposito, 2007; Urbanski, 2003) can be realized.
When one looks at the research on school climate and the change process, one can begin to understand how conflicting interests have changed the educational perceptions and policy initiatives. For example, the majority of research in school climate is collected by administrators, administrators in training, and professors who teach administrators (Fisher & Fraser, 1990). Conversely, it doesn’t take but a precursory glance for a reader to realize that important research conducted in unionism is conducted by union leaders or professors who have been supported by unions (Nelson & Gould, 1998; Weaver, 2006). It seems apparent that in both cases that each group has a vested interest. Unfortunately, the prevalent thought has become, “whenever one group wins, the other loses” (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1999; Freeman & Medoff, 1979; Vyskocil & Goens, 1979). This study intends to lessen that line of thinking by finding common administrative/union themes which support the elevation of the school through an improved school climate; the foundation of which is grounded in theory and supported by the empirical data gathered herein.

Overview of Methodology

This study examined the perception of school climate in high school teachers in a large, urban high school deemed by the State of Ohio Board of Education to be in a designation of In Need of Continuous Improvement (Children’s Defense Fund—Ohio, 2004; Ohio Department of Education, 2006). The high school is in a small city and considered to be an urban school based on its racial diversity, low SES, and blue collar community status. Additionally, the local teacher union was affiliated with the National Education Association.
The Organizational Health Inventory for Secondary Schools (Hoy et al., 1991) was selected to test school climate because it measured the dimensions of academic emphasis (labeled as Academic Emphasis on the OHI-S), communication and input (labeled as Consideration on the OHI-S), and trust and work satisfaction (labeled collectively as Morale on the OHI-S). Five questions measuring demographic characteristics and support for the union were added at the end of the survey so as not to bias previous responses.

A mixed method case study was chosen for this study. A survey was administered to teachers in one large Ohio high school building. The OHI-S instrument was selected as the quantitative survey instrument because of its common use in the field of school climate research and because the resulting data could be favorably compared with the research literature. Quantitative instruments are commonly used for analyzing factors in school climate (Creswell, 2003; Fisher & Fraser, 1990). Additionally, because this research focused on differences of climate perception among various levels of support for the local teacher union, students and administrators were not surveyed, as they have been in many school climate studies (Fisher & Fraser, 1990).

The Organizational Health Inventory (Hoy et al., 1991) can be used to test differences in perception of school climate. While other climate studies exist, the survey questions contained in the OHI-S specifically measure the dimensions of Academic Emphasis, Consideration, and Morale. These elements are among the most common elements found in the research regarding unions and union advocacy (Bascia, 1994; Carini, 2002).
This section gives a brief overview of the methodology; however, a more complete explanation of the data and data collection can be found in chapter three. In order to conduct this study, a quantitative survey instrument, the OHI-S (Appendix C), was used to help answer eight questions:

1. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Academic Emphasis, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

2. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Consideration, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

3. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Morale, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

4. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Institutional Integrity, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

5. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Resource Support, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

6. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Initiating Structure, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

7. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Principal Influence, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

8. Does support of the local education union affect the Overall Health Index score, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?
Delimitations and Political Context

The study was a case study, which limits the ability to make generalizations of the results. Additionally, this study involved a school teacher union affiliated with the National Education Association.

The political context of the school and community played a unique role in shaping the climate of the school. Issues such as an operating levy failure, a new principal, removal of a veteran teacher, and lowering of the school’s state report card designation by the state of Ohio State Board of Education, may have all played a role in the perception of the school climate.

Definition of Key Terms

This study of the differences in perception of school climate among teachers with various levels of support for the local union contains a large vocabulary specific to both the school climate and unionism fields of study. A clear understanding of this vocabulary will help facilitate a better conceptualization of this research.

*Academic Emphasis*: The perceived degree to which a school stresses academic achievement and establishes high learning standards for all students (Hoy et al., 1991).

*Collaboration*: The degree to which a teacher feels he/she is involved in the total development of the student; through open and inviting administrative communication, collegiality, shared resources, and shared decision making (Bruner, 1991; Lashway, 1997; Urbanski, 2003).

*Collective Bargaining*: The act of developing specific contractual obligations for both the teacher and employer in the form of a written or verbal agreement made between a union
(which speaks on behalf of the teacher) and the employer, usually a Board of Education (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1999; Eberts, 2007; Hoover, 1997).

Commitment: A teacher’s individually perceived expected length of stay and possible resulting decision to remain working for a specific employer based on his/her work role, environmental perceptions, and various personal and professional factors (Leithwood, Fullan, & Watson, 2003; Patterson, Warr, & West, 2004).

Consideration: The degree as to which a teacher perceives the open, inviting, supporting, and caring qualities of the administrator (Hoy et al., 1991).


Efficacy: The degree to which a teacher feels that he/she is successfully preparing students for the highest possible academic achievement and also fulfilling personal satisfaction through his/her work (Evans, O’Malley-Hammersley, & Robertson, 2001).

Initiating Structure: The degree to which teachers perceive the work abilities, attitude, and expectations of the principal (Hoy et al., 1991).
Institutional Integrity: The degree to which teachers perceive the integrity of the school. This type of organization is strong enough to resist external demands and pressures which are not in line with the educational program (Hoy et al., 1991).

Principal Influence: The degree to which teachers perceive the influential ability of the principal on his or her superiors (Hoy et al., 1991).

Morale: The degree to which teachers perceive trust and collegiality among their peers and job satisfaction in their work (Hoy et al., 1991).

Organizational Health Index for Secondary Schools (OHI-S): A school climate survey instrument designed to measure seven dimensions of school health in a high school building and used to render an overall health index of the school (Hoy et al., 1991).

Overall Health Index of the School: The overall health rating of the school, based on a calculation of the seven dimensions of school climate found in the OHI-S. Health Index scores generally range between 400 (very low) and 600 (high) on the OHI-S conversion table (Hoy et al., 1991).

Resource Support: The degree to which teachers perceive that necessary classroom supplies are available and extra materials are readily available if requested (Hoy et al., 1991).

School Climate: Teachers’ perceptions of their school environment, based on their perception of high academic goals, trust, communication, self-efficacy, commitment, and work satisfaction (Hoy, 1990; Rafferty, 2003).

Support for the Local Teacher Union: In the context of this study, a mathematical designation, based on a 4-point Likert scale, of the degree to which a teacher supports the local union.
Tenure: A public school teacher incentive provisionally contained in most collective bargaining agreements, which is granted to a teacher after the completion of several successful, successive, and mutually agreed upon evaluations administered by the administration. Tenure supporters believe the primary goal of earning tenure is to help ensure that a teacher may not be unreasonably fired by the same employer that previously determined the specific employee to have the necessary knowledge, work ethic, and attitude to teach children. Tenure opponents believe that tenure protects bad teachers by hampering the efforts of administrators in removing poorly performing teachers (Ballou, 1999; Koppich, 2005; Strom & Baxter, 2001).

Trust: A fragile perception held by an individual or group of individuals within an organization that a spoken or written word or promise will be satisfied (Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Rotter, 1967).

Union: A group of employees who have come together under a legally protected collective bargaining unit, in order to share mutual ideas and concerns, establish group input, and work together for the collective betterment and protection of those within the group. Unions exist on local, state, and national levels. At each level, different initiatives are supported which help bring input to those within the auspices of their respective individual and resulting subordinate level (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2001; Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1999; National Education Association [NEA], 2006).

Work Satisfaction: The degree to which a teacher enjoys elements of his/her overall work experience (Fullagar & Barling, 1989; Hoy, 1990).
Summary

This chapter introduced the subject and explained the background of the research. Teachers may differ in their perceptions of school climate because unions affect every teacher in different ways. Although there has been almost no previous research, it is likely that support for the union and perception of school climate are linked. While the research may suggest that teachers who support unions have more negative school climate perceptions, there is a human element of the teaching profession for school leaders to consider; it is likely that those teachers that have the most negative views of school climate and improvement feel that they have been lied to, are unappreciated, or have been alienated and ignored. The professional significance of this study is that school leaders may learn that unions, as a collective voice, endorse policies which help improve teacher perception of school climate, which in turn help improve academic achievement.

The methodology was a mixed method design and employed a quantitative survey instrument as well as case study description (Creswell, 2003).

The next chapter will review the current research in unionism and school climate. Throughout the chapter, the elements for which unions advocate will be shown as critical elements which affect school climate improvement. Because of the bi-directional effect of school climate on dimensions such as consideration, morale, and academic emphasis, and because the literature is abundant with data regarding union advocacy for the elevation of those same dimensions, connections will be drawn between union advocacy initiatives and factors commonly found in positive school climates.
CHAPTER II

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed method study was to determine differences in perception of school climate among teachers with various levels of support for teacher unions. For the purpose of this study, we have defined school climate as the view of teachers of their school environment, based on their perception of high academic goals, trust, communication, self-efficacy, commitment, and work satisfaction.

This literature review is presented in five sections and represents leading authors and case studies pertaining to this dissertation. The first section centers on climate and the importance of climate assessment in helping shape the school environment. This section focuses on school climate research and elements of school climate found in school climate surveys. The second section details studies that link school climate to school success. This section identifies significant factors in climate studies that contribute to education improvement. The third section focuses on teacher unions and collective bargaining. In this section, scholarly research in opposition to and in favor of collective bargaining, are discussed. The fourth section involves studies of the effects of unionization in schools. In this section, important studies that link effective union initiatives to student success and teacher productivity are discussed. The fifth and final section addresses studies that link school climate and unionization. Important data are gathered that reflect the bi-directional nature of climate and collective bargaining.

There exists a small gap within the literature, as there has only been one recent climate study of differences between union and nonunion staff in an education setting (Vander Putten et al., 1997), which found that union affiliation was negatively associated
with perception of the work environment. Eberts (2007), a leading researcher in education unions, commented about the current research in the field that “few analysts have examined with any rigor” the effects of unions on shared values and outcomes of teachers and administrators in the school improvement process. It is important to note that the one study regarding union and nonunion staff differences was conducted in higher education (Vander Putten et al., 1997) and might have different data than can be used for this research in public schools. A large volume of climate data presented will also come from the business sector which will be compared with data from education settings.

School Climate

School climate is perhaps the single greatest element to beginning and maintaining education improvement (Fox et. al., 1974; Noonan, 2004). Early business researchers of organizational climate (Peterson & Spencer, 1990; Tagiuri, 1968) described climate in terms of its characteristics, values, and patterns while others (Schein, 2000) described climate as a result of teamwork and as an “artifact resulting from espoused values and shared tacit assumptions” (p. xxiv). Halpin and Croft (1963) were the pioneers of the school climate study movement and used the term “personality” to envelop the human element of schools and describe the endearing qualities and shared values of all people in the school.

Recent researchers have described school climate as the teachers’ perception of their working environment (Hoy, 1990), an indication of the systemic health (Hoy & Hannum, 1997), and an effect of school culture (Schneider, 2000). Others (Rafferty, 2003) have drawn from and extended Halpin and Croft (1963) by describing school
climate as encompassing the personal and intangible structure of the school. School climate has also been signified as a product of the professional teacher-principal relationship (Halawah, 2005; Rafferty, 2003). Others have found it easier to reference the properties of a positive school climate (Van Horn, 2003) by indicating other factors such as a safe work environment (Edmonds, 1979; Nusser & Haller, 1995), improved communication (Sutherland, 1994), and a better curriculum (Fox et al., 1974).

In addition, important research has drawn connections between the qualities of a positive school climate and improved academic achievement (Brookover et al., 1978; Fisher & Fraser, 1990; Sherblom et al., 2006; Van Horn, 2003). The central thrust of improving school climate has been to realize the many factors that affect teacher productivity and use that data to improve the atmosphere and academic achievement of schools (Benninga et al., 2003; Brown & Medway, 2007; Johnson & Stevens, 2006; NEA, 2006; Van Horn, 2003).

Improvement cannot happen unless there are shared values, goals, and a widespread belief of sustaining the personality, atmosphere, and characteristics of the system (Fox et al., 1974; Norton, 1984). It is important then to have shared goals produced from the synergy of open communication between teachers and administrators (Halawah, 2005) that will in turn, nurture more productive teachers and help elevate the school climate (Edgerson, Kristonis, & Herrington, 2006).

There is also strong evidence that school climate cannot improve without a strong principal who can effectively help build shared goals (Curran, 1983; Mendel, Watson, & MacGregor, 2002), establish trust, and foster a mutual appreciation for the roles of each person in the school (Vyskocil & Goens, 1979). More than any other employee in the
school, the principal can most positively affect school climate by providing transformational leadership practices (Kelley, 1981; Pepper & Thomas, 2002), helping develop communication and trust (Halawah, 2005; Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty, 2005), and fostering quality, professional relationships with teachers in the school building (Hassenpflug, 1986).

An improved school climate has numerous benefits for schools such as decreasing feelings of stress (Griffith, 2004), establishing direction for meeting shared goals, setting benchmarks for professional growth (Norton, 1984), and empowering teachers with the ability to attain higher academic success (Brown & Medway, 2007; Fox et. al., 1974; Johnson & Stevens, 2006). This academic success, and the climate that created it, will help promote a powerful image of the school (Chiang, 2003), develop collaboration (Lashway, 1997; Urbanski, 2003), improve communication, and establish a sense of ownership of the school (Witcher, 1993).

The perception of a positive school climate can be described as an agreeable relationship among everybody in the school (Van Horn, 2003) where each person in the school interacts in informal ways that help build the school (Witcher, 1993). Schools with positive climates have shared values, trust (Fox et. al., 1974; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998), job satisfaction, job commitment (Patterson et al., 2004), strive for continued and progressive academic excellence (Johnson & Stevens, 2006), and work toward fulfilling the needs of teachers such as acceptance, appreciation, and open communication (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). In order to fill these basic needs, healthy relationships between students, teachers, and principals must exist throughout the school (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2003).
Studies That Link School Climate to School Success

Research has shown that the assessment of school climate is a critical element in the school improvement plan (Gottfredson, Hybl, Gottfredson, & Castaneda, 1986; Hoy 1990). Climate studies generally use survey instruments in order to quantify group values, explain attitudes and behaviors of those in the organization (Aldridge, Laugksch, & Fraser, 2006; Fisher & Fraser, 1990; Hoy, 1990), measure teacher commitment (Nusser & Haller, 1995) and give indications for areas of improvement (Fox et. al., 1974). As a result, climate studies have become a predictor of academic achievement when the intangible human element of the school atmosphere (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997) is measured within the climate assessment (Brookover et al., 1978; Patterson et al., 2004; Sherblom et al., 2006; Witcher, 1993). School climate improvement initiatives can also positively affect teacher productivity when policies focus on common climate elements such as communication (Rafferty, 2003), ways to improve teacher efficacy (Henson, 2001; Potosky & Ramakrishna, 2002), adequate resources, and a concentration on academic success (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999).

A school with a positive climate fosters a positive morale (Pepper & Thomas, 2002). According to Hoy (1990), morale is “a collective sense of satisfaction, enthusiasm, pride, and friendliness that teachers feel about their job and school” (p. 154). Because of its bi-directional nature, morale influences the perception of school climate and a school with a healthy climate influences a more positive morale (Kelley, 1981; Lashway, 1997). The improved climate and morale in turn help improve academic achievement (Pepper & Thomas, 2002).
School climate studies can also measure teacher efficacy (Potosky & Ramakrishna, 2002). Efficacy can be defined as the teacher’s perception that their work is helping students to academically progress (Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989; Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006) and the teacher’s ability to fulfill their own personal enjoyment (Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991).

It is also suggested that efficacy can be improved when teachers work within a positive school climate (Lee et al., 1991; Moore & Esselman, 1994; Newmann et al., 1989), when the school strongly emphasizes academic success (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993), when teachers experience few teaching obstacles (Moore & Esselman, 1994), and when the school has a principal that works with teachers (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Mendel et al., 2002; Rafferty, 2003) and encourages shared decision making among the staff (Moore & Esselman, 1994).

Research has found that staff communication (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995) and having fewer teaching obstructions (Moore & Esselman, 1994; Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995) were significant factors in improving teacher efficacy (Moore & Esselman, 1994; Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995). This is important as well, as improved teacher efficacy leads to positive perceptions and behaviors which influence the development of the school (Medrano, 1982; Short & Rinehart, 1993; Nelson & Gould, 1988) and help teachers improve educational productivity (Potosky & Ramakrishna, 2002). Conversely, schools which are not performing well tend to have teachers with low self-efficacy perceptions (Moore & Esselman, 1994).
The one element that is most common in the research of a healthy school climate is trust (Edgerson et al., 2006; Henderson et al., 2005; Hoy & Hannum, 1997). Senge (1990) defines “operational trust” as an act where each member of a group in a system can count on every person to help the system. The “fuzzy nature” of trust makes defining its prerequisites easier than the actual definition itself (Brewster & Railsback, 2003).

Research has shown that a positive school climate helps facilitate staff trust (Beachum & Dentith, 2004; Tarter & Hoy, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998) and inversely, trust helps facilitate a more positive climate (Beachum & Dentith, 2004; Hoy et al., 2003). Faculty trust can be viewed as the “horizontal relationship” in which teachers work with their fellow teaching colleagues. Faculty trust in administration can then be viewed as the “vertical relationship” that exists within the superior-subordinate paradigm (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Some studies indicate faculty trust in administration is also a result of cooperation among administration and employees (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1999). This cooperation is important in helping teachers believe in and take ownership of the mission and goals of the school (Edgerson et al., 2006).

Administrators are the strongest element in helping establish and maintain trust (Hoy, et al., 2003; Marshall, Pritchard, & Gunderson, 2004). Quality principals who exhibit encouraging personal and professional attitudes, help improve climate perceptions (Egley & Jones, 2005; Mendel et al., 2002) and promote strong trust relationships (Evans et al., 2001), will help empower the school with the ability to overcome mistrust and fear; the two factors which most negatively affect efficacy, morale, and job commitment (Rafferty, 2003).
Unions and Collective Bargaining

Since the inception of collective bargaining in education, unions have come under tight scrutiny (Ballou, 1999; Gryski, 1980; Haar, 1996; Lieberman, 2002; Moe, 2005, 2006). The last thirty years have witnessed a large volume of management research intentionally designed in opposition to unions and focused on bureaucracies and their structural inability to improve the system (Adamowski et al., 2007; Jones, 1986; Lawton, Scane, & Wang, 1995).

A claim of many union critics is that unions continue to receive more power and that their resulting influence is a barrier to administrative change (Adamowski et al., 2007; Ballou, 1999; Haar, 1996; Jones, 1986; Lieberman, 1998, 2000). It is claimed that the increased power that unions gain comes with a loss of power from school leaders (Kerchner, 2004; Moe, 2005, 2006). The large majority of business and management research is conducted from an ownership/administrative perspective and most of the research in union productivity focuses on satisfaction, and commitment (Vander Putten et al., 1997).

In the last twenty years, the majority of research intentionally opposed to teacher unions contends that the focus of educational improvement should start with the “system” that is in place (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Urbanski, 2003). These researchers contend that the problem with today’s schools is that administrators are constrained by the impenetrable, web-like “system” that negotiated agreements create and by an inability to cut through the growing hierarchy of power in unions that extends from the local to the national level. It is claimed that the current educational system makes it difficult for administrators to change schedules and work responsibilities, remove poorly performing teachers, and
comply with continually increasing state academic achievement mandates (Adamowski et al., 2007; Martin, 2007).

The common theme in management research is that a more constrained system in schools, vis-à-vis teacher unions, does not allow for progressive educational improvement (Haar, 1996; Hess & West, 2006; Kersten, 2006). Similar researchers contend that schools today have reverted to Weberian models which utilize scientific management principles in order to dictate their direction; a model of early 20th century business philosophy which espoused the conception that teachers were only motivated extrinsically. Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, and Thurston (1987) furthered this by indicating:

The most pervasive changes in the local educational power structure have been brought about by the rapidly growing practice of negotiating formally with an organization, designated as the bargaining agent for teachers, over the provisions of a contract that will set forth the terms of their service in the coming academic year. From the standpoint of power relationships, the innovation has strengthened the hand of teachers at the expense of board and administration. (p. 219)

Recent research in favor of union initiatives contends that teacher unions continue to rally for a less constrained school and more control over their own classrooms (Clery, 2002; Kroll, Havlovic, & Bushe, 1992). Meier (2004) suggests that “the imposition of greater authoritarian control over teachers, in the name of even the best curriculum and pedagogy, won’t begin to tackle the decisive intellectual failings of our schools” (p. 53). This “greater authoritarian control” is defined by Blau and Scott (1969) as “overbureaucratization;” an imbalance of power in favor of administration. It is warned
that this imbalance in power could be a signal in the lessening of accountability which in turn affects teacher productivity (Murray, 2000).

Research suggests that in order for a school to achieve its mission and improve its climate, teachers must be empowered (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001) and offered a role in the direction of school improvement and academic achievement (Hicks & DeWalt, 2006). Schein (2000) suggests that schools can’t create a climate of empowerment “if the underlying assumptions in the culture are that subordinates should do what they are told and should expect their bosses to know what they are doing” (p. xxix). Some researchers suggest that decision participation should be defined as the teacher’s perception of his/her professional impact on school improvement initiatives (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995). As a result, union initiatives continue to promote shared decision making and install checks and balances in the system (Martin, 1983). Eberts (2007) cautioned this by saying that “with empowerment must come responsibility, and only through systems of accountability in which risk is recognized and accepted can real progress be made in improving the education of the nation’s children” (p. 193).

Unlike other systems, unions that are bureaucratized are “ruthlessly efficient.” Litwalk (1969) described unions as “mechanisms of segregation;” a type of structure that enables differing social values and initiatives to live in the same system without “ruinous friction.” The ability of a union to coexist with administration is linked with the professional and democratic decision making processes that unions support (Bascia, 2000), unlike administration, where “top down” decision making processes offer but a limited voice to their superiors and for education improvement (Herman, 1992).
Contradictory perspectives between administration and teachers can often strain relations (Kerchner & Caufman, 1995) but most research in favor of teacher unions agrees that teachers lobby for ample classroom preparation, duty-free lunches, and smaller class sizes (Carini, 2002), more input for decision making (Bascia, 1994, 2000; Masters & Albright, 2003), and tenure (Kerchner, 2004; NEA, 2006), all of which are union initiatives which have varying effects on schools.

Some researchers (Naylor, 2002) suggest that critics of teacher unions are driven by personal ideologies. These critics also believe that unionized schools lack autonomy, shared goals (Martin, 2007), and that employees must have even their most basic rights documented. Research in opposition to this indicates that union employees want their description and rights documented because the employees fear future changes that will affect their job description or benefits (Lincoln & Boothe, 1993).

To help overcome these fears, a collective bargaining agreement helps develop and maintain the rights and roles of principals and teachers (Suchan & Scott, 1986). These mutually agreed upon roles, rights, and responsibilities in the collective bargaining agreement in turn help establish trust (Vyskocil & Goens, 1979) and as a secondary result, create an atmosphere of professional expectations and proactive ownership on the part of teachers (Medrano, 1982). The combination of these expectations, roles, and ownership tends to solidify the decision-making process of the school as a cumulative unit (Kerchner, 1979; Lee et al., 1991).

Researchers opposed to “solidifying” this process, claim that union initiatives further bureaucratize the school and limit further academic progress (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Fitzgerald et al., 2003; Hess & West, 2006). Critics of unions also claim that
unions are responsible for raising the cost of education, creating a poor image of public schools, (Carini, 2002) constricting time and resources, protecting bad teachers (Hess & West, 2006), opposing performance based incentives (Ballou, 1999), creating mistrust between administration and teachers, and emphasizing experience instead of performance (Eberts, 1984). Although critics are quick to point out the inadequacies of public schools, it might not be that schools are failing but that our communities expect Sisyphean feats of accomplishment by continually “raising the bar” on our schools and children (Lawton et al., 1995).

The constant raising of the bar and other tireless obstructions might be contributing factors to diminished work satisfaction shown in union teachers (Lincoln & Boothe, 1993; Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995). A large volume of data supports the claim that unionized employees experience more negative job satisfaction than their non-union counterparts (Collins, Hatcher, & Ross, 1993; Vander Putten et al., 1997) and that unions have an indirect effect on work satisfaction (Berger, Olson, & Boudreau, 1983). In opposition to these findings, the NEA (2002) found that teachers in higher education who belonged to the union had higher levels of work satisfaction than higher education teachers who did not belong to the union. Regardless of personal work satisfaction levels, employee job satisfaction does not affect teacher effectiveness (Eberts & Stone, 1991).

There is a growing body of research that indicates unions have shifted roles from their traditional industrial roots to a more personal and professional point of view (Chang & Hallock, 2000; Edelfelt, 1979; Hoover, 1997; Johnston, 2000; Naylor, 2002; Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 2006). The emphasis on unions now appears to oppose bureaucracy (Naylor, 2002), finding our schools to be “challenged by a postmodern
world in which labor is easily perceived as a negative social force” (Hoover, 1997, p. 191). Despite this “negative social force” label, more than 90% of the teachers in the United States are members of the NEA and AFT (Koppich & Kerchner, 2000).

Recent trends indicate that unions are growing out of their well-entrenched traditional values by embracing changes that help student productivity (AFT, 2001; Kerchner & Caufman, 1995; Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988; Lunenburg, 2000; Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 2006) and challenging initiatives that hinder student achievement (Poole, 2001). This recent trend of lobbying for productivity is defined by Johnston (2000) as “social movement unionism,” or “professional unionism” by the AFT (2001), or “reform bargaining” by Eberts (2007), and has its roots in the early activism movement of unions in our country (Chang & Hallock, 2000; Lunenburg, 2000). The same determination of early union teachers that brought significant academic progress and teacher equality has been reborn. From this, unions have learned to anticipate future educational challenges and to lobby early on for initiatives that will remedy these challenges (Edelfelt, 2001; Kerchner & Koppich, 2007; Koppich, 2005; Lunenburg, 2000; Murray, 2000; Poole, 2001; Siebert, 2005).

Research suggests that traditional stances and initiatives of teacher unions help regulate the system and hold everyone in the school accountable (Carini, 2002; Weaver, 2006). By this description, union teachers can loosely be defined as “bureaucrats” (Sergiovanni, 1994). The effect of being in a bureaucratic system, “managerialism,” has been described by Hoover (1997) as “a way of doing and being in corporations that partially structures, conflicts with, and at times suppresses other groups’ modes of thinking” (p. 187).
Traditionally, unions and principals have been seen as ideologically opposed (Hoover, 1997; Koppich, 2005), but Carini (2002) proffers that administration should look more to unions for their insight and reverse this oppositional perspective. Despite the tension they might cause (Prosise & Himes, 2002), differences in perception should not be suppressed but embraced, as dissenting points of view have consistently shown to be important in organizational improvements (Cohen-Rosenthal & Burton, 1999), especially when everybody in the system has the opportunity to express their beliefs (Johnston, 2000). Cohen-Rosenthal and Burton (1999) contend that conflict and diverging points of view are necessary elements in improving an organization:

All organizations and interpersonal relations experience some conflict. Conflict brings out divergent opinions and perspectives. It sparks creativity and change. It is not only inevitable but desirable. This is why unilateral programs that suppress differences lack the vitality of a union-management effort. (p. 5)

Studies of the Effect of Unionization in Schools

A general assumption that can be made after reading management research is that unions negatively affect schools (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Hess & West, 2006), however there are few data to suggest that unions negatively affect academic achievement, and for good reason. There is a body of research that indicates that collective bargaining may help raise student achievement (Carini, 2002; Eberts & Stone, 1987) and scores on standardized state tests (Steelman, Powell, & Carini, 2000). Nelson et al., (1996) found that average school students in states with 90% or more unionized teachers, scored 43 points higher on the SAT than those students in states with less than 50% of their teachers in unions. It is important to note that in their regression study, the independent variable of
collective bargaining was found to have a significant effect on SAT scores: “when collective bargaining is removed from the analysis, scores drop in all states” (p. 1). Despite all of the abundant negative criticisms of unions (Lieberman, 2000, 2002), collective bargaining has been correlated with helping raise SAT scores “no matter what equation is used” (Nelson & Gould, 1988).

With all of the negative claims about unions, why is it that schools with unions are correlated with improved SAT scores, when so much of the management literature suggests that unions are the main reason for our educational failings (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Lieberman, 2000)? Carini (2002) suggests that because of their stabilizing nature, unions actually help provide accountability and promote standards (AFT, 2001). Other research suggests that unions establish efficiency by fostering teacher commitment, professional growth (Freeman & Medoff, 1979), and improved communication (Masters & Albright, 2003).

Since the STAR report (Word et al., 1990), researchers and educators have realized the impact of smaller class sizes on student achievement (Carini, 2002; Finn, 1998; Finn & Achilles, 1999; Molnar & Achilles, 2000; NEA, 2006; Smith et al., 2003). Since unions tend to bargain for smaller class sizes and more preparation time, it is reasonable to assume the effects of those collective bargaining initiatives may have contributed to higher student achievement (Carini, 2002; Eberts, 2007). Additionally, standardized instruction and equity are hallmarks of collective bargaining (AFT, 2001), both of which have been found to be effective in helping raise student achievement for most students. Perhaps this phenomenon of unions improving academic achievement can be explained by the school principal, as schools with unions tend to have administrators
with better leadership abilities than do schools without unionized teaching staff. In fact, research indicates that progressive improvement plans by administrators in districts without unions is “not just ineffective, but even counterproductive” (Eberts & Stone, 1987).

At the national level, education unions have increased their role in creating and supporting policies that affect education (Bascia, 1998; Weaver, 2006). Since *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the AFT and NEA have been involved in the national education reform movement and have shaped their own beliefs about education improvement (Bascia, 1994). This label of “reform bargaining” has gained support among critics (Eberts, 2007) and research suggests that unions will garner more widespread support, earn more decision making input (Bascia, 2000), and increase their own level of job satisfaction and commitment (Leithwood et al., 2003) if they were to take a more holistic approach (Bascia, 1994) and focus on teaching and children (Urbanski, 2003).

Some research suggests that this increased level of teacher input comes at a price. It is surmised that when unions help improve teacher input, temporary tension in the system may develop (Prosise & Himes, 2002; Short & Rinehart, 1993). In order to overcome this tension, careful attention to all union members’ perceptions and values must be realized. Unions can be very helpful in lessening this tension if all members understand what can be accomplished (Bascia, 1994) and if there exists in each school, substantial and collegial communication between principal and teacher (Halawah, 2005; Hoy et al., 2003; Liebman, Maldonado, Lacey, & Thompson, 2005; Mendel et al., 2002).
This collaboration can be problematic, as research suggests that principals perceive teachers to have more input than is necessary while teachers perceive they have less input than is necessary to impact students (Hicks & DeWalt, 2006). It is cautioned however, that not all teachers prefer decision participation initiatives (Graham, Wilson, Gerrick, Fraas, & Heimann, 2002). Additionally, although decision participation does not appear to affect job satisfaction or efficacy (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995), when empowered teachers develop responsibility for academic progress, efficacy and school climate can improve (Esposito, 2007; Martin et al., 2001), and teachers can become more effective (Martin, 1983).

Communication, a byproduct of shared decision making, has clearly been shown to affect numerous elements of the school climate (Evans et al., 2001; Rafferty 2003; Sutherland, 1994; Vyskocil & Goens, 1979). Unfortunately, there has been little research in the area of communication and unions (Hoover, 1997). This lack of research is extremely profound, given the fact that improved communication is a major effect of, and goal for, collective bargaining (Carini, 2002).

Communication is the most critical factor in any organization (Deal & Peterson, 1994). Communication is described as the way in which system information and values are understood by all members of a system (Rafferty, 2003), how that information affects the system, and how diverging voices can promote progress (Deal & Peterson, 1994). Without communication, school improvement initiatives have little chance of succeeding (Rafferty, 2003). Quality administrators create effective initiatives as a result of common interest, open communication, and collaboration (Eberts & Stone, 1987; Esposito, 2007; Halawah, 2005; Liebman et al., 2005).
At the heart of these common interests are union initiatives. Some researchers contend that unions themselves may be the critical factor in improving education (Urbanski, 2003). Unions are able to shock schools into improvement because their communication abilities break through the traditional bureaucratic system which tends to help the average student (Carini, 2002). With this improved communication comes greater trust (Koppich & Kerchner, 2000), higher self-efficacy (Fox et al., 1974), input in decision making (Masters & Albright, 2003), improved student achievement (Esposito, 2007), and higher morale (Jobe & Parrish, 1995).

The democratic processes involved in establishing autocratic input leads to the development of the work environment (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Hoover (1997) adds to this by suggesting that all workers should have a workplace voice in a free and democratic society. Research suggests that when members of a union are able to get along with each other and understand the part that every teacher plays in the organization, the “collective voice” will help members attain their goals (Barling, Fullagar, Kelloway & McElvie, 2001; Freeman & Medoff, 1979). As this voice improves, so should job commitment, job involvement (Barling, Wade, & Fullagar, 1990) and the climate (Masters & Albright, 2003). Essentially, effective schools are a result of improved communication, synergy (Bascia, 1994; Edgerson et al., 2006), and commitment (Leithwood et al., 2003).

Another effect of collective bargaining is the improvement of working conditions (AFT, 2001). Most teachers today take their working conditions for granted, as the hard working efforts of past collective bargaining agreements and legislation have helped eclipse many early challenges in education (Ashyk, 1995; Duckworth, 1983). Research
has shown that improved classroom conditions are important elements in building “effective schools” (Nelson et al., 1996).

The working conditions for which teachers bargain comprise many areas. Most commonly, teachers advocate for safety and facility maintenance (Jobe & Parrish, 1995; NEA, 2006; Ohio Department of Education, n.d.), but recently and perhaps surprisingly, the most common lobbying interests in recent negotiated agreements have been safety and discipline (Sommerfeld, 1992). In a study on school crime and safety, it was found that 75% of administrators did not view school crime as a substantial concern. Although it may appear easy for administration to dismiss safety concerns of students and teachers, the same study found that nearly thirty million crimes each school year are committed in our schools on students and teachers (Nusser & Haller, 1995). Because a healthy school climate helps create and cultivate safe schools (Noonan, 2004), it would seem necessary that our school leaders need to look more closely at safety concerns in our schools.

Tenure is probably the most widely criticized effect of collective bargaining (Adamowski et al., 2007; Ballou, 1999; Kersten, 2006; Koppich, 2005; Murray, 2000). Tenure is often labeled as protecting incompetent teachers (Ballou, 1999; Hess & West, 2006), hindering education improvement (Ballou, 1999; Kersten, 2006), and burdening the work productivity of other competent teachers (Menuey, 2005). Other researchers have viewed tenure as a “guarantee of due process,” whereby proven teachers can not be unreasonably fired (Koppich, 2005; Strom & Baxter, 2001) and as a safety net for educators involved in the change process necessary for educational improvement (Graham et al., 2002).
Researchers opposed to tenure usually support merit pay initiatives (Ballou, 1999; Hess & West, 2006). Some researchers have argued that these incentive pay plans would be rejected wholly by employees in unions (Hess & West, 2006) but research indicates that union membership is not an indication of tenure support (Collins et al., 1993). Additionally, unions tend to attract and retain more quality teachers, as collective bargaining in schools leads to higher compensation than schools that do not have collective bargaining. In this market approach, union schools tend to get higher quality teachers than do nonunion schools (Eberts, 2007).

Teacher turnover is an issue for all school districts, as commitment has been found to play a critical role in climate improvement (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.) and academic achievement (Leithwood et al., 2003). Research indicates that tenure has been found to be a predictor of commitment to schools (Barling et al., 1990) and teacher quality (NEA, 2006). A part of this is that commitment to work improves when the employee maintains the same job description for a prolonged period of time (Barling et al., 1990). Perhaps tenure is viewed by teachers as a safety net, as tenure does not appear to affect the teacher’s willingness to change and develop (Graham et al., 2002).

Despite employees’ commitment, research in the business sector indicates that union employees have lower levels of work satisfaction than do non-union employees (Collins et al., 1993; Lincoln & Boothe, 1993). Even with this low level of satisfaction, union employees that complain about their job are less likely to leave them than those employees who do not complain (Kerchner, 2004). In contrast to work satisfaction among union and non-union employees in the business sector, it appears that union and non-union teachers in education have similar traits of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.
Sergiovanni (1969) suggests that among these levels of satisfaction, it is only fair that teachers should expect a safe environment, progressive student-centered policies, and open communication; all items for which unions continually advocate (Carini, 2002).

Factors that affect job satisfaction are different for each employee. Researchers have found that traditional surveys may not evaluate all elements of an employee’s work experience (Barling et al., 1990). The level of employee commitment to the union is a result of intrinsic and extrinsic work dissatisfaction (Fullagar & Barling, 1989). As a result, it is not certain if employees come to embrace tenure before, during, or after evaluations (Barling, et al., 1990).

One final element of collective bargaining that affects education is teacher compensation. Unions have played an important and productive role in the improvement of teacher salaries (Kerchner, 2004). Despite research that suggests unions are entrenched in antiquated models of management that espouse extrinsic motivation (Sergiovanni et al., 1987) and that collective bargaining has increased teachers’ salaries but not their quality (Hess & West, 2006), data suggest that teaching positions with better salaries tend to recruit and retain effective teachers (Carini, 2002).

Studies That Link School Climate and Unionization

To date, there has only been one study that tested differences in climate perception between union and non-union educators. That study was conducted in higher education and indicated that age, race, and education level have an effect on school climate (Vander Putten et al., 1997). The same study found differences in climate perception between specific departments and that “tenure in unit” had a significant effect on climate. Relevant peripheral research supports these findings by indicating that union
teachers tend to have more negative perceptions of various elements of their work environment than do those teachers not affiliated with the union (Berger et al., 1983; Collins et al., 1993; Vander Putten et al., 1997). One main area tends to elicit unfavorable perceptions of the work environment for non-union teachers; an unchanging work environment. Non-union teachers tend to appreciate system changes more than their union teachers. Unionized teachers tend to favor a stable and consistent environment (Barling et al., 1990; Kerchner, 1979).

The perceptions of climate affect employee attitudes and behaviors (Medrano, 1982). In a study conducted by Ferraiolo, Hess, Maranto, and Milliman (2004), it was found that union enrollment and teaching experience were the greatest predictors of teacher attitudes. Some have suggested the structure of the union itself is the driving force behind teacher attitudes and behaviors (Claudet & Ellet, 1999; Kerchner, 1979; Martin, 2007; Medrano, 1982). Still others contend that districts with dedicated union teachers exhibit greater levels of trust than districts with weak unions (Baker, 2001). These dedicated union teachers are usually active in educational reform activities and view the union as a real voice for education improvement (Beachum & Dentith, 2004).

Participatory decision making organizations like unions help strengthen schools when all members of the teaching community work together (Bascia, 2000; Fox et al., 1974; Kerchner, 1979) with the goal of using data for education improvement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999). Not only can joint union and administration goals positively affect school climate, they can help increase academic success (Green & Etheridge, 2001).
The development of the school climate can not be realized without open and effective communication (Vyskocil & Goens, 1979). In turn, open communication shapes teacher attitudes and behaviors (Rafferty, 2003). Communication, a critical element for which unions advocate, has a direct correlation on the climate of an organization (Evans et al., 2001; Rafferty 2003).

Although union employees tend to have less favorable views of their climate (Vander Putten et al., 1997), they tend to be influenced into staying in their job longer than their non-union counterparts (Barling et al., 1990). In addition, open communication by a quality principal can cause higher teacher morale and commitment (Marks & Printy, 2003).

Teacher turnover is a major concern for school climate improvement (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.). Teacher commitment can be predicted by looking at results from climate studies and factoring in job satisfaction (Carini, 2002; Barling et al., 1990). Additionally, teachers and students must be able to take ownership of their schools before loyalty will lead to commitment (Hoy & Hannum, 1997). Commitment is a concern for all education improvement initiatives because it has a bi-directional effect with climate (Leithwood et al., 2003).

Unions can affect job satisfaction by ensuring their values are aligned with those goals of the school (Bascia, 1994). The union then has yet another responsibility of helping foster a positive climate in the union and within the school, all of which will help foster increased teacher commitment, improve job satisfaction, and build a more positive climate (Barling et al., 1990; Rafferty, 2003).
This study will further research in unionism by focusing on other elements that Vander Putten, McLendon, and Peterson (1997) did not test. Their research utilized an instrument designed specifically for their research and focused on what they called “work environment indices” (culture, philosophy, climate, and quality of outcome) and used union affiliation, function area, tenure, education level, race, age, and gender as independent variables. This study will focus on established dimensions of teacher perceptions of school climate. These dimensions include:

Academic Emphasis—labeled as Academic Emphasis on the OHI-S. Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (2009) describe Academic Emphasis as “the school press for academic achievement. High but achievable goals are set for students; the learning environment is orderly and serious; teachers believe students can achieve; and students work hard and respect those who do well academically” (n.p.).

Trust and Work Satisfaction—collectively labeled as Morale on the OHI-S. Hoy et al., (2009) describe Morale as “the sense of trust, confidence, enthusiasm, and friendliness among teachers. Teachers feel good about each other and, at the same time, feel a sense of accomplishment from their jobs” (n.p.)

Communication and Input—collectively labeled as Consideration on the OHI-S. Hoy et al., (2009) describe Consideration as “principal behavior that is friendly, supportive, and collegial. The principal looks out for the welfare of faculty members and is open to their suggestions” (n.p.)

Other dimensions of school climate in the review of literature include self-efficacy and commitment. Those dimensions are not tested on the OHI-S (Hoy et al., 1991) and therefore, data for those dimensions can’t be measured in this study. While
other survey instruments have been developed to measure self-efficacy and commitment as dimensions of school climate, validity was not established and resulting data may not be valid (Johnson, Dixon, & Robinson, 1987). After an exhaustive review of school climate instruments, it was determined that the OHI-S (Hoy) measured the greatest number of important school climate dimensions and union supported goals contained in this study. This study will delve deep into the teacher perceptions of the factors that influence climate dimensions.

Summary

This review of literature was presented in five sections. The research presented in this review is intended to provide the theoretical framework for this study. This review yielded research which indicates that school climate perception has a bidirectional effect with school success. This research is in contrast to the research which indicates that unions have a greater negative effect on academic achievement than nonunion schools, since union teachers elicit more personal negative school climate perceptions than do nonunion teachers. In spite of the positive effects of unions on academic achievement, the majority of scholarly research in school climate appears to be philosophically biased and purposefully designed to oppose unions. The goal of this research is to find elements that link school climate and unionization.
CHAPTER III

Introduction

This study concerned differences in school climate perception among teachers with various levels of union support. The *Organizational Health Inventory for Secondary Schools* (Hoy et al., 1991) was the climate instrument used in this study. Although the review of literature found an abundance of the *OHI-S* dimensions of Academic Emphasis, Consideration, and Morale, all seven dimensions of the *OHI-S* were examined.

The theoretical orientation of this study was conducted from a positivist knowledge claim. This approach, according to Creswell (2003) shows a “deterministic philosophy in which causes probably determine effects or outcomes” (p. 7). This theoretical orientation is viewed as a scientific method to conducting research.

Research Questions

Research question 1 was established from the literature regarding union structures and Academic Emphasis. The review of literature indicated a preponderance of data from the managerial perspective that suggested that schools which are less constricted from administrative barriers will have higher academic achievement (Adamowski et al., 2007). A question was then framed regarding teachers’ perception of academic emphasis.

Research Question 1 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Academic Emphasis, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

Research question 2 was established from the concepts of communication and input. In the *OHI-S* survey, these dimensions are jointly labeled as “Consideration.” It is postulated that administrators which employ transformational leadership will empower
teachers with the necessary skills and internal motivation necessary for improving student achievement. Research in school climate contends that communication has a bi-directional effect with school climate, and that both a positive school climate and open communication positively affect student achievement.

Research Question 2 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Consideration, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

Research question 3 was established from the literature in trust and job satisfaction. The literature regarding trust indicates that trust helps establish a healthier school climate and better communication. Research in unions suggests that while collective bargaining helps improve communication, the same collective bargaining system may have differing effects on trust. Some research contends that a negotiated agreement helps create some level of trust for employees, but the actual process of establishing the rights and responsibilities in that agreement may lead to mistrust between employer and administration.

Researchers have found that union employees exhibit lower levels of job satisfaction than nonunion employees. Despite this lessened level of satisfaction, union employees tend to exhibit higher levels of job commitment. The literature also supports the premise that union members have a lower sense of morale than nonunion employees. Data indicate that teachers will have a higher sense of morale if they are empowered with more input, however conflicting data indicate that greater input opportunities for teachers does not appear to affect job satisfaction. The research does indicate, however that increased input and morale lead to higher teacher efficacy and improved organizational
communication. In turn, improved communication and increased efficacy help elevate school climate.

Research Question 3 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect Morale, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

Research question 4 comes from the literature in school integrity. Although the review of literature in school climate and unionism did not yield substantial data with regard to the dimension Institutional Integrity, Hoy et al., (2009) recommend testing this dimension in order to get a better overall picture of school health.

Research Question 4 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect Institutional Integrity, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

Research question 5 comes from the literature in school supplies and resources. Although the review of literature in school climate and unionism did not yield substantial data with regard to the dimension Resource Support, Hoy et al., (2009) recommend testing this dimension in order to get a better overall picture of school health.

Research Question 5 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect Resource Support, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

Research Question 6 comes from the literature in perceptions of principal abilities and principal expectations. Although the review of literature in school climate and unionism did not yield substantial data with regard to the dimension Initiating Structure,
Hoy et al., (2009) recommend testing this dimension in order to get a better overall picture of school health.

Research Question 6 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect Initiating Structure, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

Research question 7 comes from the literature in principal influential abilities. Although the review of literature in school climate and unionism did not yield substantial data with regard to the dimension Principal Influence, Hoy et al., (2009) recommend testing this dimension in order to get a better overall picture of school health.

Research Question 7 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect Principal Influence, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

Research question 8 was established from the literature in unions and school climate. Literature from the business sector suggests that union employees have a more diminished perception of their work environment than do nonunion employees. One important study from the education sector indicated that nonunion employees have higher perceptions of organizational climate than do union employees, albeit this study included non-teaching personnel.

Research Question 8 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect Overall School Health?
Choice of Mixed Methods Case Study

The decision to use a mixed method inquiry for this study was based on a couple of factors. A large volume of school improvement literature has facilitated the use of quantitative school climate instruments to make generalizations about the school and infer possible suggestions for improvement. Since the large volume of this school improvement literature is written from an administrative perspective, it was deemed necessary that this study, which is written from the perspective of a teacher, utilize the same research techniques. In doing so, comparisons of data from both perspectives can be made more easily.

Additionally, because the school from which these data were collected was purposefully selected, a descriptive analysis of the school was deemed necessary. The reasoning for the purposeful selection of the school is discussed below in the sample section of this study.

Quantitative Methodology

The Sample

From the review of literature, it was deemed necessary to utilize a high school population for the study sample. A high school was selected instead of an elementary or middle school, as high schools tend to have a larger teaching staff and would likely produce a larger sample.

The school selected for this study was an urban high school in Ohio, which services over 1,500 students in grades 9-12. One hundred two teachers comprised the teaching staff which boasted a diverse ethnic population, gender equity, and wide range of teaching experience. Subjects offered at this school were in line with the state of Ohio
Board of Education expectations and included college preparatory courses, general study classes, and vocational education classes.

The selection of this specific school was based on the school’s state report card designation by the state of Ohio State Board of Education as a level of In Need of Continuous Improvement (Ohio Department of Education, 2006). There were two reasons for selecting a school designated as In Need of Continuous Improvement for this study.

First, schools with a higher state report card designation, Effective, would have likely had higher Academic Emphasis, Consideration, and Morale levels. As a result, those schools with an Effective designation would have presumably had a more positive school climate than schools designated In Need of Continuous Improvement. Inversely, it was postulated, schools with a lower state report card designation, Under Academic Watch or In a State of Academic Emergency, would have likely had lower Academic Emphasis, Consideration, and Morale levels. In summation, it was determined that utilizing a large school, absent from the successes or shortcomings of state designated academic achievement measurements, would yield better results.

The other important reason for performing a case study in one large school was that the research design controlled for variables within the given school, as all of the survey respondents worked in the same school. In doing so, the design controlled for differing effects on school climate that might have occurred as a result of differences in principals, salary scales, negotiated agreement duties and responsibilities, curriculum, community resources, and parental involvement.
Permission was sought and obtained from the school district superintendent to use the high school as a research site and conduct the OHI-S survey with the teaching staff (Appendix B). Upon prior permission of the building principal, the survey was offered to the teachers present at the beginning of a staff in-service meeting.

My entrée into the school during the staff in-service meeting was a good-natured show of support. The building principal comically introduced me to the teaching staff by saying that “the unfortunate part of being a large school is that we become easy targets for research papers,” which resulted in supportive laughter from several teachers. He then introduced me by name and indicated that I was “another doctoral student trying to finish his dissertation,” and asked the teachers to “help a fellow teacher finish some course work.”

Before administration of the instrument, I indicated that participation in the survey was voluntary and was not being conducted by the school or for the school. Teacher respondents were asked to complete the survey. In addition, respondents were asked to remain anonymous on the survey and not write their name or an identifying mark on the questionnaire. At the conclusion of the questionnaire, I thanked the teacher respondents, solely collected the data, and did not disclose the data to anyone. Of the 96 teachers present at the in-service, the administration of the survey produced 87 willing teachers for the school climate survey, resulting in a 91% response rate.
Survey Instrument

Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) developed the Organizational Health Inventory for Secondary Schools in order to determine differences of perception in school climate and the overall health of the school. Subscales of the OHI-S and their Cronbach alpha reliability scores were Academic Emphasis (.93), Consideration (.90), and Morale (.92) (Hoy et al., 1991).

The additional dimensions of Institutional Integrity (.91), Initiating Structure (.89), Principal Influence (.87), and Resource Support (.95) are found on the OHI-S. These dimensions were not prominent in the review of literature on school climate and union support. However measures of these dimensions were kept in the survey, as Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (2009) suggest testing all dimensions of the OHI-S in order to “gain a finely tuned picture of school health”

The OHI-S survey used in this study was 44 questions in length. For each statement the participant responded with an answer based on a 4-point Likert scale: RO—rarely occurs, SO—sometimes occurs, O—often occurs, and VFO—very frequently occurs. Five questions were added to the survey in order to establish a better picture of the demographics of the teachers: age, race, school department, and number of years in building, and to measure the level of local union support.

Permission was sought and given by the author of the OHI-S instrument, Wayne Hoy (Appendix D), to add the last questions in order to determine the independent variables. Those questions were added at the end of the survey so as to avoid affecting the previous responses.
Dependent and Independent Variables

There were eight dependent variables developed from this study. Specifically, seven of the dependent variables were the seven dimensions of the OHI-S dimensions, Academic Emphasis, Consideration, Morale, Institutional Integrity, Resource Support, and Principal Influence. The eighth dependent variable, Overall Health Index, was determined by combining the seven dimensions of school health, as per the OHI-S instructions. The independent variable, support for the union, was determined by questions 51 and 52 in the survey.

Quantitative Analysis Technique

The analysis utilized several steps in order to test the hypotheses. Once the data were assembled, the respondents were grouped according to their support for the union. Respondents were grouped once based on question 51 and a second time based on question 52. A communality score was calculated for each group for each question. These communality scores were then subjected to paired sample t testing. Then, these average scores per group and question were compared to find differences.

Hypotheses were created from the set of independent and dependent variables. Each control and predictor variable was established from the review of literature and was tested to measure its effect on the perception of school climate. The original eight research questions were used to create a series of hypotheses. In order to test the hypotheses, a series of paired sample t-tests were conducted between the subgroups on each dimension of the OHI-S.
The OHI-S data were originally compiled as an Excel© file and later converted to an SPSS© file for analysis. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the responses. The exploratory factor analysis of the data obtained from the administration of the OHI-S revealed that five of the instrument’s dimensions, Institutional Integrity, Resource Support, Morale, Principal Influence, and Consideration, loaded properly. Two dimensions, Academic Emphasis and Initiating Structure, did not load. The administration of this survey on this day provides cross-validation for five of Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp’s (1991) seven dimensions of organizational health.

Qualitative Methodology

Participant Criteria Selection

Because the research design utilized a mixed method approach, interviews and retrieval of information from the Internet provided the context that helped in interpreting the survey data. In order to obtain these data, interview participants were purposefully sampled. The selection of the interview participants was based upon recommendations of the superintendent and supported by the unique experiences of each participant in teaching, union leadership, and administration.

The superintendent was selected for interview participation because of his experience in the district with union negotiations. The principal and two assistant principals were chosen to be interviewed because questions on the survey instrument pertained to the principal, their experience in school leadership and union collaborations, and their classroom teaching experience as union employees. The curriculum director and personnel director were chosen to be interviewed because of their experience in union
leadership roles, classroom teaching experience, and their experience in school and union collaborations. Two teachers were selected to be interviewed because of their number of years in the district and their experience in the teacher union. As a result, the superintendent, principal, two assistant principals, curriculum director, personnel director, and two teachers were interviewed, for a total of eight people.

**Interviews**

Seven of the eight initial interviews were conducted in person, on September 17, 2008. Because the superintendent notified the participants of the research well in advance, most participants made their schedules available for the interviews that day. The eighth participant could not be interviewed on the same day as the other seven participants and was later interviewed over the phone. One other interview required a follow-up phone call for clarification.

The eight participants were interviewed in various locations. The superintendent and building principal were interviewed in their respective offices. One assistant principal was interviewed in the teacher lounge. The other assistant principal was interviewed over the phone. The curriculum director and personnel director were interviewed in the conference room at the board office. One teacher was interviewed in the classroom and another teacher was interviewed outside the high school office.

**Interview Questions**

The initial questions that helped guide the interviews were developed from the mixed method approach known as “sequential explanatory strategy” (Creswell, 2003). In this mixed method approach, qualitative data are obtained after quantitative data have
been obtained. These qualitative data are then used to help infer reasons for surprising results within the quantitative data.

The questions were developed from the review of literature and from common items in the quantitative survey. The interview questions were developed so that the participant could speak freely and without specific direction from the researcher. Those questions included:

1. What is your position?
2. How long have you worked in this capacity?
3. What is your perception of the school climate?
4. In what capacity have you been involved with the union?
5. What is your view of the teacher union?

*Qualitative Analysis Technique*

The interviews were not recorded but hand written. Because seven of the eight interviews happened on the same day, emerging themes became quickly apparent with each successive interview. These handwritten interviews were later transcribed to Microsoft Notepad© format. The data were then analyzed by codifying and labeling the emerging themes, prioritizing each theme based on frequency and relevance to the review of literature and survey instrument, and by the quality of insightful, detailed descriptions given by the participants.
Summary

This chapter detailed the methodology of this study which measured the teacher’s perception of school support of the local union on school climate, given a teacher’s personal and professional characteristics. Hypotheses were developed and tested based on the eight research questions of this study. A paired samples t test was used to determine if there were differences between groups that did and did not support the union. Interviews with participants were also conducted in order to help infer reasoning for the quantitative findings. Chapter 4 discusses the analysis in further detail and addresses the findings of the analysis.
CHAPTER IV

Introduction

The impetus for the research in this chapter stemmed from the research questions posed in Chapter I. Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp’s (1991) OHI-S was the survey instrument used to determine if support for the local education union affects different dimensions of school climate. The research questions the survey instrument was used to test include:

1. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Academic Emphasis, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

2. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Consideration, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

3. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Morale, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

4. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Institutional Integrity, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

5. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Resource Support, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

6. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Initiating Structure, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

7. Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Principal Influence, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?
8. Does support of the local education union affect the Overall Health Index score, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

A series of hypotheses were created in order to test these research questions. These hypotheses are discussed later in the findings.

The data were obtained from the *OHI-S*, which was administered in one day at a school in-service meeting. There were 102 teachers at the high school and 96 of those teachers were in attendance at this meeting. Eighty-seven of the ninety-six teachers present volunteered to participate in the survey, resulting in a 91% response rate. A rendering of the data showed that not all respondents answered every question. This is most evident in the added questions pertaining to demographics. It is also important to note that eighty of the eighty-seven respondents described themselves as a “member of the local teacher union” on question 50. Three respondents described themselves as a “fee payer” and four respondents did not respond to the question.

The original eight research questions were used to create a series of hypotheses. In order to test the hypotheses, a series of paired sample *t*-tests were conducted between the subgroups on each dimension of the *OHI-S*. A more complete analysis of the findings is discussed in the following section.

**Findings**

*Demographic Data*

The sample consisted of teachers who were present at the professional development meeting. Teachers were asked to volunteer their time to complete the 53-question survey, which included the original 44 questions from the *OHI-S*, 8 questions
that would help define the demographics of the sample, and one question added by the school district regarding professional development.

The eight demographic questions were added by permission of author of the instrument (APPENDIX D) and were added to the instrument for questions 45 through questions 52. The demographics for the sample can be found in Table 1 below.
### Table 1

**Demographic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Total Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N = 87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Current Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng./For. Lang.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Educ.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist./Soc. Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-Up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Taught</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All grades</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African Amer.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am.Ind./Nat. Ak.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Pac.Isl.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Status</td>
<td>Union Member</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee Payer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability and Validity**

Reliability testing is conducted to determine the stability or consistency of an instrument (Creswell, 2003). Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (2009) reported Cronbach alpha coefficients for each dimension as, Institutional Integrity (.91), Initiating Structure (.89), Consideration (.90), Principal Influence (.87), Resource Support (.95), Morale (.92), and Academic Emphasis (.93).
Validity testing is conducted to measure the degree to which an instrument measures the component(s) it is designed to measure (Creswell, 2003). The OHI-S has been used many times in many settings, and its validity has been well established.

Exploratory factor analysis of the responses was conducted using SPSS© software. The Principal Component Analysis was the extraction method used and the Rotation Method utilized Quartimax with Kaiser Normalization. This method resulted in a rotation which converged in 16 iterations (George & Mallery, 2007).

Although exploratory factor analysis indicated that Principal Influence and Resource Support were the most dominant components of organizational health at this high school, two of the dimensions (Academic Emphasis and Initiating Structure) failed to load. A well-established instrument like the OHI-S should have loaded on all its dimensions in a factor analysis. Qualitative research conducted at the site offered the possibility that external political forces may have been affecting the teachers’ perceptions and productivity. This possibility is discussed later in the Qualitative Analysis section.

The exploratory factor loadings for the OHI-S and the communalities for group 1 (supports the union) and group 2 (tends to not support the union) are located in Table 2 below.
Table 2

**Factor Loadings by Question and Communalities for Subgroups Determined by Union Good**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Variables</th>
<th>Principal Influence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor Loadings</td>
<td>Communalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02.* The principal gets what he or she asks from superiors.</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43. The learning environment is orderly and serious.</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. The principal maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16.* The principal is able to work well with the superintendent.</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.* The principal’s recommendations are given serious consideration by his or her superiors.</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09.* The principal is able to influence the actions of his or her superiors.</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q31. The principal looks out for the welfare of faculty members.

Q44. Teachers identify with the school.

Q37. The morale of the teachers is high.

Q34. Teachers in this school are cool and aloof to each other.

Q42. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.

Q07. The students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set before them.

Q32. The principal schedules the work to be done.

Q01. Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands.

Q28. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.

Resource Support

Q26.* Supplementary materials are for classroom use.
Q33.* Teachers have access to needed instructional materials. 

Q12.* Teachers are provided with adequate materials for their classroom. 

Q19.* Teachers receive necessary classroom supplies. 

Q05.* Extra materials are available if requested. 

Q14.* The school sets high standards for academic performance. 

________________________________________________________________________

Morale 

Q27.* Teachers exhibit friendliness to each other. 

Q13.* Teachers in this school like each other. 

Q40.* There is a feeling of trust and communication among the staff. 

Q06.* Teachers do favors for each other. 

Q20.* Teachers are indifferent to each other.
Q35. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q03.* The principal is friendly and approachable.</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10.* The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal.</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. The principal makes his or her attitudes clear to the school.</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.* The principal is willing to make changes.</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q04. The principal asks that faculty members follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.* The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation.</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. The principal is impeded by the superiors.</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q08.* The school is vulnerable to outside pressures.</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.* Select citizen groups are influential with the board.</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.* The school is open to the whims of the public.</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.* Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program.</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22.* Teachers feel pressure from the community.</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.* A few vocal parents can change school policy.</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18.* The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41. Students try hard to improve upon previous work.</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Emphasis

Q21.* Students respect others who get  .672  .979  .423
good grades.

* These questions correspond to the dimensions in the OHI-S (Hoy et al., 1991).

Results of the Analysis

Dependent Variables

Five dependent variables resulted from the factor analysis of the data: Institutional Integrity, Resource Support, Morale, Principal Influence, and Consideration. Because these were the strongest components of organizational health to emerge from the factor analysis, each of them was analyzed to determine if it was related to support for the union.

Independent Variable

The independent variable, union support, was measured by three added questions on the survey instrument. Question 50, which asked whether the respondent was a member of the union or fee payer, revealed that only three respondents were fee payers. Two other questions, numbers 51 and 52, were used to separate teachers into categories of those who supported and those who did not support the local union. Questions 51 and 52 on the survey instrument were based on a 4-point Likert scale and include the following responses: A) strongly disagree, B) somewhat disagree, C) somewhat agree, and D) strongly agree.
Question 51 was “Members of the local teacher union do not get enough benefits for the amount of money taken from union dues.” Because the question was worded in the negative, those respondents that chose responses A or B were grouped into the subgroup labeled Benefit Perception1 (tends to have a favorable view of union benefits). Conversely, those respondents that chose responses C and D were grouped into the subgroup labeled Benefit Perception2 (tends to have an unfavorable view of union benefits). Table 3 below shows the distribution of the Benefit Perception responses.

Table 3

*Frequency Distribution of Responses for Question 51, Benefit Perception*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System 15 16.1

Total 93 100.0

Question 52 was “The local teacher union is a good example of what people can accomplish when they work together.” Respondents who selected either response C or D were grouped into the subgroup labeled Union Good1 (tends to view union favorably). Conversely, those respondents who selected A or B were grouped into the subgroup...
labeled Union Good2. Table 4 below shows the distribution of the Union Good responses.

Table 4

*Frequency Distribution of Responses for Question 52, Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Spearman’s correlation between Benefit Perception and Union Good was .719, p < .01. Thus, while the two measures were highly correlated, there was overlap of membership in the groups. The Benefit Perception variable had 19 respondents as supporting the union support and 59 as respondents as not supporting the union. The Union Good variable grouped 47 respondents as supporting the union and 33 as not supporting the union.
Factor Analysis for Each Subgroup

For the analysis of the research questions, average scores were not used. This is because the answers to the survey questions were not scale variables but ordinal variables, and should not be averaged for analysis. The factor analysis procedure, producing communalities, is the appropriate procedure for these data because communalities are scale variables. The factor analysis produced a communality, or standardized mean score, for each item for each group. The difference between the two communality scores on an item is then a function of group membership.

The factor analysis procedure was used twice: once for the groups (support/nonsupport) created by the question regarding the benefit perception of the union (#51), and again for the groups created by the question regarding whether the union is good (#52). Because the two questions sorted the sample differently, the analysis was run twice and the results were compared.

Communalities in subgroup Benefit Perception1 and subgroup Benefit Perception2, and the communalities in subgroup Union Good1 and Union Good2 were paired with each individual survey question according to the five dimensions of the OHI-S that loaded in the exploratory factor analysis. As a result, new variables were developed: Communality 1, which includes communalities for all 44 items on the OHI-S for subgroup Benefit Perception1 and Benefit Perception2, and Communality 2, which includes communalities for all 44 items on the OHI-S for subgroup Union Good1 and Union Good2.
Although both subgroups were utilized for paired t-testing, the subgroup resulting from question 52 was deemed a better fit than the subgroup for question 51 for analysis of the research questions. There were nearly even numbers from subgroup Union Good1, which had 33 respondents (37.93%), and Union Good2 which had 47 respondents (54.02%). Benefit Perception1 had 19 respondents (21.83%) and Benefit Perception2 had 59 respondents (67.81%). See Tables 3 and 4 for clarification. A more accurate rendering of the data in a paired sample t-test would be obtained if the numbers of each subgroup were equal or close to equal. Visual comparison of the groups from Tables 3 and 4 suggest that the group sizes are quite different. Communalities for the subgroups in Union Good appear in Appendix E and communalities for the subgroups in Benefit Perception appear in Appendix F.

Paired sample t-tests were performed on each subgroup according to each of the five dimensions of the OHI-S which loaded in the factor analysis. Survey questions used in the analysis were those questions that corresponded to the OHI-S dimensions (Hoy et al., 1991) and also loaded on that factor in the data. The results of each dimension are indicated below.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Academic Emphasis, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

Because the exploratory factor analysis of the entire sample did not load for the dependent variable Academic Emphasis, separate factor analyses were conducted on the two subgroups that did and did not support the union. Support for the union was
determined by the responses to questions 51 and 52. The relative support of the union did not affect the response pattern on the Academic Emphasis subscale. Thus, the instrument did not measure Academic Emphasis in this sample of teachers, whether or not they supported the union.

One possible reason for this was found within the qualitative data. Two days prior to the administration of the survey, the Ohio Department of Education’s school report card rating for the district had been lowered from a rating of *Effective* to a rating of *Continuous Improvement*. Additionally, the voters of the district had just rejected a school property tax referendum. Upon the news of both, the school district was faced with budget cuts. As a result, it was announced to teachers that there would be no money for new textbooks and professional development money would be limited. The school administration was doing what it is charged to do: make the financial decisions that keep the district functioning. To the teachers, they were hearing the phrase “do more with less.”

*Research Question 2*

Research Question 2 asked:

- Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Consideration, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?
As a result, the following null and research hypotheses were created from this second research question:

1H₀: Support of the local teacher union is not associated with perceptions of Consideration.

1H₁: Support of the local teacher union is associated with perceptions of Consideration.

Consideration was measured using survey items 3, 10, 17, and 24. Two tests of the hypotheses were conducted, one using survey item 51, Benefit Perception, to determine support for the union, and the other using survey item 52, Union Good. Communalities were calculated, and a paired samples t-test was performed to see if the two groups differed. Table 5 presents the results of the paired samples t-test with groups defined by Benefit Perception. The difference in perception of Consideration between the groups that did and did not support the union was significant, p = .002.

Table 5

| Differences in Perceptions of Consideration Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Benefit Perception |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pairings | Mean | Standard Deviation | Error Mean | Interval of Difference (2-tailed) | (2-tailed) |
| BENPERC1 | .2430000 | .0475955 | .0237978 | .1672649 | .3187351 | 10.211 | 3 | .002 |
| BENPERC2 | .2430000 | .0475955 | .0237978 | .1672649 | .3187351 | 10.211 | 3 | .002 |
Table 6 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by Union Good. The difference in perception of Consideration between the groups that did and did not support the union was significant, *p* = .003

Table 6

**Differences in Perceptions of Consideration Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Union Good**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairings</th>
<th>Consideration Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNGOOD1</td>
<td>.296250</td>
<td>.066570</td>
<td>.033285</td>
<td>(.190322, .402178)</td>
<td>8.900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGOOD2</td>
<td>.296250</td>
<td>.066570</td>
<td>.033285</td>
<td>(.190322, .402178)</td>
<td>8.900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in perception of Consideration between teachers that did and did not support the union is located in Table 7 below.
Table 7

*Differences of Mean Scores of Consideration, Based on Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supports Union</th>
<th>Opposes Union</th>
<th>Supports and Opposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 3 The principal is friendly</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and approachable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 10 The principal treats all</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty members as his or her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 17 The principal puts</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggestions made by the faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 24 The principal is willing to</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 31 The principal looks out for</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal welfare of faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7 shows, teachers who supported the union were less likely to perceive that the principal is friendly and treats all staff as his equal than teachers who did not support the union. Conversely, Table 7 also shows that teachers who did not support the union were less likely to perceive that the principal uses faculty suggestions, is willing to make changes, and is concerned about the well-being of the teaching staff than teachers that supported the union.
Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Morale, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

As a result, the following null and research hypotheses were created from this third research question:

2H₀: Support of the local teacher union is not associated with perceptions of Morale.

2H₁: Support of the local teacher union is associated with perceptions of Morale.

Morale was measured using survey items 6, 13, 20, 27, and 40. Two tests of the hypotheses were conducted, one using survey item 51, Benefit Perception, to determine support for the union, and the other using survey item 52, Union Good. Communalities were calculated, and a paired samples t-test was performed to see if the two groups differed. Table 8 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by Benefit Perception. The difference in perception of Morale between the groups that did and did not support the union was significant, p = .016.
Table 8

*Differences in Perceptions of Morale Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Benefit Perception*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENPERC1</td>
<td>.2236000</td>
<td>.1253607</td>
<td>.0560630</td>
<td>.0679442</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENPERC2</td>
<td>.1251888</td>
<td>.0634279</td>
<td>.0346406</td>
<td>.0798859</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by Union Good. The difference in perception of Morale between the groups that did and did not support the union was significant, p = .016.

Table 9

*Differences in Perceptions of Consideration Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNGOOD1</td>
<td>.2560000</td>
<td>.1418291</td>
<td>.0634279</td>
<td>.0798859</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGOOD2</td>
<td>.2560000</td>
<td>.1418291</td>
<td>.0634279</td>
<td>.0798859</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in perception of Consideration between teachers that did and did not support the union is located in Table 10 below.
Table 10

Differences of Mean Scores of Morale, Based on Union Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supports Union</th>
<th>Support Union</th>
<th>Difference between Supports and Did Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 6 Teachers do favors for each other.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 13 Teachers in this school like each other.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 20 Teachers are indifferent to each other.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 27 Teachers exhibit friendliness to each other.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 34 Teachers in this school are cool and aloof to each other.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 37 The morale of the teachers is high.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 40 There is a feeling of trust and confidence among the staff.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 42 Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 10, teachers who supported the union were more likely to perceive that teachers exhibit friendliness to each other, have high morale, feel a sense of trust among the staff, accomplish their job with enthusiasm, and identify with the school than teachers who did not support the union. Conversely, as Table 10 shows, teachers who did not support the union were more likely to perceive that teachers do favors for each other, like each other, are indifferent to each other, and are cool and aloof to each other than teachers that did support the union.

Research Question 4

The review of literature in education unions did not yield abundant research in the OHI-S dimension of Institutional Integrity. However, Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (2009) recommend testing the dimension along with the other dimensions in order to gain a finely tuned picture of the organizational health. Research Question 4 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Institutional Integrity, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

As a result, the following null and research hypotheses were created from this fourth research question:

3H₀: Support of the local teacher union is not associated with perceptions of Institutional Integrity.

3H₁: Support of the local teacher union is associated with perceptions of Institutional Integrity.
Institutional Integrity was measured using survey items 8, 29, 36, 15, 22, and 39.

Two tests of the hypotheses were conducted, one using survey item 51, Benefit Perception, to determine support for the union, and the other using survey item 52, Union Good. Communalities were calculated, and a paired samples t-test was performed to see if the two groups differed. Table 11 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by Benefit Perception. The difference in perception of Institutional Integrity between the groups that did and did not support the union was significant, p = .006.

Table 11

*Differences in Perceptions of Institutional Integrity Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Benefit Perception*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>95% Confidence</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pairings</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td>Error Mean</td>
<td>Interval of Difference</td>
<td>(2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENPERC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENPERC2</td>
<td>.1713333</td>
<td>.0933995</td>
<td>.0381302</td>
<td>.0733166</td>
<td>.2693501</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by Union Good. The difference in perception of Institutional Integrity between the groups that did and did not support the union was significant, p = .004.
Table 12

*Differences in Perceptions of Institutional Integrity Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairings</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNGOOD1</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>.3056667</td>
<td>.148195</td>
<td>.060501</td>
<td>.150145</td>
<td>.461188</td>
<td>5.052</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in perception of Institutional Integrity between teachers that did and did not support the union by Union Good is located in Table 13 below.
Table 13

*Differences of Mean Scores of Institutional Integrity, Based on Union Good*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supports Union</th>
<th>Support Union</th>
<th>Difference between Supports and Did Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1 Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parent demands.</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8 The school is vulnerable to outside pressures.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 15 Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 22 Teachers feel pressure from the community.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 29 Select citizen groups are influential with the board.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 36 The school is open to the whims of the public.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 39 A few vocal parents can change school policy</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 13, teachers who supported the union were more likely to perceive that teacher are protected from unreasonable demands, the school is vulnerable to outside pressures, teachers feel pressure from the community, the school is under pressure from the community, the school is open to the whims of the public, and that a few vocal parents can change school policy than those teachers who did not support the union. Conversely, Table 13 shows, teachers who did not support the union were more likely to perceive that community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program and that select citizen groups are influential with the board than teachers that supported the union.

Research Question 5

Research Question 5 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Resource Support, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

As a result, the following null and research hypotheses were created from this fifth research question:

4H₀: Support of the local teacher union is not associated with perceptions of Resource Support.

4H₁: Support of the local teacher union is associated with perceptions of Resource Support.

Resource Support was measured using survey items 26, 33, 12, 19, and 5. Two tests of the hypotheses were conducted, one using survey item 51, Benefit Perception, to determine support for the union, and the other using survey item 52, Union Good. Communalities were calculated, and a paired samples t-test was performed to see if the
two groups differed. Table 14 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by Benefit Perception. The difference in perception of Resource Support between the groups was not significantly different.

Table 14

*Differences in Perceptions of Resource Support Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Benefit Perception*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pairings</td>
<td>Mean Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENPERC1</td>
<td>.1524000</td>
<td>.1885837</td>
<td>.0843372</td>
<td>-.0817576</td>
<td>1.807</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by Union Good. The difference in perception of Resource Support between the groups that did and did not support the union was significant, p = .001.

Table 15

*Differences in Perceptions of Resource Support Between Groups That Did and Did Not Support the Union, Defined by Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pairings</td>
<td>Mean Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGOOD1</td>
<td>.211200</td>
<td>.057756</td>
<td>.025829</td>
<td>.139487</td>
<td>8.177</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGOOD2</td>
<td>.211200</td>
<td>.057756</td>
<td>.025829</td>
<td>.139487</td>
<td>8.177</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difference in perception of Resource Support between teachers that did and did not support the union is located in Table 16 below.

Table 16

*Differences of Mean Scores of Resource Support, Based on Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supports Union</th>
<th>Support Union</th>
<th>Supports and Did Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 5 Extra materials are available if requested.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 12 Teachers are provided with adequate materials for their classrooms.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 19 Teachers receive necessary classroom supplies.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 26 Supplementary materials are available for classroom use.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 33 Teachers have access to needed instructional materials.</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 16, teachers who supported the union were more likely to perceive that teachers have adequate resources and classroom supplies than teachers that did not support the union. Conversely, as Table 16 shows, teachers who did not support the union were more likely to perceive that extra materials are available if requested than teachers who supported the union.
Research Question 6

The review of literature in education unions did not yield abundant research in the OHI-S dimension of Initiating Structure. However, Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (2009) recommend testing the dimension along with the other dimensions in order to gain a finely tuned picture of the organizational health. Research Question 6 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Initiating Structure, as measured by the Organizational Health Inventory?

Because the exploratory factor analysis of the entire sample did not load for the dependent variable Initiating Structure, separate factor analyses were conducted on the two subgroups that did and did not support the union. Support for the union was determined by the responses to question 52. The relative support of the union did not affect the response pattern on the Initiating Structure subscale. Thus the instrument did not measure Initiating Structure in this sample of teachers, whether or not they supported the union.

A possible reason for this was found within the wording of the survey questions in the Initiating Structure dimension and in the qualitative data. All of the questions within the dimension of Initiating Structure (questions 4, 11, 18, 25, and 32) asked the respondent to assert their perception of the principal. This was problematic because the principal was new and had only been on the job for a week. Many teachers likely couldn’t describe the appearance of the principal in this large school, much less give opinions as to his abilities on a survey. For this reason, this question was going to give a wide variety of answers. Some respondents likely estimated their response based on first impressions and others might have used past perceptions of the previous principal, who
according to interviews was not well-respected. At the expense of the question, neither perception was right and would have likely altered the results of the dimension.

Additionally, a large number of respondents did not respond to all of the questions in this dimension. This was most prevalent in question 32. Of the 87 respondents, only 68 gave responses, for a response rate of 78.16%.

**Research Question 7**

The review of literature in education unions did not yield abundant research in the OHI-S dimension of Principal Influence. However, Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (2009) recommend testing the dimension along with the other dimensions in order to gain a finely tuned picture of the organizational health. Research Question 7 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect perceptions of Principal Influence, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

As a result, the following null and research hypotheses were created from this seventh research question:

- $H_0$: Support of the local teacher union is not associated with perceptions of Principal Influence.
- $H_1$: Support of the local teacher union is associated with perceptions of Principal Influence.

Principal Influence was measured using items 2, 9, 16, and 23. Two tests of the hypotheses were conducted, one using survey item 51, Benefit Perception, to determine support for the union, and the other using survey item 52, Union Good. Communalities were calculated, and a paired samples t-test was performed to see if the two groups differed. Table 17 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by
Benefit Perception. The difference in perception of Principal Influence between the
groups that did and did not support the union was not significantly different.

Table 17

*Differences of Mean Scores of Principal Influence, Based on Benefit Perception*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BENPERC1</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BENPERC2</td>
<td>.2245000</td>
<td>.1849369</td>
<td>-.0697759</td>
<td>.5187759</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 presents the results of the paired samples t test with groups defined by
Union Good. The difference in perception of Institutional Integrity between the groups
that did and did not support the union was significant, p = .014.

Table 18

*Differences of Mean Scores of Principal Influence, Based on Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNGOOD1</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNGOOD2</td>
<td>.3102500</td>
<td>.1188707</td>
<td>.0594354</td>
<td>.1211001</td>
<td>.4993999</td>
<td>5.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in perception of Principal Influence between teachers who did and
did not support the union is located in Table 19 below.
Table 19

*Differences of Mean Scores of Principal Influence, Based on Union Good*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supports Union</th>
<th>Support Union</th>
<th>Difference between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2 The principal gets what he or she asks from superiors.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 The principal is able to influence the actions of his or her superiors.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16 The principal is able to work well with the superintendent.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23 The principal’s recommendations are given serious consideration by his or her superiors.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30 The principal is impeded by the superiors.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 19, teachers who supported the union were more likely to perceive that the principal is able to influence the actions of his superiors, is able to work well with the superintendent, and gives recommendations which are given serious consideration by his superiors more than teachers that did not support the union.

Conversely, as shown in Table 1, teachers who did not support the union were more
likely to perceive that the principal gets what he asks from superiors than teachers that supported the union.

*Research Question 8*

Research Question 8 asked:

Does support of the local education union affect the Overall Health Index, as measured by the *Organizational Health Inventory*?

In order to answer this research question, Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp’s (2009) procedures for calculating the Overall Health Index were used for subgroup 1 (tends to support the union) and subgroup 2 (tends to not support the union). The first step in this calculation involved taking the mean for each of the 44 questions for subgroup 1 (tends to support the union) and assigning it to the corresponding dimension. This step was repeated for subgroup 2 (tends to not support the union). See Appendix G for more details. The collection of all seven dimensions and their corresponding question numbers is found in Table 20 below.
Table 20  

*Grouping of Test Questions with Corresponding OHI-S Dimensions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OHI-S Dimension</th>
<th>Question numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Integrity (II)</td>
<td>1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 36, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure (IS)</td>
<td>4, 11, 18, 25, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>3, 10, 17, 24, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Influence (PI)</td>
<td>2, 9, 16, 23, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Support (RS)</td>
<td>5, 12, 19, 26, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale (M)</td>
<td>6, 13, 20, 27, 34, 37, 40, 42, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emphasis (AE)</td>
<td>7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 38, 41, 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each subgroup the mean scores for each dimension were summed and a mean calculated for each dimension. This was performed by adding the subgroup averages for each question of one specific dimension at a time.

In order to standardize the scores for comparison to other districts, further calculations were performed. The following steps were performed for each subgroup. The first step was the mean score for each given dimension minus Hoy’s et al., (2009) normed mean score for the dimension multiplied by 100. The second step was to divide the results of step 1 by the addition of Hoy’s standard deviation for that dimension plus 500. Each subgroup’s dimensions were calculated using Hoy’s et al., (2009) step.

These scores could then be compared against normative data obtained through Hoy et al., (1991) research. The normative average of each dimension is 500, and the standard deviation is 100. Therefore, a score of 400 is one standard deviation from the normative of score of 500.
The Overall Health Index was calculated by adding the standardized score for each dimension and dividing by seven. The Overall Health Index, like the standardized scores for each OHI-S dimension, is based on a normative scale where 500 is the statistical mean. Table 21 represents the Overall Health Index scores from this study.

Table 21

*Overall Health Index Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall Health Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup 1 – Tends to support the union</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup 2 - Tends to not support the union</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 21, subgroup 1 (tends to support the union) had a higher Overall Health Index than did subgroup 2 (tends to not support the union). Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (2009) have a standard interpretation of these scores and as far as the distribution, both subgroups in these data fall in the Below Average range.

Qualitative Analysis

Interviews conducted at the school proved to be an ideal way to explain phenomena that couldn’t be explained with data gathered through the survey instrument. The mixed method approach known as “sequential explanatory strategy” utilizes interviews conducted after administration of the survey instrument (Creswell, 2003). The decision to conduct interviews at the school was necessary to substantiate the data obtained from the OHI-S (Hoy et al., 1991). Analysis of the qualitative data produced observations in several categories that help describe the context.
New principal.

The new principal had been on the job for a little more than a week at the time of the administration of the survey. The new principal came from a different district and as a result, nobody knew much about him. There seemed to be some level of concern among teachers, as they felt the previous principal was not pushing academic achievement or enforcing discipline. These teachers seemed concerned that the practices of the last principal might have carried over into the new school year.

Failure of the operating levy.

The voters in the district had recently voted down an increase in property taxes for schools, as they had in the past several elections. As a result, more cuts to programs were made. Administration made it clear that there was no money for new text books and that some programs might have to be completely eliminated. It was also indicated that there wasn’t enough surplus to afford a pay raise for teachers. Respondent 4 indicated that “the school is a product of the community.” As a result, the community appeared to have shown their disdain for the teachers at the ballot.

Recent negotiated agreement.

The collective bargaining team agreed to a 1% raise just two days prior to the administration of the survey. Most teachers were upset that the district, which had not seen a raise in a long time, could not afford an appropriate cost of living raise to their salary. This was even more troublesome as the staff had thought they were going to get a raise the previous year. The administration informed the local association that there just wasn’t enough money to pay for a raise. In doubt of this, the local association called the
Ohio Education Association in to check the finances of the school. The Ohio Education Association affirmed what the school district had already declared: there wasn’t enough money in the operating budget to afford a raise. Respondent 3 suggested that the recent negotiated agreement was “a fair contract” while respondent 8 commented that the raise “could have happened last year.”

Recent removal of a tenured teacher.

One tenured teacher was removed due to No Child Left Behind provisions. Respondent 1 commented that “unfortunately for that teacher, federal law supersedes the union contract.” Although the local association tried to intervene on behalf of the teacher, federal law was upheld. Respondent 7 suggested that the teachers seemed to develop a sense of mistrust of the administration as a result of the removal of the teacher. Respondent 3 strengthened this idea by saying that “corrective action has made it hard to convince a staff that the administration is trying to build a team.” Respondent 8 did suggest however, “the union has been a good safety net” and that teachers have “nothing to worry about if they just do their job.”

State report card score drop

Although the school had maintained its level of academic achievement, it did not meet adequate yearly progress because the district had remained at the same academic index for three straight years. When this occurs, the Ohio Department of Education lowers the rating of the school report card for the district by one level.
Administrators had lengthy careers as classroom teachers in the district

Interviews suggested the administrators understood how their teachers operated and what their needs were. Because the administrators had been teachers in the same district, they appeared to have a firm grasp of the challenges the teachers faced and also the tacit knowledge of which teachers were not performing to expectation. Respondent 4 added that “some contract language can be manipulated to protect teachers that don’t need protection.” For the most part, the administration believed that teachers need protection. As the respondent 5 commented, “as long as there is human nature, you will treat someone badly. That is why we have a teacher union.”

Some administrators were quite active in the local union as teachers

When those teachers went into administration, they began to look at administrative policies through teachers’ eyes. As a result, it was suggested by respondent 6 that “because our administrators were once teachers in this district, our administrators listen to teachers more than they would otherwise.” Respondent 7 commented that “input is more than just listening—administrators need to be able to follow through with concerns of the staff.” It was suggested by respondent 6 that “without a union, there would be little input.” Through the course of interviews, it became apparent that the administration seemed to support the advocacy of teacher issues.
**Uneasiness of staff to make changes**

There tended to be resistance to change from 11th and 12th grade teachers, as respondent 2 suggested, “the focus of the Ohio Achievement Test appeared to be on 9th and 10th grades.” The 11th and 12th grade teachers saw the changes as superficial to their grade and subject. As a result, respondent 2 commented that “necessary changes were being questioned when they hadn’t been in the past.”

**Local education union had a history of pushing for more**

The district prides itself on its collective bargaining accomplishments. Respondent 5 furthered this by saying that “things like a master contract were only a dream to some teachers when they started teaching.” Respondent 5 additionally commented that, “many teachers within the union have pushed for smaller class sizes in the past, but the issue hasn’t been brought up in some time.” Respondent 4 supported this by saying that the local association “could really do things to help students” but commented that the current union “tends to push for less responsibility and less accountability.” Respondent 6 also added to this by suggesting that “some teachers just want to be shown what to do.”

**Communication issues**

Respondent 3 commented that teachers often complain that only the faculty council, a forum advocated by the union, has had communication with the superintendent. Respondent 5 offered a diffusing solution to this teacher concern when she said, “We are like any other district—input comes as a result of your leadership as a
teacher.” Respondent 4 suggested that “the current bureaucracy has made it difficult to have open communication.”

*Mistrust of union leadership*

Respondent 4 indicated that the local education union doesn’t have representatives who are representing the interests of those teachers at the high school. Respondent 4 also commented that some of the local union leadership became active perhaps as a result of a personal agenda. Respondent 8 suggested that there were trust issues between union leaders and teachers as well as between union leaders and the administration. Respondent 5 balanced this idea by suggesting that “union leaders are generally good teachers.”

*Teachers could do more.*

Respondent 4 suggested that some teachers no longer care about their results and have taken the attitude of “just give me what I need to do in order to get the job done” or “that’s not my job.” Respondent 3 commented that “the administration has used a subtle but firm hand in order to get the teachers going in the same direction as the ship.” Respondent 3 admitted to getting frustrated sometimes by hearing teachers ask to be treated and paid “like professionals” when the same “professionals” leave five minutes after the school bell rings.

*Conclusion*

The data obtained through the interviews supported the findings of the survey instrument. There seemed to be a difference in climate perception in this school between teachers who supported the local education union and teachers who did not support the
local education union. Although five dimensions of the *OHI-S* loaded in the exploratory factor analysis, two dimensions did not. In order to help explain this loading failure, qualitative data were analyzed, and as a result, common themes emerged and possible reasons were theorized.

The dimension of Initiating Structure could not be tested, as it did not load in the exploratory factor analysis. In order to answer Research Question 6, it was necessary to look at qualitative data. The emerging themes from the interviews, coupled with inspection of the research instrument, indicated a two-fold problem. First, the principal was new to the job and had been working with the school for one week. Secondly, all of the questions relative to Research Question 6, Initiating Structure, concerned teacher perceptions of the abilities of the principal. Because the principal was new to the school, many respondents could not give an opinion on his abilities and gave no response for many questions in this dimension.

The dimension of Academic Achievement also could not be tested, as it did not load in the exploratory factor analysis. In order to answer Research Question 1, it was necessary to look at qualitative data. Interviews and data collected at the site gave some possible reasons for this. First, the school report card, reported by the Ohio Department of Education, had just lowered one rating. Secondly, the voters of the district defeated a recent school operating levy. Lastly, school budget reductions gave many teachers the feeling that improving academic achievement would be a nearly impossible task.
Summary

The OHI-S (Hoy et al., 1991) was used as the survey instrument for the research. The survey was administered to the teaching staff during a professional development session. Ten added questions were used in the instrument to obtain demographical information. The exploratory factor analysis conducted on the OHI-S rendered a loading of five of the instrument’s scales: Institutional Integrity, Consideration, Principal Influence, Resource Support, and Morale. Two dimensions, Academic Emphasis and Initiating Structure failed to load. Paired samples t tests were conducted on the subgroups, teachers who did and did not support the union. Hypotheses were created and tested from the five dimensions that loaded and for the Overall Health Index.

This chapter also utilized qualitative data obtained through interviews. Themes emerged and were used to suggest reasons why two dimensions of the research instrument failed to load. The societal, educational, and political implications of these data are discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

Introduction

The notion that unions are an impediment to school improvement has been the cornerstone of much of the management literature for the last forty years (Ballou, 1999; Gryski, 1980; Haar, 1996; Lieberman, 2002; Moe, 2005). Despite all of the theory behind these allegations, there are few empirical data to support these claims (Eberts, 2007), primarily because unions have not been isolated in the analysis.

It seems that the primary concern of management is a perceived loss of power. Organizational researchers (Sergiovanni et al., 1987) indicate that unions add to the bureaucratic web of decision making, thereby reducing the effectiveness of administrators by hampering the daily schedule, limiting after school responsibilities, and by impeding the administrator’s role in removing poorly performing teachers.

These are legitimate administrative concerns. If one were to look at the same administrative concerns from the perspective of the teacher, then the crux of the ongoing impasse comes into focus. Why does this perception of teachers matter? Because the greatest two predictors of academic achievement are quality of teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Heck, 2007) and size of classroom (Carini, 2002; Finn & Achilles, 1999; Molnar & Achilles, 2000; Smith et al., 2003).

Although union researchers indicate that union efforts play a role in these dimensions (Carini, 2002) management will quickly counter these data by showing that these two factors are the most expensive endeavors in improving academic achievement. Important research has shown that other less expensive initiatives, such as improving the school climate may obtain similar desired academic achievement results (Brookover et
al., 1978; Edmonds, 1979; Hoy, 1990). Researchers have shown that unions play a role in improved academic achievement (Carini, 2002) but as yet, no significant research in the field of education unions has included the impact of support of the union on the school climate.

Statement of the Problem

Although there are countless articles written by prominent leadership researchers concerning the negative effect of unions on education, very little of the literature isolates unionism in the analysis (Eberts, 2007). Perhaps unions affect schools in unseen ways. This may partially explain the reason why management researchers have such a difficult time quantifying their beliefs that unions affect school productivity.

In this study a widely-used school climate instrument was used to measure the differences in perception of school climate between union and nonunion teachers. The challenge with this research approach was that teachers in unionized schools are beholden to “fair share” provisions. In this district, the “fair share” members are defined as “fee payers,” meaning that the teachers pay the exact fee that union members pay but the money from that fee does not get forwarded to their local association. Teachers must choose to either be union members or “fee payers.” The reason for this is because all teachers under the collective bargaining agreement would profit from the salary and benefits for which the local association lobbied and paid.

It was surmised that an adequate N for nonunion teachers would not be achieved if the research simply compared the two groups, union versus nonunion. If however, teachers could be categorized as supportive or unsupportive of the local teacher union through added questions on the research instrument, then an analysis of the differences of
dimensions in climate perception may go a long way toward explaining the ways in which the local teacher union affects teachers and the schools in which they teach. The review of the literature suggested that if this study were to be conducted in one school, then that school should be a public school with a local union. Additionally, that school should not be at the high end or low end of the academic index and should have a large enough staff to produce a large sample.

Relationship to Current Research

To date, sufficient research in the area of education unions and climate does not exist. There are abundant data in the business sector regarding climate and unions. It comes as no surprise then that the majority of education leadership research utilizes data gathered from the business sector. This practice is not done in order to skew the data or because of some pre-conceived disposition to unions. It is done mostly out of convenience. Additionally, if leadership were to conduct the same study in schools, union leaders might become defensive, entrench, and oppose such a study—the results of which might have unknown repercussions.

This is a good reason for having an outsider conduct this study. Prior to the data collection, permission was sought from the superintendent. Prominent figures in the school administration, union leadership, and teaching faculty were contacted and informed of the research. All who participated in the research were informed that their participation was voluntary. In order to ease concerns of the school, the school was informed that all data gathered would later be collectively shared. In order to gain support from the district, the possibility of adding questions to the instrument was offered. The school district took this offer and added the last question to the instrument, question 53.
This support from the school was critical to the current research in the field for a couple reasons. First, the school had just settled a hotly contested negotiated agreement, the results of which left many teachers unsatisfied. Furthermore, the administration didn’t want to be seen as “union busting” due to the content of some of the questions. The data that were obtained due to the administration’s willingness to have this survey conducted were important, as up to that point no data concerning education unions and school climate existed.

The teaching staff would prove more of a challenge to garner their support. This was evident because several teachers did not complete the demographical information in the survey. A close inspection of the raw data concluded that teachers from various departments, ages, and ethnicities were unwilling to share demographical information. Even though a prepared script was read by the administrator of the survey and informed the participants that the individual data would not be shared with the district, there seemed to be some mistrust among staff. A point of support for this perception of mistrust is that during the administration of the survey, one of the respondents was heard saying to a colleague “Yeah. Age, department, and ethnicity. They could figure out exactly who I am.”

Upon reflection, if the administration or an organization came in to do the same study, this researcher is not certain that the same teachers would be as willing to be as open in their responses. Because of the recent contract negotiations and political element beleaguering the school, an outsider with no specific agenda and no affiliation to any teacher, administrator, or the union was the best choice for this study.
Perhaps other researchers have attempted to find the link between union support and school climate and faced similar but more challenging trust obstacles. Administrators who want to conduct this research are going to be seen as “union busters” and union leaders who want to conduct this research are going to be seen as a “special interest” and as anti-progress. The fact that there is little research in this area gives credibility to both of these possibilities.

Although it is easy for leadership to utilize business sector data to solidify managerial beliefs, it is faulty to do so. Today’s teachers are more prepared, educated, and developed than ever. State and federal laws continue to push teachers to be the best professional possible and instill the importance of lifelong learning. The NCLB act, as it was pointed out in an interview at the school, supersedes contract law, as one continually underperforming teacher was removed from teaching. Few will argue that the same education, experience, or commitment to a continuing education is contractually and legally bound to union workers in other professions. Why then should researchers use the same data from sectors other than education? If improved school climate helps elevate academic achievement and the two greatest predictors of academic achievement are quality of teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Heck, 2007) and size of classroom (Carini, 2002; Finn & Achilles, 1999; Molnar & Achilles, 2000; Smith et al., 2003), then the opinions of teachers should be the driving force behind school climate research, not the opinions of an out-of-state factory employee who works third shift.
Methodology Considerations

This study was conducted at one large high school and as a result, limited generalizations can be made about the results of the study to other schools. Additionally, this study involved a teacher union affiliated with the NEA. Although these points can be conceded, the methodology of this study has brought some key points into focus.

The study is credible. A well-established instrument was used for the collection of the quantitative data. The test was administered to a large and mostly present (90.3% of teachers were in attendance) teaching staff at the beginning of a required professional development session. Additionally, an outsider administered the survey, resulting in a high return rate of volunteer participation in the survey (91% return rate).

Because the study was limited to one high school, a great many variables were accounted for in the research design. Furthermore, the mixed method design allowed perspective into possible reasons for dimension perceptions and data extraction challenges. On-site interviews solidified possible reasons for the loading failure of two dimensions of the instrument.

Discussion of the Results

In the factor analysis, Academic Achievement and Initiating Structure, two dimensions on the OHI-S, did not load. Case interviews conducted on the day of the administration of the OHI-S offer insight as to reasons why this widely used instrument did not load on these two dimensions.

Two days prior to the administration of the survey, a hotly debated negotiated agreement, which included a 1% pay increase for teachers, was agreed to by the local teacher union. This pay increase was under dispute as teachers felt they had endured too
long in their position without a pay raise. The leadership of the district was faced with state budget cuts and a recently failed operating levy, all while trying to negotiate a contract for the local teacher union. Teachers who expected a pay raise were told that the district, because of recent developments, could not afford a teacher pay raise. Union representatives from the local school district contacted the Ohio Education Association (the state governing body of the local teacher union) in order to look at the school finances and determine whether or not the school district was making good on their claims that they could not afford a pay raise. The analysis by the Ohio Education Association indicated the school district was being truthful to their employees and that the school district could not afford a raise. Earlier in the week, the school district also learned that its Ohio School Report Card designation had dropped one rating from a level of Effective to a level of Continuous Improvement. This only added heat to the political dimension that the administration faced. As an employee commented “how can you expect the voters to give you their tax money if the school report card goes down in score?”

The results of the tests conducted on the five dimensions of organizational health which loaded, indicate that there was a significant difference in perception in each dimension of organizational health between teachers who support the union and teachers who do not support the union. Additional insight was given to the two dimensions of organizational health which failed to load. The results of the testing of each dimension are discussed below.
Academic Achievement did not load in the exploratory factor analysis. Since a hypothesis could not be developed or tested because of the loading failure of this dimension, qualitative data are necessary to help infer reasons for this occurrence. It is reasonable to infer that a combination of the school’s lowered School Card rating, a rejected operating levy, and budget cuts to academic materials helped lead to this phenomenon.

Consideration, subgroup 1 (teachers who tend to not support the union) had a more positive perception of Consideration than subgroup 1 (teachers who tend to support the union), p = .003. The questions from this dimension concerned teacher input and communication and sorted into two categories; whether the principal was perceived as nice and whether the principal was perceived as getting the job done. Teachers who did not support the union had more positive perceptions of the questions regarding the friendliness of the principal than teachers who supported the union. Teachers who support the union had more positive perceptions of the questions regarding the abilities of the principal than teachers who did not support the union. The qualitative data from the interviews supported this possibility.

Morale, subgroup 1 (teachers who tend to support the union) had a more positive perception of Morale than subgroup 2 (teachers who tend to not support the union), p = .016. The questions from this dimension concerned teachers’ perception of morale, efficacy, and work satisfaction. The union teachers had a more positive perception of Morale than teachers that did not support the union. This finding stands in stark contrast to the literature which suggested that a unionized workforce has a more negative view of Morale (Berger et al., 1983; Lincoln & Boothe, 1993; Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995). While
most of the answers for the questions are similar between the two groups, question 27, “Teachers exhibit friendliness to each other,” and question 34, “Teachers in this school are cool and aloof to each other” are quite different. The responses from these questions have suggested an alternative interpretation: there may have been an in-group and an out-group in the school.

*Institutional Integrity*, subgroup 2 (teachers who tend to not support the union) and subgroup 1 (teachers who tend to support the union) had nearly equal perceptions of Institutional Integrity, \( p = .004 \). The biggest group difference in the responses to the questions was in question 15, “Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program,” which received more agreement from those teachers who did not support the union than those teachers who did support the union. The questions in this dimension concerned teachers’ perception of the community and how the community affects the school. Since the recent voter rejection of the school operating levy, one would expect that all teachers, regardless of level of union support, would have a diminished perception of Institutional Integrity. Because the operating levy and contract negotiations occurred during the same time period, it is possible that sides had been drawn during negotiations: those that supported measures to get a pay increase (those that supported union initiatives like work stoppages) and those that were content with the current salary schedule (those who would likely not have supported the union and issues like work stoppages). If this was the case, then subgroup 2 (those that tend to not support the union), would be more inclined to take an oppositional view of the union, or in this case, support the view of the community who had recently turned down the school operating levy. The qualitative data from the interviews support this possibility.
**Resource Support**, subgroup 1 (teachers who tend to support the union) had a more positive perception of Resource Support than subgroup 2 (teachers who tend to not support the union), $p = .001$. The questions from this dimension concerned teachers’ perception of the classroom materials. Since the faculty was informed that there would be no money for new textbooks and supplies, one would expect that both teachers would have had diminished views of Resource Support. The review of literature indicates that Resource Support is a regular item for union advocacy. Because of this, one would expect that if teachers have received that for which they have worked and advocated, then the same teachers would be satisfied. The qualitative data from the interviews support this possibility.

**Initiating Structure** did not load in the exploratory factor analysis. Because a hypothesis could not be developed or tested because of the loading failure of this dimension, qualitative data are necessary to help infer reasons for this occurrence. The questions from this dimension concern teachers’ perception of the abilities of the principal. A look at the raw data shows that many teachers did not respond to the questions of this dimension. There is a very good reason for this; the new principal had only been on the job for one week and many teachers could not comment on his abilities. One teacher at the top of the survey strengthened this possibility by writing at the top of the survey “new principal, can’t answer these questions” and indicated the corresponding questions with an asterisk. It is also reasonable to assume that some teachers based their responses on the last principal or the assistant principal, the results of which would skew the data even if the dimension did load.
Principal influence, subgroup 2 (teachers who tend to not support the union) had a more positive perception of Principal Influence than subgroup 1 (teachers who tend to support the union), p = .014. The questions from this dimension concerned teachers’ perception of administrative abilities. Teachers in the school had recently been told that there would be no new money for textbooks and school supplies. These financial decisions generally come from the Superintendent and Board of Education, who prior to contract negotiations had informed the teaching staff that there wasn’t enough money in the school budget for a pay raise. With this knowledge, teachers who favored a raise (those teachers who tend to support the union) would likely oppose Board initiatives and because the administration seemed to believe that the new contract was “fair” might also believe that the building principal has little impact in affecting the Superintendent or Board decisions. The qualitative data from the interviews supported this possibility.

Overall Health Index, subgroup 1 (teachers who tend to support the union) had a more positive perception of the Overall Health of the school. Teachers who supported the union had an Overall Health Index of 480 and teachers who did not support the union had an Overall Health Index of 461. The qualitative data from the interviews supported this possibility.

Unionization has generally been viewed as having a negative impact on schools. Although there has been little research regarding education unions and school climate, leading management researchers have blasted unions for four decades without relevant data to support their claims. Most people who read this research have not challenged the findings; they have been neither proactive nor reactive. In many ways, the same level of union membership apathy was seen at the school district where this research was
conducted. It was claimed by one respondent at this high school that “teachers are not involved in the union like they should be, but when the teachers want something they are the first to complain.”

Although the bulk of management literature would have the reader believe that unions have been the cause of school failings, nevertheless, this research has shown otherwise. Union support was shown to be a predictor of higher perceptions of school climate in four of the five OHI-S (Hoy, et al., 1991) dimensions than those teachers who did not support the union. Additionally, teachers who supported the union had a higher Overall Health Index than teachers that did not support the union.

Implications of the Research

This is but one small study. This climate study gave a cross-sectional view for the organizational health of this particular school on this particular day. It is important to mention the political and community developments which staged the events and shaped the perceptions of educators in the district.

There are implications of this study for various segments of education. For school leaders, the possibility that union-supporting teachers tend to view the morale of the school more favorably than those that oppose education unions is startling. These data are completely contradictory to nearly all business sector data regarding organizational climate and morale (Collins et al., 1993; Vander Putten et al., 1997). Because of this study, administrators can begin to regard union-supporting teachers as helpers in improving the overall perception of morale and resource support. Administration doesn’t have to view unions or union supporters as determined adversaries, but rather as team players working to elevate the school through improved worker attitudes. If
administrators have been practicing those policies which the current leadership and
unions researchers promote, then management has been taking an unfounded and
counterproductive approach with unions in improving the school’s climate.

Teachers can learn from this research that advocacy and synergistic approaches
work. If teachers are the driving force behind academic achievement, then teacher
opinions matter. During the interviews conducted at the research site, it was suggested by
respondent 5 that today’s teachers take for granted the advocacy that helped define the
current professional. The summation of this study has given but a brief insight into this
line of thinking. While teachers may continue to ask for more and more of administration,
it would beneficial for teachers to learn from those teacher advocates who came before
them.

Union leaders must concede that the building principal is effectively the one
charged with running the school. Although the perceptions of teachers are important to
the elevation of school climate, this does not take away from the responsibility of the
principal in improving the school. Administrators, as the sole decision maker for most
schools, know full-well the importance and necessity of accountability. Although the area
of principal influence is not a dimension for which unions lobby, given the recent
political atmosphere in this school, union leaders might find it advantageous to support
those administrators which make it possible to succeed in their profession.

Additionally, union leaders might learn from one of the dimensions which fared
higher for those teachers that did not support the union—consideration. Although the
results on the survey may have been impacted by the recent levy failure and the meetings
leading up to and the acceptance by both parties of the negotiated agreement, however,
these results do not remove union leadership’s accountability from this dimension. Previous research has shown that improved input does not predict work satisfaction (Graham et al., 2002).

As a result, union leaders must work toward collectively improving perceptions of consideration. If there is no benefit for the school or administration to back union concerns of improved input, then administration will continue to enact policies based on existing data. In this situation, teachers, regardless of their level of union support, will suffer. It would be most beneficial to local education unions to accept and enact at the local level, new policies and initiatives espoused by their national governing bodies which embrace the educational improvement of the child over personal or ideological interests.

Recommendations for Further Research

While this study was able to measure perceptions of five dimensions of organizational health, two of the factors (Initiating Structure and Academic Emphasis) failed to load in the factor analysis. This lack of data is significant for two reasons: Academic Emphasis is at the center of the union/school improvement debate. Additionally, the perception of the Initiating Structure (perceptions of the abilities of the principal) is important in understanding how union and management work together.

Further research may want to replicate the same study, but conducted with several districts. Purposeful sampling may dictate the need to choose districts that have not had the same recent political turmoil and administrative turnover. It seems apparent that tensions were high between teachers and administration as a result of the recent political events in the district. According to Short and Rinehart (1993), tensions during times of
negotiations are to be expected, but it is how the leadership moves past this that will determine the future of the district. Additionally, purposeful sampling may necessitate finding a school with a principal who has been at the school for at least a few years. Many teachers could not complete answers on the OHI-S because they had limited information about the new principal. A replication study of this instrument might reveal different qualitative data and a complete factor loading for all dimensions of the OHI-S.

Summary

The debate over the power struggle between administration and unions will never cease. Both parties have their perception of what is necessary for school improvement. The quick answer of “the system” (Chubb & Moe, 1990) can be used to justify the elimination of unions and to effectuate the overhaul of the current organization of schools into a complete “top down” system of managerial control. Similar management theorists also suggest that unions limit organizational productivity by infringing upon management’s role in the workplace (Adamowski et al., 2007; Fitzgerald et al., 2003). If the most important element of school improvement is academic achievement, then management’s position that unions decrease academic achievement is unfounded (Eberts, 2007), as unions have been shown to increase academic achievement, and apparently based on conjecture.

Organized labor will continue to claim that the right of the employee to have a democratic voice in the work force should never be questioned in a free society (Hoover, 1997). This voice is an important element in elevating teacher morale, efficacy (Henson, 2001), and the overall school climate (Rafferty, 2003), all while providing a safety net for teachers to grow professionally (Graham et al., 2002).
Schools may choose to help effectuate increased academic achievement through school climate surveys but measuring school climate and enacting policies which help improve it are two different challenges. When schools begin to earnestly look at all dimensions which help shape school climate, putting aside personal ideologies, preconceived notions, and long-standing differences, then the idea of systemic change will become a reality. If however, we continually choose to accept things as they are, without serious inquiry, calling upon and enacting policies from quotes of speakers whose income is derived from the deliberate degradation of our schools, then we have condemned our schools to continually perpetuate the same negative thinking and academic results.
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APPENDIX C:

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
# OHI-S

**DIRECTIONS:** THE FOLLOWING ARE STATEMENTS ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL. PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH STATEMENT CHARACTERIZES YOUR SCHOOL BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>VFO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely Occurs</td>
<td>Sometimes Occurs</td>
<td>Often Occurs</td>
<td>Very Frequently Occurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands. **RO**
2. The principal gets what he or she asks for from superiors. **RO**
3. The principal is friendly and approachable. **RO**
4. The principal asks that faculty members follow standard rules and regulations. **RO**
5. Extra materials are available if requested. **RO**
6. Teachers do favors for each other. **RO**
7. The students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them. **RO**
8. The school is vulnerable to outside pressures. **RO**
9. The principal is able to influence the actions of his or her superiors. **RO**
10. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal. **RO**
11. The principal makes his or her attitudes clear to the school. **RO**
12. Teachers are provided with adequate materials for their classrooms. **RO**
13. Teachers in this school like each other. **RO**
14. The school sets high standards for academic performance. **RO**
15. Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program. **RO**
16. The principal is able to work well with the superintendent. **RO**
17. The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation. **RO**
18. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them. **RO**
19. Teachers receive necessary classroom supplies. **RO**
20. Teachers are indifferent to each other. **RO**
21. Students respect others who get good grades. **RO**
22. Teachers feel pressure from the community. **RO**
23. The principal's recommendations are given serious consideration by his or her superiors. **RO**
24. The principal is willing to make changes. **RO**
25. The principal maintains definite standards of performance. **RO**
26. Supplementary materials are available for classroom use. **RO**
27. Teachers exhibit friendliness to each other. **RO**
28. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades. **RO**
29. Select citizen groups are influential with the board. **RO**
30. The principal is impeded by the superiors. **RO**
31. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of faculty members. **RO**
32. The principal schedules the work to be done. **RO**
33. Teachers have access to needed instructional materials. **RO**
34. Teachers in this school are cool and aloof to each other. **RO**
35. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.

36. The school is open to the whims of the public.

37. The morale of the teachers is high.

38. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.

39. A few vocal parents can change school policy.

40. There is a feeling of trust and confidence among the staff.

41. Students try hard to improve on previous work.

42. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.

43. The learning environment is orderly and serious.

44. Teachers identify with the school.

45. How many years have you worked your current school building?

46. In what department (or subject) do you teach primarily?

47. What is your age?

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS OR STATEMENTS BELOW BY CIRCLING THE MOST APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

48. What grade do you teach primarily?  
   9th  10th  11th  12th

49. Describe your ethnicity.
   African-American   American Indian/Native Alaskan   Asian/Pacific Islander
   Hispanic   Mixed Heritage   Caucasian

50. “Fair share” is a term used to describe the union membership status of a teacher in the local teacher union, when that specific teacher has opted to have a portion, or all of their union dues redirected to a mutually agreed upon alternative cause.

   What is your union membership status?
   A. Traditional membership   B. “Fair Share” membership

51. Members of the local teacher union do not get enough benefits for the amount of money taken from union dues.

   A. Strongly Disagree   B. Somewhat Disagree   C. Somewhat Agree   D. Strongly Agree

52. The local teacher union is a good example of what people can accomplish when they work together.

   A. Strongly Disagree   B. Somewhat Disagree   C. Somewhat Agree   D. Strongly Agree
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APPENDIX E:

COMMUNALITIES PRODUCED FROM QUESTION 51 (BENEFIT PERCEPTION)
Communalities for Subgroup 1 (tends to support the union).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00003</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00004</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00005</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00008</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00009</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00010</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00011</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00012</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00013</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00014</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00015</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00016</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00017</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00018</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00019</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00020</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00021</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00022</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00024</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00025</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00026</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00027</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00028</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Communalities for Subgroup 2 (tends to not support the union).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00003</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00004</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00005</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00008</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00009</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00010</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Code</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00011</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00012</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00013</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00014</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00015</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00016</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00017</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00018</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00019</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00020</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00021</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00022</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00024</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00025</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00026</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00027</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00028</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00029</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00030</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00031</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00032</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00033</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00034</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00035</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00036</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00037</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00038</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00039</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00040</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00041</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00042</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00043</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00044</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
APPENDIX F:

COMMUNALITIES PRODUCED FROM

QUESTION 52 (UNION GOOD)
Communalities for Subgroup 1 (tends to support the union).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00003</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00004</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00005</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00008</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00009</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00010</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00011</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00012</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00013</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00014</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00015</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00016</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00017</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00018</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00019</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00020</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00021</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00022</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00024</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00025</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00026</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00027</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00028</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Communalities for Subgroup 2 (tends to not support the union).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00003</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00004</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00005</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00008</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00009</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00010</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00042</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00043</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00044</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
APPENDIX G:

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR SAMPLE
Subgroup 1 (tends to support the union)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum Statistic</th>
<th>Maximum Statistic</th>
<th>Sum Statistic</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00003</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00004</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>-.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00005</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00006</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>-.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00007</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00008</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>-.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00009</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>-.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>-.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00011</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00012</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00013</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00014</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00015</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00017</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>-.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00018</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>-.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00019</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>-.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00020</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00021</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00022</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00023</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00024</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00025</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00026</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00003</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>-.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00004</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>-.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00005</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subgroup 2 (tends to not support the union)
| VAR00006 | 68 | 2 | 4 | 231 | 3.40 | .082 | .672 | -.674 | .291 |
| VAR00007 | 67 | 1 | 4 | 171 | 2.55 | .086 | .702 | .079 | .293 |
| VAR00008 | 68 | 1 | 4 | 226 | 3.32 | .092 | .762 | -.836 | .291 |
| VAR00009 | 58 | 1 | 4 | 132 | 2.28 | .095 | .720 | .112 | .314 |
| VAR00010 | 61 | 1 | 4 | 154 | 2.52 | .111 | .868 | -.157 | .306 |
| VAR00011 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 194 | 2.94 | .116 | .943 | -.672 | .295 |
| VAR00012 | 67 | 1 | 4 | 152 | 2.27 | .118 | .963 | .270 | .293 |
| VAR00013 | 67 | 2 | 4 | 206 | 3.07 | .080 | .659 | -.079 | .293 |
| VAR00014 | 65 | 1 | 4 | 180 | 2.77 | .090 | .724 | .128 | .297 |
| VAR00015 | 62 | 1 | 4 | 149 | 2.40 | .101 | .799 | .328 | .304 |
| VAR00016 | 44 | 1 | 4 | 121 | 2.75 | .113 | .751 | -.582 | .357 |
| VAR00017 | 54 | 1 | 4 | 138 | 2.56 | .086 | .634 | .244 | .325 |
| VAR00018 | 62 | 1 | 4 | 184 | 2.97 | .097 | .768 | -.619 | .304 |
| VAR00019 | 65 | 1 | 4 | 149 | 2.29 | .122 | .980 | .197 | .297 |
| VAR00020 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 130 | 1.97 | .096 | .784 | .449 | .295 |
| VAR00021 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 153 | 2.32 | .092 | .747 | .084 | .295 |
| VAR00022 | 68 | 1 | 4 | 197 | 2.90 | .113 | .933 | -.359 | .291 |
| VAR00023 | 49 | 2 | 4 | 122 | 2.49 | .078 | .545 | .445 | .340 |
| VAR00024 | 59 | 2 | 4 | 174 | 2.95 | .095 | .729 | .079 | .311 |
| VAR00025 | 63 | 2 | 4 | 185 | 2.94 | .081 | .644 | .057 | .302 |
| VAR00026 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 155 | 2.35 | .111 | .903 | .147 | .295 |
| VAR00027 | 66 | 2 | 4 | 205 | 3.11 | .081 | .659 | -.115 | .295 |
| VAR00028 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 115 | 1.74 | .084 | .686 | .677 | .295 |
| VAR00029 | 59 | 1 | 4 | 156 | 2.64 | .118 | .905 | -.086 | .311 |
| VAR00030 | 52 | 1 | 4 | 121 | 2.33 | .102 | .734 | .324 | .330 |
| VAR00031 | 59 | 2 | 4 | 158 | 2.68 | .085 | .655 | .445 | .311 |
| VAR00032 | 52 | 1 | 4 | 130 | 2.50 | .097 | .700 | .357 | .330 |
| VAR00033 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 159 | 2.41 | .108 | .877 | .216 | .295 |
| VAR00034 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 120 | 1.82 | .101 | .821 | .868 | .295 |
| VAR00035 | 66 | 2 | 4 | 201 | 3.05 | .082 | .666 | -.051 | .295 |
| VAR00036 | 63 | 1 | 4 | 148 | 2.35 | .104 | .826 | .502 | .302 |
| VAR00037 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 157 | 2.38 | .086 | .696 | -.113 | .295 |
| VAR00038 | 67 | 1 | 4 | 167 | 2.49 | .089 | .726 | -.096 | .293 |
| VAR00039 | 61 | 1 | 4 | 148 | 2.43 | .118 | .921 | .224 | .306 |
| VAR00040 | 65 | 1 | 4 | 164 | 2.52 | .091 | .731 | .041 | .297 |
| VAR00041 | 67 | 1 | 4 | 133 | 1.99 | .066 | .536 | .592 | .293 |
| VAR00042 | 66 | 1 | 4 | 174 | 2.64 | .080 | .648 | -.179 | .295 |
| VAR00043 | 65 | 1 | 4 | 167 | 2.57 | .085 | .684 | .196 | .297 |
| VAR00044 | 57 | 1 | 4 | 148 | 2.60 | .096 | .728 | .226 | .316 |

Valid N (listwise) | 35