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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Prior to 1960 few states had any laws dealing with collective bargaining rights of public employees. Then in 1962 President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988, granting bargaining rights to federal employees. This Executive Order triggered a significant change in attitude toward negotiations in the public sector\(^1\) and actually had a more significant impact on state and local governments than on bargaining rights for federal employees.\(^2\)

Since 1962 collective bargaining in education has developed at an incredible rate. Thirty-three states now have collective bargaining laws that affect education\(^3\) and over 60% of America's teachers work under a collective bargaining contract.\(^4\)


In Ohio, more than 90% of the school districts have a formal, written collective bargaining agreement with their teacher association even though there is no collective bargaining legislation. During the 1976-77 school year the average Ohio school district devoted more than 340 hours to preparing and conducting teacher negotiations.\(^5\)

During the past fifteen years teacher unions have expanded their demands at the bargaining table. At first teachers sought to end unilateral control over their salary schedule. Later they demanded higher wages and improved fringe benefits, and collective bargaining rather than "collective begging" became a common teacher-union expression. Quickly, grievance procedures, recognition, organizational rights, impasse resolutions, extra duty pay and specific working conditions were added to their demands.\(^6\)

Gradually, or in some cases quickly, the scope of bargaining expanded. Both the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA) take the position that there is virtually nothing which occurs within the school district that is not subject to bargaining.\(^7\) An AFT statement in 1965 said: "We would place no limit on the scope of negotiations. ... Anything on which the two


\(^7\)"The Role of Collective Bargaining in Public Education," Published by the National PTA, Chicago, 1978, p. 5.
parties can agree should become a part of the agreement."

This unlimited scope philosophy of bargaining could have, and
in some cases already has had, drastic ramifications. Mario Fantini
speaks to this point:

Teachers' organizations are seeking control of the schools
themselves. ... Once teachers' organizations deal with
matters of policy - in such areas as personnel (including
hiring and firing), budget (including where limited funds
are allocated), school organization (how the school is
organized for learning), student personnel (how students
are grouped, which students remain in school) - once these
public responsibilities are relinquished, then an almost
absolute professional monopoly will have been achieved.\(^8\)

Ronald G. Corwin agrees with Fantini and suggests that the movement by
teachers to determine educational policies of common concern can be
boiled down to a question of who controls American education.\(^9\)

Lawrence Pierce also believes the control of American education
is being seriously threatened. He states that collective bargaining
will destroy the public school system as it exists today. He warns
that school boards will become emasculated if the strength of teacher
unions continues to increase. Pierce believes the public must become
directly involved in the bargaining process if collective bargaining
is going to serve the public interest and if the power of teacher unions

---

\(^8\) Mario D. Fantini, *What's Best for the Children: Resolving the
Power Struggle Between Parents and Teachers* (Anchor Press/Doubleday,
1975).

Conflict in High Schools* (New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1970),
p. 48.
is going to be controlled. 10

Five states have already passed legislation mandating some form of public involvement in the collective bargaining process: California, Florida, Idaho, Kansas and Minnesota. Pisapia describes each of these laws in his recent Phi Delta Kappan article: 11

1. California's Rodda Act - (a) requires that initial proposals of both parties be presented at public meetings held by the employer, (b) stipulates that negotiations cannot commence until a reasonable time has elapsed after submission of the proposals to the public, (c) requires that the public have the right to express its opinion at a public board meeting, (d) requires the board to adopt initial proposals at an open meeting and (e) requires the board to make new proposals public within 24 hours and report board votes on them.

2. Florida's Law - (a) provides that all negotiations must occur in public, (b) exempts from public disclosure work products of the employer in preparation for and during negotiations, (c) exempts discussions between the employer and the board concerning collective bargaining from disclosure, (d) allows mediation to be done outside of public scrutiny, and (e) requires that proposals and counter-proposals developed prior to a negotiations session be duplicated for the public and media present at the session.

3. Idaho's Senate Bill 1279 - mandates open records of all bargaining sessions.

4. Kansas' 1977 Bargaining Law - requires that all bargaining sessions be open to the public.

5. Minnesota's Public Employee Bargaining Law - provides that (a) all negotiations occur in public and that (b) all mediations, revisions and hearings be held in public. Meetings of school boards to discuss proposals are open to the public.


In states where public involvement in negotiations is not mandated, citizens have unsuccessFully attempted to use existing sunshine laws to gain access to sessions. The courts have generally found that sunshine laws not specifically referring to negotiations, do not apply to public sector bargaining.

Some citizens want to be involved in the collective bargaining process. The National PTA Association recommends several ways for parents to become involved in the collective bargaining process:

1. Ask that the initial proposals from the teachers for inclusion in the contract and the initial proposals from the board of education be presented in a public meeting, with advance notice of the meeting.

2. If you wish, seek to be an active participant at the bargaining table. Although your request is not likely to be granted... insist that the PTA be given an opportunity to state your unit's position on topics to be considered for negotiations.

3. Ask that your school board make known all tentative agreements for the collective bargaining agreement at least two weeks prior to any vote by the board for final adoption.

4. Speak as advocates for children.... The PTA should take positions on issues related to class size, planning time, length of the school day and year, evaluation procedures, and parent-teacher conferences.

Boards of Education and professional negotiators are beginning to realize that collective bargaining in the public sector is not the same as collective bargaining in the private sector. Myron Lieberman recently stated:

---

Today there is no excuse for debating whether or how collective bargaining in education differs from collective bargaining in the private sector. The differences are real and important, and they justify this conclusion: Providing public employees collective bargaining rights similar to those provided private sector employees is undesirable public policy.\(^{13}\)

Tom Shannon agrees with Lieberman and states that once boards of education realize the public-private sector differences, and once they accept the idea that collective negotiations are part of the governmental decision-making machine, then the question is not whether or not the public should be involved, but what form should citizen participation in collective negotiations take.\(^{14}\)

Other questions might be: What are the attitudes of board presidents, superintendents, teacher association presidents and PTA leaders toward community involvement in collective bargaining? Would they support legislation mandating some form of community involvement in collective bargaining? Would the attitudes of school leaders of small districts differ from the attitudes of school leaders of large districts? Would the attitudes of school leaders of school districts which have used an outside negotiator at the teacher bargaining table differ from the attitudes of school leaders of school districts which have not used an outside negotiator? Would the attitudes of school leaders of school districts which have experienced a teacher strike differ from the attitudes of school leaders of school districts which have not experienced a teacher strike?


Statement of the Problem

The following questions were studied in this research project:

1. What are the attitudes of Ohio school leaders (superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and parent-teacher association leaders) toward community involvement in teacher negotiations?

2. How do the attitudes of superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders differ?

3. How do the attitudes of superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders differ toward community involvement in teacher negotiations when three variables are considered: (1) student enrollment, (2) use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table, and (3) occurrence of a teacher strike?

4. What are the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward the scope of teacher negotiations?

5. Would Ohio school leaders support collective bargaining legislation for public employees?

6. Would Ohio school leaders support legislation mandating community involvement in teacher negotiations?

7. Which Ohio school districts have opened their teacher negotiations to the public?

Purpose of the Study

This study had the following purposes:

1. to compare and analyze the differences in the attitudes of Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations,

2. to identify, describe, and analyze how the attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations differ when three variables are considered: (1) student enrollment, (2) use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table, and (3) occurrence of a teacher strike,
3. to identify the attitudes of each of four groups of Ohio school leaders toward the enactment of collective bargaining legislation for Ohio public employees,

4. to identify the attitudes of each of four groups of Ohio school leaders toward legislation mandating community involvement in teacher negotiations,

5. to identify the attitudes of each of four groups of Ohio school leaders toward the scope of teacher negotiations, and

6. to provide baseline data for future studies on the attitudes of each of four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

Significance of the Study

In November, 1977, the Ohio legislature passed a collective bargaining bill (S.B. 222) for public employees, but the bill was vetoed by the governor. It provided for binding arbitration, permitted employee strikes under certain conditions, permitted agency shops, and provided a broad scope for bargaining. It did not provide for community involvement in the bargaining process.

This year the Ohio legislature will again be considering a collective bargaining bill for public employees. In the past the legislature has considered community involvement amendments to their collective bargaining bills, but they never had the results of a statewide study on the subject. This dissertation will provide data on the attitudes of school leaders throughout the state toward community involvement in the teacher negotiations process.

A Florida study on the attitudes of their school leaders and negotiators toward community involvement in teacher negotiations was conducted one year after the implementation of their "sunshine"
collective bargaining law.\textsuperscript{15} A doctoral dissertation was written on community involvement in teacher negotiations one year after the implementation of California's Public Notice Law.\textsuperscript{16} This dissertation will provide baseline data on the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations before implementation of any collective bargaining legislation.

If and when Ohio does implement collective bargaining legislation, then this dissertation could provide baseline data for a future study of the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations before and after the implementation of collective bargaining legislation.

Many journal articles have been written on community involvement in teacher negotiations, but very few studies have been done. This study will provide some basic research data on the attitudes of Ohio school leaders and how these attitudes differ when selected variables are considered: (1) student enrollment, (2) use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table, and (3) the occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district.


Independent Variables

The educational literature and the researcher's past experiences have lead the researcher to suspect that the attitudes of superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders may differ toward community involvement in teacher negotiations when each of three variables is considered. These variables are:

1. student enrollment or the size of the school district,
2. use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table, and
3. occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district.

1. Student Enrollment or Size

The attitudes of school leaders could differ toward community involvement in teacher negotiations when the size of the school district is considered because the political forces in small school districts are different from the political forces in large school districts.

Summers and many others believe that collective bargaining in public employment is shaped by political forces:

Private employment collective bargaining is a process of decision-making shaped primarily by market forces, while in public employment it is a process of governmental decision making shaped ultimately by political forces. The introduction of collective bargaining in the private sector restructures the labor market, while in the public sector it also restructures the political processes.17

The political forces in small school districts are often different from political forces in large school districts because of some basic differences in people-people relationships and people-organization relationships. For example, from the researcher's experience, when comparing smaller districts with larger districts, he has found:

1. In small districts the teachers, staff, or their spouses are more often leaders of the community and have a more significant effect on community attitudes.

2. In small districts there appears to be a closer personal and emotional tie between the teaching staff, the superintendent, and the school board.

3. In small districts there is little or no line-staff bureaucracy, so there is greater access to persons of authority.

4. In small districts the community tends to have a greater feeling of ownership toward the schools.

5. In large districts power appears to be centralized and there is more diversity of interests.

6. In large districts there tends to be greater distrust of local government.

7. In large districts racial, social, and economic differences lead to conflict.

8. In large districts the private sector labor movement appears to have a greater influence on the political process.

The attitudes of school leaders toward collective bargaining could differ significantly when the size of a school district is considered.

Lohr has concluded:

Size of school district and negotiations history of the district have a direct relationship relative to the perceptions and attitudes of the superintendents and teacher representatives toward bargaining strategies and the conduct of negotiations.

---

Mikrut has concluded:

The following demographic variables are significant in determining teacher attitude toward collective negotiations:
size of community, present type of employee/employer relationship in the school, sex, age, type of class taught, religion, ethic group affiliation, number of dependents, highest degree held, number of years taught and type of district.19

Oliver has concluded:

The expressed opinions of school board presidents concerning the role of the school board member in professional negotiations are positively related to (a) size of school district, (b) legal classification of district, and (c) degree of involvement in negotiations.20

Some authors of educational articles believe that the size of the school district or the decline in the size of a school district could have an affect on the attitudes of school leaders toward collective bargaining. Evans has stated:

As enrollments decline and costs climb, parent and citizen scrutiny of and participation in the schools is increasing. The calls from the public for open negotiations are more frequent. ... The issues of the role of the public in the bargaining process is far from settled. 21

Krinsky has stated:

Most open bargaining in Wisconsin takes place in rural areas or small cities with minimal press coverage.


Experience with open bargaining in urban areas has tended to be negative from the perspective of union and labor spokesmen alike.

From the researcher's experiences and from a study of the literature it appears that the attitudes of school leaders could differ toward community involvement in collective bargaining when the size of the school district is considered. So, student enrollment or the size of the school district will be one of the independent variables.

2. Use of an Outside Negotiator

The use of an outside negotiator for teacher negotiations has increased rapidly during the past few years. A recent Ohio School Boards Association Research Report states:

A noticeable shift has occurred during the past two years regarding the chief negotiator for school districts. During the 1974-75 school year only 8.6% of the school districts employed an outside negotiator. During the 1976-77 school year, outside negotiators were used by 19.4% of the districts - double the number from just two years ago. ... It would appear that this trend towards employing outside negotiators would continue as the negotiations process becomes more time consuming and complex within each district.

Evans supports this report and states in his *Trends in Collective Bargaining in Public Education*:

The fact that nearly one-half of the districts have utilized outside negotiators and consultants, and more may do so in the future, serves to underscore the utmost importance of having a skilled, competent, experienced

---


negotiator representing the board's and public's interests. Since up to one-half of the school districts now employ an outside negotiator or "expert" during teacher negotiations, then the question must be asked: "What effect does this outside third force have on the negotiations process and on the attitudes of the participants?"

Several research studies have touched on this question. Capriotti states:

The use of a state education association representative or a union representative as an advisor at the negotiating table to the teacher negotiating team has some impact in the parties coming to agreement prior to impasse.

Lyden had concluded the following:

With an outside negotiator, there are fewer personal and emotional issues discussed and negotiations move more rapidly to the key issues. The majority of the study participants in each category reported the overall effect of the outside negotiator is positive.

Eastman supports Lyden's results:

The overall effect of using an outside negotiator was reported as predominately positive by all three groups.


surveyed (superintendents, school board presidents and chief negotiators).

Evans is concerned with both the secretiveness of negotiations and the use of outside negotiators:

Secretiveness of the negotiations process and the use of outside negotiators have been the sources of difficulties procedurally. Outside negotiators have not had as comprehensive an awareness of the schools and have sometimes been regarded as entering the process with fixed goals. The secretiveness of the negotiations process fosters difficulties in keeping both the public and teachers apprised, especially when the time arrives for ratification. 28

The researcher has personal experience with the use of an outside negotiator during teacher negotiations. The researcher was superintendent when his Board of Education hired an outside negotiator for six months of difficult teacher negotiations. This negotiator talked regularly with the superintendent and with the Board of Education and certainly had an affect on our attitudes toward teacher negotiations.

It would appear from the educational literature and from the researcher's personal experiences that the attitudes of school leaders may differ toward community involvement in teacher negotiations when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered. So, the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table will be the second independent variable of this study.


3. **Occurrence of a Teacher Strike**

Although strikes by teachers are prohibited by Ohio statute, Ohio school districts continue to experience strikes. The Ohio School Boards Association recently reported:

For 1972-73 school year through November, 1977, Ohio school districts experienced 108 classroom teacher strikes. These strikes affected over 900,000 pupils throughout the state.²⁹

A teacher strike is a traumatic event for any school district, for any teacher association or for any community. Tremendous pressure is applied at every level. From the researcher's experience, during a strike:

1. The board of education pressures the administration to keep the schools open and the teachers apply pressure to close the schools.

2. The community pressures the board and the teachers to end the strike.

3. The newspapers and other media may report the news in emotional terms and polarize the community.

4. Teachers encourage students, relatives, and friends to pressure the board of education and the administration.

5. Administrators urge teachers "to be professional" and not to strike.

6. Teachers are torn between loyalty to their profession, loyalty to their association, loyalty to their peers, and compliance with state law.

7. Parents are frightened for the safety of their children.

8. The community polarizes into three groups: the pro-teacher group, the pro-board of education group, and the unbiased end the strike group.

---

Everyone feels the pressure.

During a teacher strike everything becomes unnatural and the normally calm atmosphere of the school can become very emotional. The following experiences have been reported:

As each replacement teacher's car approached the parking lot exit, deputies used riot sticks to push screaming strikers out of the driveway.

The replacement teachers haven't had an easy time. Nearly all have received intimidating telephone calls. Some callers have asked: "Do you think it's safe to leave your children at home?"  

A strike is the ultimate labor-management confrontation even in school systems. Teachers, like other human beings, acting out of anger, frustration, and emotion often take actions in a strike that they themselves would scorn under other circumstances.

You're essentially a peaceful, loving person. You got yourself elected to your school board or appointed as superintendent because you wanted to do something positive for your community and satisfying for yourself. How will you react when your tires are slashed, when your spouse receives obscene telephone calls, when hate letters threaten your children's safety or even their lives, when your place of business is picketed and your customers harassed? Any and all of these odious occurrences can be - and often are - part and parcel of a teacher strike.


31 Ibid., p. 21.


The normal operation of a school district is rarely the same after a teacher strike. Tension, stress, and hurt remain. People remember, and too often, they remember only the worst. Hoffman states:

"Frequently it is in the aftermath of a strike that serious problems develop because people find it difficult to forget the emotions of the moment. ... Regardless of the settlement circumstances, the period immediately following a strike is difficult for both sides. Retribution is often the most prevalent feeling — at least subconsciously — of board and administration toward employees; and of employees toward board and administration. Emotional scars often permeate the entire organizational structure of the school and the community."

Thealan Associates state:

"As a practical matter everything is not over when the teachers return to the classroom after a strike. In many situations the bitterness lingers on; for years and no district is the same after a strike."

A teacher strike has dramatic and lasting effects on a community and on the people involved. The attitudes of school leaders may differ toward community involvement in teacher negotiations when a teacher strike in the school district is considered. So, the occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district will be the third independent variable.

**Dependent Variables**

Many methods have been proposed for community involvement in teacher negotiations. Some of the most well known proposals have been made by the National PTA, Pisapia, Shannon, and Sarason.

---


The National PTA has proposed the following:  

1. Ask that the initial proposals from the teachers and the initial proposals from the board of education be presented in a public meeting;  
2. Seek to be an active participant at the bargaining table;  
3. Insist that your PTA be given an opportunity to state your unit's position on topics to be considered for negotiations;  
4. Ask that your school board make known all tentative agreements for the collective bargaining agreement at least two weeks prior to any vote by the board for final adoption;  
5. Make sure the final document when ratified by teachers and school board is made available to the public;  
6. Lobby for open negotiation sessions if your state law supports closed negotiations;  
7. Try to limit the areas that are negotiable if the scope of your negotiations is too broad.  

Pisapia has proposed the following: 

1. Develop statewide networks to identify citizen information needs;  
2. Conduct public surveys;  
3. Establish temporary citizen study teams;  
4. Have your school board form advisory groups to sample public opinion, propose issues, and react to board/union positions prior to bargaining;  
5. Make union proposals public to test citizen reactions and provide for a hearing to obtain public comments;  

6. During bargaining make all new subjects public within 24 hours;

7. Have third-party observer during bargaining;

8. Give the public a voice at the bargaining table during discussions;

9. Open all negotiation sessions to the public;

10. Grant citizens the opportunity to review and influence agreements before they are ratified;

11. Have a public interest representative ratify the agreement for the public.

Shannon has proposed the following: 38

1. Publicly file the initial proposals of the employee representatives;

2. Widely disseminate these proposals in their verbatim form;

3. Hold public hearings to give clear opportunity for input from the people;

4. Adopt the school board’s response at a public meeting;

5. During negotiations the community should be given public status reports;

6. After negotiations the public should have the right to comment on the proposed agreement at a public board meeting;

7. Form Citizen Advisory Committees to advise the board on issues.

Sarason has proposed the following: 39

1. Hold open meetings before the formal negotiations begin and at intervals during the process;

---

38 Shannon, "Citizen Participation," pp. 82-84.

2. Conduct inexpensive, small-sample surveys;

3. Establish large citizens' advisory committees to advise the board on what positions to take and what issues to emphasize before and during negotiations;

4. Establish school councils to propose issues and react to board and teacher organization positions, and to serve as a conduit for the ideas and concerns of students, parents and other citizens;

5. Form numerous, temporary citizen study teams to gather data and community opinion, to engage in organized and informal discussions in the community, and to present their findings to the board;

6. Have community or parent representatives participate in teacher negotiations as mediators, helping each party see the other's point of view;

7. Have parent representatives function as self-interested third parties in the bargaining process, with their own demands and the right to approve any final agreement;

8. Establish an ombudsman position with the sole task of participating in all major aspects of policy-making, including the negotiations process. The ombudsman would be mandated to act as protector of the public interest, placing highest priority on the interests of students.

For this study the researcher has combined these four sets of proposals into fifteen community involvement statements. The attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward these fifteen statements will be the dependent variables of this study. The fifteen community involvement statements are as follows:

1. The school board should take the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations.

2. The school board should consider the expressed concerns of the community when it formulates its teacher bargaining priorities.

3. During the period of teacher negotiations the community should be kept informed about all school board deliberations and decisions relating to the negotiation process.
4. The school board should establish a definite process for community input into teacher negotiations before actual negotiations begin.

5. The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues at a public hearing before actual negotiations begin.

6. The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through extensive public opinion surveys.

7. The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through Community Advisory Committees.

8. The initial bargaining proposals of the teacher association and the school board should be available for public review through such means as public meetings or media releases.

9. Any proposal or counterproposal introduced at the bargaining table should be available for public review through such means as public meetings or media releases.

10. A Community Advisory Committee should be allowed to observe teacher negotiations but not participate in them.

11. Community members and the media should be allowed to observe all teacher negotiation sessions.

12. Community representatives should be allowed to participate at the bargaining table, prior to impasse, as mediators of disputes.

13. Community representatives should be allowed to participate at the bargaining table as an independent third party.

14. Community members should have an opportunity to express their views on the final agreement at a public hearing before ratification by the school board.

15. The final agreement of teacher negotiations should be ratified through a public referendum.

**Null Hypotheses**

Nine null hypotheses were tested. They are:

- **H0**: The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of school board presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.
H2. The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

H3. The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

H4. The attitudes of school board presidents are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

H5. The attitudes of school board presidents are not significantly different from the attitudes of PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

H6. The attitudes of PTA leaders are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

H7. The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the size of the school district is considered.

H8. The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

H9. The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the occurrence of a teacher strike is considered.

**Definition of Terms**

The following are definitions of terms which are used often:

1. AFT - The American Federation of Teachers. A teacher union affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

2. Collective Bargaining - The performance of the mutual obligations of the employer and the union to meet at reasonable times, to negotiate in good faith, and to execute a written agreement covering negotiated and agreed to items.

3. Community Involvement - Informing the community about school issues and allowing them to respond to these issues and be a part of the decision making process.
4. Good-faith Bargaining - The obligation of both parties to meet at reasonable times in reasonable places to confer with respect to matters covered in the scope of negotiations. Good-faith bargaining does not require either party to agree to a proposal or to make a concession.

5. NEA - The National Education Association. The NEA is not affiliated with the AFT or the AFL-CIO.

6. Negotiations - Same as collective bargaining.

7. School Leaders - Superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents or PTA leaders.

8. Strike - A concerted cessation or slow down of work by a group of organized employees utilized as a pressure tactic to enforce acceptance of their terms.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations have been identified:

1. School leaders in state institutions, special schools for the handicapped and joint vocational schools were not surveyed.

2. Only Ohio school leaders were surveyed.

2. All PTA leaders in Ohio were not surveyed. Only the Council presidents, members of the Ohio PTA Board of Directors and a random sample of the building unit presidents were surveyed.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

There is a great deal of literature dealing with the various aspects of collective bargaining. However, there is very little literature on community involvement in collective bargaining, even though five states now mandate some form of community involvement during public employee negotiations.

This study will review the history of collective bargaining in both the public and private sectors, then review the history of community involvement in public employee collective bargaining. The study will also examine the initial alliance of teacher unions and parents, the conflicts between the teacher unions and the communities, the initial attempts at community involvement in teacher negotiations, and the present legislative status of community involvement.

Community involvement in teacher negotiations is still in its infancy, but, like a recent taxpayer movement in California, it may be a sleeping giant.
History of Private Sector Negotiations

The Industrial Revolution in England left skilled laborers without the assistance and protection of the guilds. Laws were passed to accelerate industrialization and to protect property and management rights at the expense of the rights of workers. During this period it was believed that low wages would act as a stimulus for steady work and would prevent absenteeism. Employees were required to work ten to fourteen hours a day, six days a week.¹

When workers attempted to organize their leaders would often face imprisonment. In 1799 Parliament declared illegal any association of workers for the purpose of securing higher wages, altering the hours of work, or decreasing the required work demanded by management.²

This bias against workers was transplanted to the American colonies, but American workers started to organize into trade unions even before the American Revolutionary War. The first employee strike occurred in 1778 when printers of the New York Royal Gazette walked off their jobs.³

In 1828 employees established their own political party with the formation of the "Republican Political Association of the City of


²Ibid., p. 3.

Philadelphia." In 1886 the American Federation of Labor was formed and this did much to organize labor groups. By the turn of the century employees were meeting with management to improve salaries and working conditions.

Organized labor's strength did seem to wane in the 1920's, but during the 1930's the depression and the resulting massive unemployment caused increased public sympathy for labor. In 1935 the Wagner National Labor Relations Act was passed by Congress and it provided a legal framework for bargaining:

the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representatives of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiations of any agreement or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party. ... \(^5\)

This Act and the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 prohibited employers from interfering with the rights of workers to join labor unions and to negotiate with management. Labor considered these Acts as their Magna Carta and their membership rose from 3.0 million in 1933 to an estimated membership of over 18 million in 1969. \(^6\) Today, most employees are working under some form of negotiated agreement.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 67.


\(^6\) Nolte, "Status and Scope of Collective Bargaining," p. 3.
History of Public Sector Negotiations

Until the late 1940's public employees had been prohibited by law from bargaining with management, but this does not mean that management enjoyed unilaterial control over decisions affecting the salaries and working conditions of public employees. American public employees have always had some influence over management decisions, but often they have had to resort to extreme measures to be heard.

From early times public employees have used strikes and slowdowns to gain concessions from management. The first public employee strike was in 1816 when employees in a naval shipyard went on strike for a shortened workday and to gain provisions similar to those in private shipyards. Since that time there have been thousands of public employee strikes, with several hundred occurring this past year, both in states with collective bargaining laws and in states without collective bargaining laws.

During the time before the 1940's the federal and state governments strongly resisted public employee bargaining. In 1919 Calvin Coolidge, as Governor of Massachusetts, won wide acclaim by his famous declaration relative to the Boston police strike:

This right of the police of Boston to affiliate (with AFL) has always been questioned, never granted, is now prohibited ... There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anytime, anywhere.

---

Also when the Wagner Act was passed in 1935 it clearly stated that government employees were not covered under its provisions. So in 1937 when government employees attempted to initiate collective bargaining President Roosevelt said:

The process of collective bargaining ... cannot be transplanted into the public service. It has its distinct and unsurmountable limitations when applied to public personnel administration. ... I want to emphasize that militant tactics have no place in the functions of any organization of government employees.

Legitimate collective bargaining with public employees did not occur until former private organizations were taken over by the government in the 1940's. State legislation guaranteed bargaining rights that had been gained in the private sector by mass-transit workers, public utility employees and hospital workers. So the bargaining agreements reached in the private sector were transferred to the public sector nearly intact, except compulsory arbitration was often substituted for the right to strike. However, these occurrences did not seem to spark widespread collective bargaining legislation for public employees. The new laws passed made it clear that these employees were the exception to the rule and that other public employees could not negotiate.

Meaningful legislation for public employee negotiations was first enacted in 1955 in New Hampshire and in 1959 in Alaska. These laws did not require bargaining but they did legally permit negotiations with

---


public employees under certain specified conditions.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1962 Wisconsin was the first state to require local governments to bargain in good faith with their employees. The law also set up the appropriate machinery to enforce the law.\textsuperscript{12} This same year President Kennedy in his Executive Order 10988 granted federal employees limited freedom to organize and negotiate with management. This order formalized the relationships between the federal government and its employees and acted as a catalyst for legislation at the state level.\textsuperscript{12}

In 1969 President Nixon issued his Executive Order 11491 which enlarged the scope of President Kennedy's Order and allowed federal employees not only to bargain collectively, but also called for final settlement of impasse by binding arbitration.\textsuperscript{13}

Due to these events and a great deal of lobbying efforts, 33 states now have collective bargaining laws that affect public employees.\textsuperscript{14} At this time a majority of public employees is working under some sort of master agreement on working conditions.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11}T. M. Stinnett, Jack Kleinmann and Martha Ware, \textit{Professional Negotiations in Public Education}, (New York, Macmillan, 1966).
\item \textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 265.
\item \textsuperscript{14}"State by State Roundup of Collective Bargaining Laws," \textit{Phi Delta Kappan}, Volume 60, Number 6, pp. 472-73.
\end{itemize}
History of Teacher Negotiations

In 1961 the United Federation of Teachers won exclusive bargaining rights in New York City, and that event is now pointed to by many as the beginning of the era of teacher negotiations.15 However, there had been scattered instances of negotiations and militancy between teachers and school boards for the fifty years prior to 1961.16

In 1897 a Chicago Teachers' Union was formed but it did not affiliate with the American Federation of Labor. The first group of teachers to affiliate with the AFL was in 1902 in San Antonio, Texas.17 In 1916 the Chicago Federation of Teachers was formed with the merging of several Chicago teacher unions and one in Gary, Indiana. This group affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Soon thereafter management-employee conflict increased. In 1917 the Chicago Board of Education adopted a resolution prohibiting membership by any of its teachers in the Chicago Federation of Teachers. The Supreme Court of Illinois upheld the board's dismissal of several teachers, declaring that membership "is immical to proper discipline, prejudicial to efficiency of the teacher force, and detrimental to the welfare of the public school system."18 In 1930 a similar case arose in Seattle and had the same results. The courts ruled that the Seattle teachers could not organize.

Even though there were many setbacks, teachers continued to organize in the 1940's and 1950's and continued to use their organized strength. There were over 100 teacher strikes from 1942 through 1959. These strikes involved more than 20,000 teachers.\(^{19}\)

In 1946 the Norwalk, Connecticut teachers struck to achieve bargaining recognition and won. In 1947 the Buffalo, New York teachers struck over wages. The union truck drivers refused to deliver food to the schools and eventually the schools were closed. Soon thereafter the New York legislature passed a law outlawing strikes by public employees.\(^{20}\)

In 1949 Minneapolis teachers struck when they were told they would work four fewer weeks during the school year and take a ten percent salary cut. In 1950 and 1951 the New York City teachers conducted a "selective strike" by refusing to take part in any afterschool extracurricular activities.\(^{21}\)

The first significant change in the attitude of the courts toward teacher unions occurred in 1951 in Connecticut. The Supreme Court held that teachers could lawfully organize as a labor union, could bargain collectively with boards of education concerning pay and working conditions, and could agree to arbitrate those issues that did not erode the board's legal prerogative to have the last word. This case is


\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 114.

\(^{21}\)Ibid., p. 114.
pointed out as the actual beginning of collective negotiations in the public schools. 22

With this beginning the struggle over union representation intensified. Who would represent the teachers? The National Education Association in the 1950's opposed the idea of collective bargaining, while the United Federation of Teachers spoke out strongly for it. The two unions battled with these clearly defined lines until 1961 when the UFT won the exclusive bargaining rights for the New York City teachers. Donley states:

And the New York bargaining election of 1961 would once and for all awaken teacher associations to the fact that militancy was in the cards for the American teacher; if the associations would not move into the future, teacher unions would. 23

The UFT victory in 1961 spurred teacher unions in California, Colorado, Minneapolis, Chicago and Detroit to new efforts and it also made the NEA reassess its position. By 1967 the NEA estimated that 400,000 school personnel were under bargaining contracts in 1,179 districts where teachers were represented by NEA affiliates. By 1971 the NEA and its affiliates were bargaining, union style, for more teachers than was the American Federation of Teachers and its local unions. By 1972 a total of almost 1.5 million instructional personnel throughout the nation were covered by negotiated agreements. 24

What were some of the causes of the rapid increase in teacher negotiations and militancy? Pierce,\textsuperscript{25} Nolte,\textsuperscript{26} Perry, and Wildman\textsuperscript{27} stated the following reasons:

1. Salaries and fringe benefits to teachers were not in line with those in the private sector.

2. Public demonstrations, illegal strikes, and peaceful marches were shown to be effective forces for change.

3. The supply and demand situation for teachers changed with declining enrollments, so teachers looked to negotiated agreements to ensure their employment.

4. The nature of the teacher work force changed with it becoming increasingly more masculine and these males tended to be more committed to union efforts.

5. With increased school district consolidations, the size of school districts increased, effective communication decreased, the teacher's voice in policy formation decreased and the concentration of teachers increased.

6. The competition between the NEA and the AFT increased the militancy of each organization's leadership, as each group attempted to offer more lucrative proposals to potential members.

7. The public disenchantment with public education encouraged teachers to take a defensive reaction and to demand more control over policy formation.

8. The 1962 and the 1969 Executive Orders, new state legislation and the success of negotiations in the private


\textsuperscript{26}Nolte, "Status and Scope of Collective Bargaining," pp. 5-10.

sector encouraged the interest in teacher negotiations, even in the rural areas.

9. The declining power and capability of school boards to deal realistically with the changing urban centers, desegregation of schools, separation of church and state, and student unrest encouraged teachers to demand a more significant voice in decision-making.

What are some of the effects of having collective bargaining in the public sector? Summers says:

The introduction of collective bargaining in the private sector restructures the labor market, while in the public sector it also restructures the political processes ... (It) alters the governmental processes, creating within the process special procedures for making decisions about the wages and working conditions the public will give its employees. 28

Pierce says:

Collective bargaining has definitely shifted some of the control of schools from school boards and school administrators to the teachers. Teachers are not asking only to share in decisions over salaries and fringe benefits. They are asking the right to determine ... important areas of educational policy. This shift in decision-making power to teachers' organizations has further diminished the power of school boards and the public's ability to express its preferences regarding school policy. 29

Fantini says:

This political process inside the schools has seen a gradual shift in power from school administration to teachers, through their professional teacher associations ... (teachers) have slowly but steadily mobilized their ranks to the point where they yield considerable collective influence. 30


29 Pierce, Public Testimony on Public Schools, pp. 134-35.

Collective bargaining has significantly changed the politics of education. Now let's look at how these changes have affected the community and its role in policy decisions.

The History of Community Involvement in Teacher Negotiations

Community involvement is one of the major components of our democratic form of government. We believe in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Schools are an arm of state government, but in the minds of most people, schools are local institutions to be run according to local wishes. We elect our local boards of education or public officials who appoint our board members. These board members are to make decisions that reflect the public will, and if they do not, they are voted out of office.

This form of community involvement worked well in the past when communities were homogeneous, but problems have arisen as communities have grown. Communities have become heterogeneous, and with few exceptions, the poor and minority groups have been under-represented on boards of education. 31 This problem has been made even worse by the lack of control that board of education members actually have over school affairs in large city districts. After studying the New York City school system, Gittel has stated:

As the school system has grown larger and more complex and as policies demand more specialized knowledge, the board has had to withdraw from an effective policy role. The bureaucracy and special interest groups have gained

31 Luvern L. Cunningham and Raphael O. Nystrand, Citizen Participation in School Affairs: A Report to the Urban Coalition, (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1968), p. 4.
power by means of their expertise, while the board, lacking expertise, has lost power.\textsuperscript{32}

Three other changes in our large school systems which have also led to a loss of traditional community involvement and to a loss of board control include:

1. growth of the power of the superintendent,
2. bureaucratization of city school systems, and
3. rise of teacher organizations and collective bargaining.

Superintendents have always had considerable influence over policy decisions, but in large school systems they often effectively run the schools. Crain and Street found after studying eight large school systems:

On many issues ... the superintendent's judgments generally go unchallenged ... because of the superintendent's accumulation of detailed information, his technical background, and his appeals to standard or good practices. ... On such issues, the superintendent in effect runs the schools. Any criticism in these areas may cause the superintendent to accuse the board of interference with his administrative role.\textsuperscript{33}

The bureaucratization of city school systems has also caused a loss of community involvement. Cunningham and Nystrand state:

\begin{quote}

\end{quote}
The bureaucratization of city school systems and urban population trends have decimated the effectiveness of informal citizen influence upon schools in many neighborhoods. City wide curricula and generalized policy pronouncements from central office can be deterrents to developing programs which respond to particular neighborhood needs.  

Teacher organizations were originally supportive of community participation, but with the emergence of collective bargaining they now push to control educational decision-making through the bargaining process. Cheng states:

The emergence of collective bargaining on the part of teachers resulted in an upheaval in public education. This upheaval came about because teachers were seeking to legally end unilateral decision-making on the part of the Board of Education and school administration; the existing educational power structure was being militantly challenged by teachers through their union organizations.  

As city boards of education gradually became more and more unrepresentative of the people and as they slowly lost their power to respond effectively to community concerns, an alliance between teacher organizations and community groups was formed. Cheng states further:

While teachers were seeking to drastically alter the power balance in the educational structure, they found community groups, for the most part black and Spanish speaking, demanding more of a voice in the operation of schools. Such a situation had the makings of a natural alliance.

34 Cunningham, Citizen Participation in School Affairs, p. 5.
36 Ibid., p. 91.
In the early days of teacher negotiations it was not unusual to find community and parent groups supporting the teachers in their efforts to gain new rights through bargaining agreements.

This alliance though did not last long and was eventually shattered by the rise of the community control movement. There were three primary reasons for the emergence of this movement. They were:

1. the failure of schools to educate the vast majority of blacks and poor,
2. the thrust for black self-determination, and
3. the resistance to integration in Northern urban centers by large segments of white community.\(^37\)

The community control movement and teacher associations came head to head during the 1968 Ocean Hill-Brownsville strike and this ended the alliance. Wollett has provided insight into the conflict between teacher unions and community groups:

The assertion by groups of parents - whether in Scardale or in Ocean Hill-Brownsville - that the neighborhood public schools are "theirs" and that they must have total control over who is hired, what they teach and what methods they use are squarely opposed to the highest aspirations of public teachers.\(^38\)

The alliance could have been doomed anyway because once the union secured a power base its attitude toward community involvement changed. Cheng states:


Once they had become central powers many urban unions were basically content to ally themselves with the existing power structure they had so long fought ... Simply put, the union which had just recently won political status, was evidently unwilling to relinquish these new political gains to groups of parents who were outside the educational structure.

It is also important to point out that both the unions and the board negotiators wanted centralized negotiations because this kept the power centralized at the top.

**Initial Attempts at Community Involvement**

After the alliance between teachers and parent groups vanished, there was little if any community involvement in teacher negotiations until 1972. In that year the Philadelphia Board of Education invited a group of parents to participate in the teacher negotiations. The parents were given the option of joining either the union or the board negotiating team. After serving on the Board's team for the first bargaining session, the group of parents chose to disassociate itself and to serve as an independent third party. The board responded by "disinviting" the parents from future sessions.

In 1974 the Detroit Board of Education introduced a plan to involve the community in teacher negotiations. This plan provided for periodic meetings of 16 community representatives, two from each of the eight regional districts, with a representative of the superintendent's office to discuss the issues and the progress in negotiations.

The president of the Board of Education expressed doubts about whether the method allowed the community meaningful access to the bargaining process. He expressed concern in three areas. These areas were as follows: ⁴⁰

1. The plan did not allow the community direct access to the decision-making process at the bargaining table;
2. The community was highly dependent upon the superintendent's representative for its information and understanding of the process;
3. The process could cause the community members to be viewed as allies of the board instead of independent third parties.

The first parent-union agreement was negotiated in the spring of 1974 in Newark, New Jersey. A group of parents from one school negotiated a supplementary agreement with the Newark Teachers Union on the implementation of a federal program. This agreement was later presented to the Newark Board of Education for its approval. At first the Board objected to these separate negotiations, but in the end it ratified the agreement.

This decentralized negotiation process seemed to work well, yet the Newark Teachers Union did not favor including parents in the negotiation process for the overall agreement. The parents liked the decentralized negotiations and wanted to be involved in all negotiations — decentralized and overall.

The Chicago Board of Education once opened negotiations to the public and press, but after an initial enthusiastic response, most community members stopped attending. Cheng states two factors that might explain the apparent loss of interest: (1) the community members were allowed only as observers and (2) the meetings were often long and tiring. 41

In an article in The Midwest Monitor42 and in an article by Pisapia,43 efforts by other city and county organizations to involve the community in teacher negotiations are reviewed:

1. In Fairfax County, Virginia, final ratification of the agreement was postponed for six months while the community was informed and given an opportunity to react.

2. In Fallon, Nevada, the Board of Education and the Teachers Association permitted observers at their negotiation sessions.

3. In Medford, Oregon, the Board of Education opened their negotiations to the public after a few rocky, difficult negotiation sessions.

4. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Board of Education and the Teachers Association agreed to open negotiations to the public. The board negotiator felt it worked well, but noted that the attendance by the public was poor.

5. In Montgomery County, Maryland, two parents participated as observers at all the negotiation sessions.

6. In Rochester, New York, the Board of Education and the Teachers Union permitted observers at their negotiation sessions.

41Cheng, Altering Collective Bargaining, p. 117.

42The Midwest Monitor, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, November/December, 1977, p. 4.

7. In Toledo, Ohio, the Teachers Union had involved the community in negotiations by asking community representatives to assist them in formulating their initial bargaining proposals.

These efforts to involve the community in teacher negotiations have shown that community members can become knowledgeable about the dynamics of the process and can react concretely to board and union proposals.

The Midwest Monitor stated in a recent article that the open meeting movement which sprung up after the Watergate hearings is extending to the labor relations process:

The open meeting movement is extending to the labor relations process - primarily through voluntary open negotiation sessions. ... the comments of many practitioners indicate that open bargaining does result in a better informed public and more understanding of the collective bargaining process - despite the fact that after initial meetings, very few people attend the sessions.

The results of two surveys have shown that most school leaders are not in favor of involving the public in their teacher negotiations. The National School Boards Association survey showed the following:

1. Over 61% of the school leaders surveyed felt there should be no involvement of the community in negotiations beyond the board's acting as the public's representative.

2. Only 23% of the school leaders surveyed felt that negotiation sessions should be open to the press and public scrutiny.

Midwest Monitor, November/December, 1977, p. 5.

3. Only 15% of the school leaders surveyed felt the board should hold hearings in advance of the bargaining process.

The Evans, Knox, and Wiedenman survey of teacher association presidents, negotiators, and school personnel directors found the following:

1. Only 20% of these school leaders reported that their school district had opened their bargaining to the public.

2. Only 17% of their boards of education had publicized the issues which would be discussed before negotiations began.

3. Only 25% of their boards of education held a public hearing prior to the ratification of their teacher agreement.

It is apparent that some boards of education today inform the public and some even involve the public in their negotiations, but these boards of education are still very much in the minority. At this time, few boards are required by law to involve the public, but now in this post-Watergate era, several states have recently passed legislation mandating some form of public involvement in teacher negotiations and many other states are strongly considering such legislation. The next section of this study will examine these laws, some Attorney General opinions and some court rulings.

Legislation on Community Involvement in Teacher Negotiations

Thirty-three states presently have collective bargaining laws that affect education, but only six states have laws that provide for

---

some form of community involvement in teacher negotiations: California, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota and Texas. Pisapia described these laws in a recent Phi Delta Kappan article:\(^7\)

1. California's Rodda Act - provides for public review of the initial proposals, gives the opportunity for the public to respond to the initial proposals, and mandates that any new proposals become public within 24 hours.

2. Idaho's Senate Bill 1279 - provides that records of bargaining sessions be public.

3. Florida's Law - provides that all negotiations occur in public, allows private planning sessions and allows private mediation sessions.

4. Kansas' Bargaining Law - provides that all bargaining sessions be open to the public.

5. Minnesota's Public Employee Bargaining Law - provides that all bargaining sessions occur in public, that all mediation sessions be public and that all planning sessions be public.

6. Texas' Bargaining Law - provides that all bargaining and mediation sessions be open to the public.

All of these community involvement laws were passed during the post-Watergate era and were part of the "open government" movement. These "sunshine" or "open meeting" laws were supposed to shed the purifying light of public scrutiny on government bodies of all types. Every state now has some kind of "sunshine" law, but some states have exempted the collective bargaining process from public scrutiny. Those states are as follows:\(^8\)


\(^8\) Midwest Monitor, November/December, 1977, p. 2.
1. Illinois excludes the public from meetings for collective bargaining purposes;

2. Indiana allows private sessions for discussion of strategy with respect to collective bargaining;

3. Michigan allows private sessions for both strategy and actual negotiations;

4. Ohio allows private sessions for any matters relating to the negotiation process;

5. Wisconsin allows private sessions for the purpose of collective bargaining.

In some states the courts or the Attorney General have gotten involved in the collective bargaining process and have either opened negotiations to the public or have closed them. Some examples of these are the following: 48

1. In Iowa the Attorney General ruled that one party cannot unilaterally demand that negotiations be open or closed to the public. He stated that a unilateral demand to have open or closed negotiating sessions would constitute an unfair labor practice.

2. In North Dakota the Supreme Court ruled that a school board's collective bargaining and its consideration of contract proposals must be held in public. This decision was based on North Dakota's open meeting or "sunshine" statute.

3. In Massachusetts and Wisconsin the courts have ruled that demanding public negotiating sessions was an unfair labor practice. Also, the Massachusetts legislature recently narrowly defeated a proposal to outlaw public sector bargaining completely.

4. In New Hampshire the Supreme Court found that "sunshine" laws not specifically referring to negotiations do not apply to public sector bargaining. It is interesting to note that this is directly opposite to court rulings in other states.

---

5. In Virginia the Supreme Court ruled that all public sector negotiations were illegal.

At the present time many state courts, many state Attorney Generals, and many state legislatures view the collective bargaining process in many different ways. The NEA and the AFT had hopes for national legislation to mandate nationwide collective bargaining, but the June 24, 1976, decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of National League of Cities v. Usery dampened these hopes. This decision restricted the power of the federal government to regulate public employer-employee relationships within individual states. Most legal experts now feel that a national collective bargaining law would be unconstitutional. So, collective bargaining will continue to be regulated by state government, state courts, and state Attorney Generals.

There continues to be a growing demand for "open government" and it would appear that the barriers to open negotiations will continue to fall, state by state. It is hard to retain the support of the average citizen if he feels he does not have the right to know, nor the right to be involved. A recent New York Times article by Sandow exemplifies this point:

> If schools continue to be seen as the exclusive domain of teachers and administrators (at war), the public will be reluctant to fund activities "they" carry on as education.

---

Summary

Many educators, school leaders, and private citizens have definite opinions for and against community involvement in teacher negotiations. Many of the opponents are against open negotiations believing that it would destroy the negotiation process. Most boards of education would prefer to continue to meet in private and to keep the public as far away from the negotiation process as possible. Shannon points out that this might be a mistake because the public may be the board's best friend:

The best friend the school board has in the collective negotiations process is the public. The school board represents the people and must act to ensure that its lines of communication with the people are unclogged. This may require a new approach to receiving input from the people. The more closely a school is attuned to the needs of its constituency, the more credibility it has as it exercises its decision-making responsibilities of governance.

A Pennsylvania superintendent also speaks to this issue:

In the final analysis, by educating the public about the critical importance of the what, why, and how of the bargaining process, by opening negotiations to public scrutiny wherever and whenever doing so will be in the public interest, and by giving the community more opportunities to help formulate the board's (public's) bargaining priorities, school boards will be in a stronger position to repel attempts by teacher unions to negotiate themselves into blatant control of the public's schools. Then, if and when a "third force" does come to pass in education, school board members rightfully will have become its generals, rather than its enemies.

50 Tom Shannon, "Citizen Participation in School District Negotiations - Boon or Boondoggle," School Business Affairs, April, 1977, p. 84.

Years ago the public tended to go along quietly with school officials and school board members, but this day has past. At some point in time, every state, every community, and every board of education is going to have to deal with how much, how often, and in what way they are going to involve the public in their "private" affairs.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The main purposes of this study were to compare and analyze the differences in the attitudes of four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in collective bargaining and to identify how these attitudes differ when three selected variables are considered: (1) student enrollment, (2) use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table, and (3) occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district. To gain information about the attitudes of the school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations a survey was conducted. This chapter explains how the survey questionnaire was developed, how the sample population was identified, how the questionnaire was administered, how the data were collected, how the data were analyzed, and how the hypotheses were tested.

Development of the Questionnaire

To gather the data for this study the questionnaire in the appendix C was used. This survey technique had several advantages: (1) it provided a non-threatening environment for respondents; (2) it provided a manageable sampling method considering the large number of respondents and their geographical diversity; (3) it also provided a technique that allowed the respondents minimal time involvement.
The basis of the questionnaire was derived from a study of the literature, especially Cheng,\(^1\) the National PTA,\(^2\) Pisapia,\(^3\) Shannon,\(^4\) and Sarason.\(^5\) Each of these authors advocates some form of community involvement in teacher negotiations. The researcher combined these recommendations into a set of fifteen community involvement statements. Each statement represented one form of community involvement in teacher negotiations, and the respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with each statement. The fifteen statements were designed to be a continuum of community involvement from the school board just representing the community's interests during negotiations to the school board allowing the community to be directly involved in the teacher negotiation process.

These original fifteen statements were designed into a questionnaire and presented to several professors in the College of Education at The Ohio State University and to the leaders of the Ohio School Boards Association, the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, the Ohio Education Association, and the Ohio Congress of Parents and


Teachers for review and comment. After this process the questionnaire was significantly revised.

This revised questionnaire was pilot tested by administering it to fifteen people: three university professors and three former members of each of the school leadership groups - three former superintendents, three former school board presidents, three former teacher association presidents, and three former PTA leaders. These groups were chosen because they would be familiar with the concepts, would be interested in the topic, and would have the same background as the study's population. Each of the former school leaders chosen had held his/her respective leadership position within the past five years.

The questionnaire was revised further after the pilot study.

Sample Population

The study was designed to sample the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations. So, except for the leaders of the four island school districts, every local, city, and exempted village school superintendent, school board president, and teacher association president in the state of Ohio and 375 Ohio PTA leaders received a questionnaire. A total of 2,200 Ohio school leaders were sampled - 612 superintendents, 612 school board presidents, 601 teacher association presidents, and 375 PTA leaders.

The 375 PTA leaders were carefully chosen from an overall list of 1,630 PTA leaders as follows:

1. All 97 Ohio PTA Council Presidents were chosen;
2. All 38 members of the Ohio PTA Board of Directors were chosen; and

3. Two-hundred and forty local PTA building unit presidents were randomly chosen from an overall list of 1,495 local unit presidents.

To provide a sample with a validity level of over 90%, 240 building unit presidents were selected to receive the questionnaire.

This study was endorsed by the Ohio School Boards Association, the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, and the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers. These groups provided the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the superintendents, school board presidents, and PTA leaders. The Ohio Education Association provided the names and addresses of the teacher association presidents.

**Administration of the Questionnaire**

After the names and addresses of the sample population were identified and the pilot study completed, the researcher proceeded with the mailing process.

The Executive Vice-President of the Ohio School Boards Association signed an endorsement letter for the school board presidents; the Executive Director of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators signed a letter for the superintendents; and the President of the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers signed a letter for the PTA leaders. The Ohio Education Association did not endorse this study so no official from that organization could sign an endorsement letter. As a substitute the researcher's major advisor signed the cover letter to the teacher association presidents.
Three thousand three hundred questionnaires and cover letters were printed. Each questionnaire was coded so the researcher could identify the non-respondents. A questionnaire, an endorsement letter, and a postage free return envelope were sent to each of the 2,200 school leaders.

After four weeks only about 45% of the school leaders had responded, so a second mailing was sent to all non-respondents. The second mailing included a revised endorsement letter, another questionnaire, and another postage free return envelope.

After two more weeks 61.6% of the school leaders had responded or a total of 1,356. The individual group totals and percentages were as follows:

- Superintendents: 551 returns, 90.0%
- School Board Presidents: 322 returns, 52.6%
- Teacher Presidents: 342 returns, 56.9%
- PTA Leaders: 141 returns, 37.6%

The 551 responses of the superintendents were considered a highly satisfactory return. No further follow-up study seemed necessary for this group since only 10% of the population did not respond.

The percentages of responses of the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders were discussed with a research professor in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. He recommended that the researcher compare the responses of the non-responding school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders with the responding school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders. He also recommended that the sample size of the non-respondent group be approximately
twenty to twenty-five respondents.

So, the researcher randomly selected 25 (8.6%) of the non-responding school board presidents and 20 (8.6%) of the non-responding PTA leaders and telephoned them. The questionnaire was orally administered to these school leaders and the responses were recorded.

The oral responses of the non-responding school board presidents and PTA leaders were statistically compared using a t-test to the written responses of the responding school board presidents and PTA leaders, respectively. No significant differences were found, so it is assumed that the attitudes of the non-responding school board presidents and PTA leaders are the same as the attitudes of the responding school board presidents and PTA leaders.

No follow-up survey was done for the teacher association presidents because the Ohio Education Association would not release the necessary information. The 56.9% response from this group does represent a much larger percentage of students in Ohio schools because large city teacher association presidents tended to be more responsive than small city or village teacher association presidents. The teacher association presidents from the eleven largest school districts in Ohio all responded to the original survey questionnaire.

Data Collection

When a completed questionnaire was received it was dated and its code number was recorded on a master list. The data from each questionnaire, all 1,356, were then transferred to IBM cards as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>School Leader Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns 2-26</td>
<td>Responses to Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns 27-28</td>
<td>Date Questionnaire Was Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns 29-31</td>
<td>Code Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number from 0-4 was keypunched in columns 2-26 depending upon the participants response or lack of response. The following code numbers were used for the responses to the fifteen community involvement statements (columns 2-16):

- 0 = No Response or Invalid Response
- 1 = Agree
- 2 = Tend to Agree
- 3 = Tend to Disagree
- 4 = Disagree

If a participant marked more than one response it was coded zero.

Zero responses were excluded from the statistical analysis.

**Treatment of the Data**

The researcher used Ohio State University's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to achieve the primary purposes of the study. This statistical package is an integrated system of computer programs designed for the analysis of social science data. The system provides a comprehensive package that enables the user to perform many different types of data analyses in a simple and convenient manner. SPSS allows a great deal of flexibility in the format of data and offers the researcher a large number of statistical routines, such as, test of significance, t-test, and analysis of variances.
The data were first tabulated into frequency tables for each question and analyzed to determine the standard error of measurement. The data were analyzed as a whole, all 1,356 responses, and for each individual school leader group. For the fifteen community involvement statements the standard error of measurement was found to be low in every case: less than 0.030 overall, less than 0.046 for superintendents, less than 0.060 for school board presidents, less than 0.062 for teacher association presidents and less than 0.093 for PTA leaders.

The first six null hypotheses listed on pages 22-23 were tested as follows:

1. The responses of each group of school leaders were analyzed and compared by adding together their responses to the fifteen community involvement statements \((Q1 + Q2 + Q3 + \ldots + Q15)\), then t-test and analysis of variances techniques were used to determine significant differences. By analyzing the summations, the researcher was able to compare more realistic data on how the overall attitudes of the school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations differed than by just analyzing each question individually.

2. The responses of each group of school leaders were analyzed and compared for each community involvement statement, then t-test and analysis of variances techniques were used to determine significant differences.

Null hypothesis seven:

The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher nego-
tations will not differ when the size of the school district is considered.

was tested by using an analysis of variances technique.

Null hypotheses eight and nine:

The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the occurrence of a teacher strike is considered.

were tested by using a t-test technique.

Summary

A questionnaire was used to gather the data. The questionnaire was developed from the literature and piloted with the assistance of university professors and past school leaders.

The questionnaire was mailed to 2,200 school leaders with the appropriate endorsement letter and return envelope. After four weeks the non-respondents received a second mailing.

Over 61.6% of the school leaders responded to the questionnaire. The attitudes of the non-responding school board presidents and PTA leaders were determined by calling a random sample of 8.6% of them and administering the questionnaire over the telephone. No significant differences were found between the attitudes of the responding and the non-responding school board presidents and PTA leaders. The non-responding teacher association presidents could not be surveyed because their telephone numbers could not be obtained from the Ohio Education
Association. No follow-up study was considered for the non-responding superintendents because over 90% responded to the questionnaire.

The data were analyzed by using Ohio State University's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences using t-test and analysis of variances techniques.
CHAPTER IV

DATA AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The main purposes of this study were to analyze and compare the attitudes of four groups of school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations and to identify how these attitudes differ when three selected variables are considered.

In this chapter the 551 superintendent responses, the 322 school board president responses, the 342 teacher association president responses, and the 141 PTA leader responses will be presented, compared, and analyzed. These responses will be statistically compared to determine the significant differences between the attitudes of the four groups of school leaders and to determine how the responses differ when the three selected variables are considered: (1) student enrollment; (2) use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table; and (3) occurrence of a teacher strike. Two statistical techniques will be used to analyze the data: (1) analysis of variances and (2) t-test.
**Responses to the Questionnaire**

Two thousand two hundred Ohio school leaders were surveyed and 1,356 (61.6%) responded, including 551 superintendents (Supt.), 322 school board presidents (S.B.P.), 342 teacher association presidents (T.A.P.), and 141 PTA leaders. Each school leader was asked to respond to 25 multiple choice questions. The first fifteen questions were statements describing ways to involve the community in teacher negotiations. The school leaders were asked to state whether they agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree, or disagree with each of these statements. The last ten questions were used to provide background data and to assess the attitudes of the school leaders toward the scope of bargaining and new collective bargaining legislation.

Tables 1 to 25 show the results by school leadership group for each of the 25 questions, with each table containing the actual numbers and the percentages of responses. Tables 1 to 15 also contain the percentages agreeing or tending to agree and the group mean scores for each school leadership group.

The group mean score is the average score for a school leadership group for a particular question, where the following point values are assigned to the responses:

- **Agree** = 1
- **Tend to Agree** = 2
- **Tend to Disagree** = 3
- **Disagree** = 4

If the group mean score for an individual statement is less than 2.50, then the leadership group agrees with the statement. If the group mean score is greater than 2.50, then the leadership group disagrees with the statement.
1. **Question One**: The school board should take the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations.

Table 1 shows the survey results for Question One. All four groups strongly supported this statement, with the superintendents having a group mean score of 1.3218, the school board presidents having a score of 1.1495, the teacher association presidents having a score of 1.6500, and the PTA leaders having a score of 1.5971. Therefore, the superintendents, the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and the PTA leaders all strongly felt that the school board should take the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations.

### Table 1

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE SCHOOL BOARD TAKING THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR REPRESENTING THE COMMUNITY'S INTEREST IN TEACHER NEGOTIATIONS BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=547)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=321)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=340)</th>
<th>PTA (N=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>429 (78.4%)</td>
<td>277 (86.3%)</td>
<td>178 (52.4%)</td>
<td>81 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>80 (14.6%)</td>
<td>41 (12.8%)</td>
<td>116 (34.1%)</td>
<td>39 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>18 (3.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>33 (9.7%)</td>
<td>13 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20 (3.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>13 (3.8%)</td>
<td>6 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>1.3218</td>
<td>1.1495</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
<td>1.5971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Question Two:** The school board should consider the expressed concerns of the community when it formulates its teacher bargaining priorities.

The survey results for Question Two are shown in Table 2. All four groups strongly supported this statement, with the superintendents having a group mean score of 1.5649, the school board presidents having a score of 1.6031, the teacher association presidents having a score of 1.9201, and the PTA leaders having a score of 1.2878. Therefore, the superintendents, the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and the PTA leaders all strongly felt that the school board should consider the expressed concerns of the community when it formulates its teacher bargaining priorities.

**TABLE 2**

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE SCHOOL BOARD CONSIDERING THE EXPRESSED CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITY WHEN IT FORMULATES ITS TEACHER BARGAINING PRIORITIES BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=547)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=338)</th>
<th>PTA (N=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>297 (54.3%)</td>
<td>156 (48.8%)</td>
<td>115 (34.0%)</td>
<td>102 (73.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>205 (37.5%)</td>
<td>141 (44.1%)</td>
<td>159 (47.0%)</td>
<td>35 (25.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>31 (5.7%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>40 (11.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14 (2.6%)</td>
<td>6 (1.9%)</td>
<td>24 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>1.5649</td>
<td>1.6031</td>
<td>1.9201</td>
<td>1.2878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Question Three**: During the period of teacher negotiations the community should be kept informed about all school board deliberations and decisions relating to the negotiation process.

Table 3 shows the survey results for Question Three. The PTA leaders supported this statement and had a group mean score of 1.7174. The superintendents, the school board presidents, and the teacher association presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 2.7468, 2.8683, and 2.7719, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders felt the community should be kept informed about all school board deliberations and decisions relating to the negotiation process, but the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this concept.

**TABLE 3**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES ON THE COMMUNITY BEING KEPT INFORMED ABOUT ALL SCHOOL BOARD DELIBERATIONS AND DECISIONS RELATING TO THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=549)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=319)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=342)</th>
<th>PTA (N=138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>86 (15.7%)</td>
<td>39 (12.2%)</td>
<td>69 (20.2%)</td>
<td>77 (55.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>118 (21.5%)</td>
<td>72 (22.6%)</td>
<td>64 (18.7%)</td>
<td>34 (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>194 (35.3%)</td>
<td>100 (31.4%)</td>
<td>85 (24.9%)</td>
<td>16 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>151 (27.5%)</td>
<td>108 (33.9%)</td>
<td>124 (36.3%)</td>
<td>11 (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>2.7468</td>
<td>2.8683</td>
<td>2.7719</td>
<td>1.7174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Question Four:** The school board should establish a definite process for community input into teacher negotiations before actual negotiations begin.

Table 4 shows the survey results for Question Four. The PTA leaders and the teacher association presidents supported this statement with group mean scores of 1.5714 and 2.4041, respectively. The superintendents and the school board presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 2.6327 and 2.6906, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders and the teacher association presidents supported the establishment of a definite process for community input into teacher negotiations, but the superintendents and the school board presidents were opposed to this concept.

### TABLE 4

Actual numbers and percentages of responses to the school board establishing a definite process for community input in the teacher negotiations before actual negotiations begin by leadership groups and the percentages agreeing or tending to agree and the group mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=550)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=339)</th>
<th>PTA (N=140)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84 (15.3%)</td>
<td>38 (11.9%)</td>
<td>71 (20.9%)</td>
<td>85 (60.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>153 (27.8%)</td>
<td>102 (31.9%)</td>
<td>126 (37.2%)</td>
<td>38 (27.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>194 (35.3%)</td>
<td>101 (31.6%)</td>
<td>76 (22.4%)</td>
<td>9 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>119 (21.6%)</td>
<td>79 (24.7%)</td>
<td>66 (19.5%)</td>
<td>8 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>2.6327</td>
<td>2.6906</td>
<td>2.4041</td>
<td>1.5714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Question Five**: The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues at a public hearing before actual negotiations begin.

Table 5 shows the survey results for Question Five. The PTA leaders supported this statement with a group mean score of 1.9571. The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 2.8818, 2.8777, and 2.7471, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders felt the community should have an opportunity to express its views at a public hearing, but the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this concept.

**TABLE 5**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE COMMUNITY HAVING AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS ITS VIEWS AT A PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE ACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS BEGIN BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=550)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=319)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=340)</th>
<th>PTA (N=140)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>48 (8.7%)</td>
<td>39 (12.2%)</td>
<td>44 (12.9%)</td>
<td>58 (41.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Agree</strong></td>
<td>136 (24.7%)</td>
<td>74 (23.2%)</td>
<td>103 (30.3%)</td>
<td>41 (29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Disagree</strong></td>
<td>199 (36.2%)</td>
<td>93 (29.2%)</td>
<td>88 (25.9%)</td>
<td>30 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>167 (30.4%)</td>
<td>113 (35.4%)</td>
<td>105 (30.9%)</td>
<td>11 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Mean Score**

2.8818  2.8777  2.7471  1.9571
6. **Question Six:** The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through extensive public opinion surveys.

Table 6 shows the survey results for Question Six. The PTA leaders supported this statement with a group mean score of 2.4676. The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 3.0437, 3.0656, and 2.9474, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders felt the community should have an opportunity to express its views through extensive public opinion surveys, but the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this concept.

**TABLE 6**

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE COMMUNITY HAVING AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS ITS VIEWS THROUGH EXTENSIVE PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=549)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=342)</th>
<th>PTA (N=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30 (5.5%)</td>
<td>20 (6.3%)</td>
<td>31 (9.1%)</td>
<td>27 (19.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>116 (21.1%)</td>
<td>71 (22.2%)</td>
<td>74 (21.6%)</td>
<td>45 (32.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>203 (37.0%)</td>
<td>97 (30.3%)</td>
<td>119 (34.8%)</td>
<td>42 (30.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>200 (36.4%)</td>
<td>132 (41.3%)</td>
<td>118 (34.5%)</td>
<td>25 (18.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>3.0437</td>
<td>3.0656</td>
<td>2.9474</td>
<td>2.4676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Question Seven:** The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through Community Advisory Committees.

Table 7 shows the survey results for Question Seven. The PTA leaders supported this statement with a group mean score of 2.2806. The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 2.6838, 2.6031, and 2.6559, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders felt the community should have an opportunity to express its views through Community Advisory Committees, but the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this concept.

**TABLE 7**

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE COMMUNITY HAVING AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS ITS VIEWS THROUGH COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEES BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=544)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=340)</th>
<th>PTA (N=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51 (9.4%)</td>
<td>38 (11.9%)</td>
<td>35 (10.3%)</td>
<td>37 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>201 (37.0%)</td>
<td>117 (36.6%)</td>
<td>127 (37.4%)</td>
<td>52 (37.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>161 (29.6%)</td>
<td>99 (30.9%)</td>
<td>98 (28.8%)</td>
<td>24 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>131 (24.1%)</td>
<td>66 (20.6%)</td>
<td>80 (23.5%)</td>
<td>26 (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>2.6838</td>
<td>2.6031</td>
<td>2.6559</td>
<td>2.2806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Question Eight**: The initial bargaining proposals of the teacher association and the school board should be available for public review through such means as public meetings or media releases.

Table 8 shows the survey results for Question Eight. The PTA leaders supported this statement with a group mean score of 1.7194. The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 2.6417, 2.7819, and 2.8817, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders felt the initial bargaining proposals should be available for public review, but the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this concept.

**TABLE 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=547)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=321)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=338)</th>
<th>PTA (N=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>100 (18.3%)</td>
<td>47 (14.6%)</td>
<td>40 (11.8%)</td>
<td>76 (54.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>153 (28.0%)</td>
<td>87 (27.1%)</td>
<td>92 (27.2%)</td>
<td>37 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>137 (25.0%)</td>
<td>76 (23.7%)</td>
<td>74 (21.9%)</td>
<td>15 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>157 (28.7%)</td>
<td>111 (34.6%)</td>
<td>132 (39.1%)</td>
<td>11 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>2.6417</td>
<td>2.7819</td>
<td>2.8817</td>
<td>1.7194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **Question Nine**: Any proposal or counterproposal introduced at the bargaining table should be available for public review through such means as public meetings or media releases.

Table 9 shows the survey results for Question Nine. The PTA leaders supported this statement with a group mean score of 2.0949. The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 3.0460, 3.1003, and 3.1563, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders felt any proposal or counterproposal introduced at the bargaining table should be available for public review, but the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this concept.

**TABLE 9**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO ANY PROPOSAL OR COUNTERPROPOSAL INTRODUCED AT THE BARGAINING TABLE BEING AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=543)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=319)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=339)</th>
<th>PTA (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>53 (9.8%)</td>
<td>26 (8.2%)</td>
<td>32 (9.4%)</td>
<td>53 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Agree</strong></td>
<td>97 (17.9%)</td>
<td>60 (18.8%)</td>
<td>54 (15.9%)</td>
<td>37 (27.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Disagree</strong></td>
<td>165 (30.4%)</td>
<td>89 (27.9%)</td>
<td>82 (24.2%)</td>
<td>28 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>228 (42.0%)</td>
<td>144 (45.1%)</td>
<td>171 (50.4%)</td>
<td>19 (13.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</strong></td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Mean Score</strong></td>
<td>3.0460</td>
<td>3.1003</td>
<td>3.1563</td>
<td>2.0949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Question Ten**: A Community Advisory Committee should be allowed to observe teacher negotiation sessions but not participate in them.

Table 10 shows the survey results for Question Ten. All four groups were opposed to this statement, with the superintendents having a group mean score of 2.8938, the school board presidents having a group mean score of 2.9813, the teacher association presidents having a group mean score of 2.9324, and the PTA leaders having a group mean score of 2.5725. Therefore, all four groups of school leaders were opposed to a Community Advisory Committee observing teacher negotiation sessions.

### TABLE 10

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO A COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE BEING ALLOWED TO OBSERVE TEACHER NEGOTIATION SESSIONS BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50 (9.2%)</td>
<td>33 (10.3%)</td>
<td>40 (11.8%)</td>
<td>29 (21.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>152 (27.8%)</td>
<td>69 (21.5%)</td>
<td>81 (23.8%)</td>
<td>36 (26.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>150 (27.5%)</td>
<td>90 (28.0%)</td>
<td>81 (23.8%)</td>
<td>38 (27.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>194 (35.5%)</td>
<td>129 (40.2%)</td>
<td>138 (40.6%)</td>
<td>35 (25.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>2.8938</td>
<td>2.9813</td>
<td>2.9324</td>
<td>2.5725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. **Question Eleven:** Community members and the media should be allowed to observe all teacher negotiation sessions.

Table 11 shows the survey results for Question Eleven. All four groups were opposed to this statement, with the superintendents having a group mean score of 3.1993, the school board presidents having a group mean score of 3.3500, the teacher association presidents having a group mean score of 3.3578, and the PTA leaders having a group mean score of 2.8201. Therefore, all four school leadership groups were opposed to community members and the media observing all teacher negotiation sessions.

**TABLE 11**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS AND THE MEDIA BEING ALLOWED TO OBSERVE ALL TEACHER NEGOTIATION SESSIONS BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=542)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=341)</th>
<th>PTA (N=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>48 (8.9%)</td>
<td>27 (8.4%)</td>
<td>26 (7.6%)</td>
<td>23 (16.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Agree</strong></td>
<td>73 (13.5%)</td>
<td>32 (10.0%)</td>
<td>29 (8.5%)</td>
<td>27 (19.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Disagree</strong></td>
<td>144 (26.6%)</td>
<td>63 (19.7%)</td>
<td>83 (24.3%)</td>
<td>41 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>277 (51.1%)</td>
<td>198 (61.9%)</td>
<td>203 (59.5%)</td>
<td>48 (34.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</strong></td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Mean Score</strong></td>
<td>3.1993</td>
<td>3.3500</td>
<td>3.3578</td>
<td>2.8201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Question Twelve: Community representatives should be allowed to participate at the bargaining table, prior to impasse, as mediators of disputes.

Table 12 shows the survey results for Question Twelve. All four groups were opposed to this statement, with the superintendents having a group mean score of 3.5861, the school board presidents having a group mean score of 3.7000, the teacher association presidents having a group mean score of 3.5221, and the PTA leaders having a group mean score of 3.0662. Therefore, all four school leadership groups were opposed strongly to community representatives participating at the bargaining table as mediators of disputes.

**TABLE 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=546)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=339)</th>
<th>PTA (N=136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6 (1.8%)</td>
<td>15 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>36 (6.6%)</td>
<td>13 (4.1%)</td>
<td>35 (10.3%)</td>
<td>23 (16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>124 (22.7%)</td>
<td>64 (20.0%)</td>
<td>74 (21.8%)</td>
<td>36 (26.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>376 (68.9%)</td>
<td>241 (75.3%)</td>
<td>224 (66.1%)</td>
<td>62 (45.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>3.5861</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>3.5221</td>
<td>3.0662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. **Question Thirteen**: Community representative should be allowed to participate at the bargaining table as an independent third party.

Table 13 shows the survey results for Question Thirteen. All four groups were opposed to this statement, with the superintendents having a group mean score of 3.7161, the school board presidents having a group mean score of 3.7882, the teacher association presidents having a group mean score of 3.7012, and the PTA leaders having a group mean score of 3.0576. Therefore, all four school leadership groups were opposed strongly to community representatives participating at the bargaining table as an independent third party.

**TABLE 13**

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES BEING ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE AT THE BARGAINING TABLE AS AN INDEPENDENT THIRD PARTY BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=546)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=321)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=338)</th>
<th>PTA (N=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (1.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>16 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (2.2%)</td>
<td>7 (2.2%)</td>
<td>13 (3.8%)</td>
<td>23 (16.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Disagree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 (19.6%)</td>
<td>54 (16.8%)</td>
<td>63 (18.6%)</td>
<td>37 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>419 (76.7%)</td>
<td>260 (81.0%)</td>
<td>258 (76.3%)</td>
<td>63 (45.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Mean Score</strong></td>
<td>3.7161</td>
<td>3.7882</td>
<td>3.7012</td>
<td>3.0576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **Question Fourteen**: Community members should have an opportunity to express their views on the final agreement at a public hearing before ratification by the school board.

Table 14 shows the survey results for Question Fourteen. The PTA leaders supported this statement with a group mean score of 2.1014. The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this statement with group mean scores of 3.1123, 3.1090, and 3.0921, respectively. Therefore, the PTA leaders felt community members should have an opportunity to express their views on the final agreement at a public hearing before the agreement is ratified by the school board, but the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents were opposed to this concept.

### Table 14

**Actual Numbers and Percentages of Responses to Community Members Having the Opportunity to Express Their Views on the Final Agreement at a Public Hearing Before Ratification by Leadership Groups and the Percentages Agreeing or Tending to Agree and the Group Mean Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supts.</th>
<th>S.B.P.</th>
<th>T.A.P.</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=543)</td>
<td>(N=321)</td>
<td>(N=337)</td>
<td>(N=138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
<td>(8.1%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(34.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
<td>(23.1%)</td>
<td>(35.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to Disagree</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27.8%)</td>
<td>(29.9%)</td>
<td>(23.1%)</td>
<td>(14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45.7%)</td>
<td>(44.5%)</td>
<td>(46.6%)</td>
<td>(15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agreeing or Tending To Agree</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>3.1123</td>
<td>3.1090</td>
<td>3.0920</td>
<td>2.1014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. **Question Fifteen**: The final agreement of teacher negotiations should be ratified through a public referendum.

Table 15 shows the survey results for Question Fifteen. All four groups were opposed to this statement, with the superintendents having a group mean score of 3.6758, the school board presidents having a group mean score of 3.7344, the teacher association presidents having a group mean score of 3.8083, and the PTA leaders having a group mean score of 2.9854. Therefore, all four school leadership groups were opposed strongly to the final agreement of teacher negotiations being ratified through a public referendum.

**TABLE 15**

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE FINAL AGREEMENT BEING RATIFIED THROUGH A PUBLIC REFERENDUM BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS AND THE PERCENTAGES AGREEING OR TENDING TO AGREE AND THE GROUP MEAN SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=546)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=339)</th>
<th>PTA (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>17 (3.1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.3%)</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>16 (11.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Agree</strong></td>
<td>13 (2.4%)</td>
<td>12 (3.8%)</td>
<td>10 (2.9%)</td>
<td>28 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tend to Disagree</strong></td>
<td>100 (18.3%)</td>
<td>49 (15.3%)</td>
<td>36 (10.6%)</td>
<td>35 (25.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>416 (76.2%)</td>
<td>255 (79.7%)</td>
<td>290 (85.5%)</td>
<td>58 (42.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Agreeing or Tending to Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Mean Score</strong></td>
<td>3.6758</td>
<td>3.7344</td>
<td>3.8083</td>
<td>2.9854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first fifteen questions dealt with community involvement in teacher negotiations. The remaining ten questions deal with a variety of topics related to negotiations. The first of these, Question Sixteen, deals with the limitations the school leaders felt should be put on the scope of negotiations. Table 16 shows that the superintendents and the school board presidents would like to limit negotiations to discussions on salary and fringe benefits only, but the teacher association presidents and the PTA leaders felt there should be no limit on the scope of negotiations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=543)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=317)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=341)</th>
<th>PTA (N=140)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Fringe Benefits Only</td>
<td>385 (70.9%)</td>
<td>171 (53.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>45 (32.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary, Fringe Benefits and Cond. of Empl.</td>
<td>115 (21.2%)</td>
<td>53 (16.7%)</td>
<td>55 (16.1%)</td>
<td>28 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Item of Concern to Either Party</td>
<td>43 (7.9%)</td>
<td>93 (29.3%)</td>
<td>285 (83.6%)</td>
<td>67 (47.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Seventeen deals with the following question: "Do you believe Ohio needs a collective bargaining law for public employees?"

Table 17 shows that the teacher association presidents and the PTA leaders believed that Ohio needs a collective bargaining law, but the superintendents and the school board presidents did not believe that Ohio needs a collective bargaining law.

### TABLE 17

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO OHIO'S NEED FOR A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING LAW FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYEES BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=517)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=306)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=332)</th>
<th>PTA (N=123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200 (38.7%)</td>
<td>63 (20.6%)</td>
<td>322 (97.0%)</td>
<td>71 (57.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>317 (61.3%)</td>
<td>243 (79.4%)</td>
<td>10 (3.0%)</td>
<td>52 (42.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Eighteen deals with the one provision the school leaders would put into a collective bargaining law if one were being written by the state legislature today. Table 18 shows that the superintendents favored limiting the scope of bargaining; the school board presidents and the PTA leaders favored outlawing the right of teachers to strike; the teacher association presidents favored binding arbitration to resolve impasses.
# TABLE 18

## ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO ONE PROVISION THE RESPONDENTS COULD GUARANTEE IF A NEW COLLECTIVE BARGAINING LAW WERE BEING WRITTEN BY THE STATE LEGISLATURE TODAY BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=540)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=311)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=336)</th>
<th>PTA (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limiting Scope of Bargaining</td>
<td>324 (60.0%)</td>
<td>119 (38.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>27 (19.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Broad Scope of Bargaining</td>
<td>18 (3.3%)</td>
<td>21 (6.8%)</td>
<td>47 (14.0%)</td>
<td>17 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlawing Right of Teachers to Strike</td>
<td>128 (23.7%)</td>
<td>129 (41.5%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>52 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirming Right of Teachers to Strike</td>
<td>4 (0.7%)</td>
<td>6 (1.9%)</td>
<td>66 (19.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding Arbitration for Impasses</td>
<td>17 (3.1%)</td>
<td>9 (2.9%)</td>
<td>157 (46.7%)</td>
<td>23 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding Arbitration for Grievances</td>
<td>9 (1.7%)</td>
<td>9 (2.9%)</td>
<td>27 (8.0%)</td>
<td>7 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Shop Provision</td>
<td>3 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>26 (7.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37 (6.9%)</td>
<td>17 (5.5%)</td>
<td>9 (2.7%)</td>
<td>8 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Nineteen deals with the school leaders supporting legislation mandating some form of community involvement in teacher negotiations. Table 19 shows that the PTA leaders strongly favored this position, but the superintendents, the school board presidents, and the teacher association presidents opposed any legislation mandating community involvement.

**TABLE 19**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO SUPPORTING LEGISLATION MANDATING SOME FORM OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TEACHER NEGOTIATIONS BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=544)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=315)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=331)</th>
<th>PTA (N=128)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>133 (24.4%)</td>
<td>46 (14.6%)</td>
<td>79 (23.9%)</td>
<td>82 (64.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>411 (75.6%)</td>
<td>269 (85.4%)</td>
<td>252 (76.1%)</td>
<td>46 (35.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Twenty deals with the school board of the school leaders negotiating with its teacher association. According to Table 20, over 78% of the responding school leaders indicated that their school board negotiated with their teacher association.

**TABLE 20**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE INCIDENCE OF THE SCHOOL BOARD NEGOTIATING WITH ITS TEACHER ASSOCIATION BY LEADERSHIP GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=548)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=319)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=340)</th>
<th>PTA (N=133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>442 (80.7%)</td>
<td>251 (78.7%)</td>
<td>300 (88.2%)</td>
<td>116 (87.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106 (19.3%)</td>
<td>68 (21.3%)</td>
<td>40 (11.8%)</td>
<td>17 (12.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Twenty-One deals with the school board of the school leaders opening its negotiation sessions to the public. According to Table 21, over 6.9% of the responding school leaders indicated that their school board had opened its teacher negotiation sessions to the public at one time or another.

**TABLE 21**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE SCHOOL BOARD OPENING ITS TEACHER NEGOTIATION SESSIONS TO THE PUBLIC BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=542)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=315)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=335)</th>
<th>PTA (N=122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45 (8.3%)</td>
<td>24 (7.6%)</td>
<td>23 (6.9%)</td>
<td>17 (13.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>497 (91.7%)</td>
<td>291 (92.4%)</td>
<td>312 (93.1%)</td>
<td>105 (86.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Twenty-Two deals with the school district of the school leaders experiencing a teacher strike. According to Table 22, over 23% of the responding school leaders indicated that their school district had experienced a teacher strike.

**TABLE 22**

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT EXPERIENCING A TEACHER STRIKE BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=548)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=319)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=340)</th>
<th>PTA (N=133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126 (23.0%)</td>
<td>82 (25.7%)</td>
<td>92 (27.1%)</td>
<td>72 (54.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>422 (77.0%)</td>
<td>237 (74.3%)</td>
<td>248 (72.9%)</td>
<td>61 (45.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Twenty-Three deals with the school board of the school leaders using an outside negotiator at the teacher negotiation bargaining table. According to Table 23, over 38.9% of the responding school leaders indicated that their school board has used an outside negotiator at the teacher negotiation bargaining table.

**TABLE 23**

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE SCHOOL BOARD USING AN OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR AT THE TEACHER NEGOTIATION BARGAINING TABLE BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sup. (N=545)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=317)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=336)</th>
<th>PTA (N=118)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>212 (38.9%)</td>
<td>139 (43.8%)</td>
<td>146 (43.5%)</td>
<td>63 (53.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>333 (61.1%)</td>
<td>178 (56.2%)</td>
<td>190 (56.5%)</td>
<td>55 (46.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Twenty-Four deals with the teacher association of the school leaders using an outside negotiator at the bargaining table. According to Table 24, over 53.9% of the responding school leaders indicated that their teacher association has used an outside negotiator at the bargaining table.

**TABLE 24**

**ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE TEACHER ASSOCIATION USING AN OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR AT THE BARGAINING TABLE BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sup. (N=545)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=318)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=336)</th>
<th>PTA (N=115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>317 (58.2%)</td>
<td>204 (64.2%)</td>
<td>183 (54.5%)</td>
<td>62 (53.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>228 (41.8%)</td>
<td>114 (35.8%)</td>
<td>153 (45.5%)</td>
<td>53 (46.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Twenty-Five deals with the enrollment of the school district of the school leaders in Kindergarten through Grade Twelve. Table 25 indicates the K-12 enrollment of the school district in which the respondents were involved.

TABLE 25

ACTUAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE PRESENT ENROLLMENT IN GRADES K-12 BY LEADERSHIP GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supt. (N=550)</th>
<th>S.B.P. (N=320)</th>
<th>T.A.P. (N=339)</th>
<th>PTA (N=130)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,500</td>
<td>172 (31.3%)</td>
<td>92 (28.8%)</td>
<td>105 (31.0%)</td>
<td>9 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500-2,999</td>
<td>201 (36.5%)</td>
<td>118 (36.9%)</td>
<td>118 (34.8%)</td>
<td>20 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-15,000</td>
<td>169 (30.7%)</td>
<td>104 (32.5%)</td>
<td>105 (31.0%)</td>
<td>63 (48.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15,000</td>
<td>8 (1.5%)</td>
<td>6 (1.9%)</td>
<td>11 (3.2%)</td>
<td>38 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Mean Scores

The group mean score is an average score for a school leadership group for a particular question. If the group mean score for an individual question is less than 2.50, then the leadership group agrees with the question. If the group mean score is greater than 2.50, then the leadership group disagrees with the question.

Table 26 shows the group mean scores of each school leadership group for each of the fifteen community involvement questions.
### TABLE 26
THE GROUP MEAN SCORES OF EACH SCHOOL LEADERSHIP GROUP TO EACH OF THE FIFTEEN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>S.B.P.</th>
<th>T.A.P.</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3218</td>
<td>1.1495</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
<td>1.5971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5649</td>
<td>1.6031</td>
<td>1.9201</td>
<td>1.2878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7468</td>
<td>2.8683</td>
<td>2.7719</td>
<td>1.7174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6327</td>
<td>2.6906</td>
<td>2.4041</td>
<td>1.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8818</td>
<td>2.8777</td>
<td>2.7471</td>
<td>1.9571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0437</td>
<td>3.0656</td>
<td>2.9474</td>
<td>2.4676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6838</td>
<td>2.6031</td>
<td>2.6559</td>
<td>2.2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6417</td>
<td>2.7819</td>
<td>2.8817</td>
<td>1.7194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0460</td>
<td>3.1003</td>
<td>3.1563</td>
<td>2.0949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8938</td>
<td>2.9813</td>
<td>2.9324</td>
<td>2.5725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1993</td>
<td>3.3500</td>
<td>3.3578</td>
<td>2.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5861</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>3.5221</td>
<td>3.0662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7161</td>
<td>3.7882</td>
<td>3.7012</td>
<td>3.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1123</td>
<td>3.1090</td>
<td>3.0920</td>
<td>2.1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6758</td>
<td>3.7344</td>
<td>3.8083</td>
<td>2.9854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the data in Table 26 shows the following:

1. The superintendents did not support any of the thirteen community involvement options proposed in Questions 3 to 15. They only supported the two philosophical questions - Questions 1 and 2.

2. The school board presidents did not support any of the thirteen community involvement options proposed in Questions 3 to 15. They only supported the two philosophical questions - Questions 1 and 2.

3. The teacher association presidents did not support twelve of the thirteen community involvement options proposed. They did support the school board establishing a definite process for community input into teacher negotiations before actual negotiations begin, and they supported the two philosophical questions.
4. The PTA leaders supported the two philosophical questions and eight of the thirteen community involvement options proposed. They supported the following options:

4.1 The community being kept informed about all school board deliberations and decisions relating to the negotiation process,

4.2 The school board establishing a definite process for community input before actual negotiations begin,

4.3 The community having an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues at a public hearing before actual negotiations begin,

4.4 The community having an opportunity to express its views through public opinion surveys,

4.5 The community having an opportunity to express its views through Community Advisory Committees,

4.6 The initial bargaining proposals being available for public review through such means as public meetings or media releases,

4.7 Any proposal or counterproposal introduced at the bargaining table being available for public review, and

4.8 The community having an opportunity to express its views on the final agreement before ratification by the school board.

The PTA leaders did not support the following community involvement options:

4.1 A Community Advisory Committee being allowed to observe teacher negotiation sessions but not participate in them,

4.2 The community and the media being allowed to observe all teacher negotiation sessions,

4.3 Community representatives being allowed to participate at the bargaining table as mediators of disputes,

4.4 Community representatives being allowed to participate at the bargaining table as an independent third party, and

4.5 The final agreement being ratified through a public referendum.
**Tests of Significance**

Using Ohio State University's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, the data were examined using a test of significance. The results of this test showed that the data were significant with $p < 0.11$. The test results for Question 21 were significant with $p < 0.11$; the test results to Question 23 were significant with $p < 0.03$; the test results to Question 24 were significant with $p < 0.06$; the test results to all the other questions were significant with $p < 0.01$.

**Comparing Respondents with Non-Respondents**

Overall 1,356 school leaders responded to the survey, with 90.0% of the superintendents, 52.6% of the school board presidents, 56.9% of the teacher association presidents, and 37.6% of the PTA leaders responding. Since the percentages of returns for the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and the PTA leaders were less than 60%, the researcher decided to compare the attitudes of the non-responding school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders with the attitudes of their respective responding school leader group.

Twenty-five (8.6%) of the non-responding school board presidents and twenty (8.6%) of the non-responding PTA leaders were called at random and the questionnaire was administered to them over the telephone. The responses of the non-responding school board presidents were compared with the responses of the responding school board presidents, and the responses of the non-responding PTA leaders were compared with the responding PTA leaders by using a t-test.
Table 27 shows the t-test results for these two comparisons. There were no significant differences in the attitudes with $p < 0.05$ for 14 out of the 15 community involvement questions for the school board presidents and for all 15 questions for the PTA leaders. Therefore, the attitudes of the non-responding school board presidents are the same as the attitudes of the responding school board presidents, and the attitudes of the non-responding PTA leaders are the same as the attitudes of the responding PTA leaders.

### Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2-Tail Probability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.B.P.</td>
<td>PTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference between groups with $p < 0.05$.

The researcher was not able to compare the attitudes of the non-responding teacher association presidents with the responding teacher association presidents because the Ohio Education Association would not
release the names or the telephone numbers of their local association presidents.

No effort was made to determine the attitudes of the non-responding superintendents because over 90% of the superintendents responded to the survey.

**Comparing Responses Between School Leadership Groups**

To test the first six hypotheses listed on pages 22-23, the responses of each school leadership group toward community involvement in teacher negotiations were compared in four ways:

1. All four groups were compared by using an analysis of variances technique on the responses to each of the fifteen community involvement questions;

2. The groups were compared two at a time (superintendents vs. school board presidents, superintendents vs. teacher association presidents, superintendents vs. PTA leaders, school board presidents vs. teacher association presidents, school board presidents vs. PTA leaders, and teacher association presidents vs. PTA leaders) by using a t-test technique on the responses to each of the fifteen community involvement questions;

3. All four groups were compared by using an analysis of variances technique on the summation of responses (Q1 + Q2 + Q3 ... + Q15) to the fifteen community involvement questions;

4. The groups were compared two at a time by using a t-test technique on the summation of responses to the fifteen community involvement questions.

1. **Analysis of Variances Technique on Each Question (Q1 - Q15)**

Table 28 lists the degrees of freedom, the sum of squares, the mean squares, the F Ratio, and the F Probability when the four school leadership groups were compared by using an analysis of variances technique on the responses to each of the community involvement questions. An asterisk is shown in Table 28 to mark the F Probabilities where a significant difference with $p < 0.001$ resulted.
TABLE 28
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCES STATISTICAL DATA USED TO COMPUTE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEADERSHIP GROUPS FOR EACH OF THE FIFTEEN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0504</td>
<td>16.6835</td>
<td>34.848</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.2496</td>
<td>15.7499</td>
<td>29.627</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144.5127</td>
<td>48.1709</td>
<td>43.733</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144.5461</td>
<td>48.1820</td>
<td>50.157</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102.5719</td>
<td>34.2573</td>
<td>34.920</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.1319</td>
<td>13.7106</td>
<td>15.771</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.7359</td>
<td>6.2453</td>
<td>6.816</td>
<td>0.00010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144.0042</td>
<td>48.0014</td>
<td>42.523</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124.7329</td>
<td>41.5776</td>
<td>41.359</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.2060</td>
<td>5.7353</td>
<td>5.459</td>
<td>0.00100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.9871</td>
<td>11.3290</td>
<td>11.897</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.9671</td>
<td>13.3224</td>
<td>25.279</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58.0109</td>
<td>19.3370</td>
<td>49.740</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124.9326</td>
<td>41.6442</td>
<td>43.030</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.6353</td>
<td>23.8784</td>
<td>53.379</td>
<td>0.00001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference between groups with p < 0.01

These analyses of variances results show that the PTA leaders were significantly (p < 0.01) more supportive than the other three school leadership groups for twelve of fifteen of the community involvement questions. The PTA leaders were not significantly more supportive for the following questions:

Question 1 - The school board should take the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations.

Question 7 - The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through Community Advisory Committees.
Question 10 - A Community Advisory Committee should be allowed to observe teacher negotiation sessions but not participate in them.

These analysis of variances results also show that the school board presidents were significantly more supportive than the other three leadership groups toward the school board taking the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations (Question 1).

2. T-Test Technique on Two Groups at a Time for Each Question (Q1-Q15)

Table 29 lists the 2-tail probabilities when the responses of the four school leadership groups to the fifteen community involvement questions are compared two at a time by using a t-test technique. An

**TABLE 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Supt. vs S.B.P.</th>
<th>Supt. vs T.A.P.</th>
<th>Supt. vs PTA</th>
<th>S.B.P. vs T.A.P.</th>
<th>S.B.P. vs PTA</th>
<th>T.A.P. vs PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference between groups with p < 0.01
asterisk is shown to mark the 2-tail probabilities where the t-test showed a significant difference between groups with $p < 0.01$.

These t-test results show that the PTA leaders were significantly ($p < 0.01$) more supportive than the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents for fourteen out of fifteen of the community involvement questions. The PTA leaders were not significantly more supportive of the school board taking the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations (Question 1), but, like the other three school leadership groups, they did support this concept.

These t-test results also show the following:

2.1 The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents all supported the school board taking the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations (Question 1); the superintendents were significantly ($p < 0.01$) more supportive than the teacher association presidents and significantly ($p < 0.01$) less supportive than the school board presidents; the school board presidents were significantly ($p < 0.01$) more supportive than the teacher association presidents.

2.2 The superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents all supported the school board considering the expressed concerns of the community when it formulates its teacher bargaining priorities (Question 2), but the teacher association presidents were significantly ($p < 0.01$) less supportive than the superintendents and the school board presidents.
2.3 The teacher association presidents were supportive of the school board establishing a definite process for community input into teacher negotiations (Question 4), but the superintendents and the school board presidents were not supportive of this concept. The teacher association presidents were significantly ($p < 0.01$) more supportive of establishing a definite process for community involvement than the superintendents and the school board presidents.

2.4 Both the superintendents and the teacher association presidents were opposed to the initial bargaining proposals being available for public review (Question 8), but the superintendents were significantly ($p < 0.01$) more opposed than the teacher association presidents.

2.5 The superintendents, school board presidents, and the teacher association presidents were all opposed to community representatives participating at the bargaining table as mediators of disputes (Question 12), but the school board presidents were significantly ($p < 0.01$) more opposed than the superintendents and the teacher association presidents.

2.6 Both the superintendents and the teacher association presidents were opposed to the final agreements being ratified through a public referendum (Question 15), but the teacher association presidents were significantly ($p < 0.01$) more opposed than the superintendents.

3. **Analysis of Variances Technique on the Summation of Responses**

   \[(Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 + \ldots + Q_{15})\]

   When the responses to the fifteen community involvement questions were added together for each school leadership group, the following average group mean score for each leadership group was obtained:
These means were analyzed using an analysis of variances technique. The compute analysis showed a F Ratio of 67.054 and a F Probability less than 0.00001 with three degrees of freedom. These data indicate that the PTA leaders are significantly (p < 0.01) more supportive of the fifteen community involvement questions than the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents. The data also show that there are no significant differences between the attitudes of the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

4. T-Test Technique on Two Groups for the Summation of Responses (Q1 + Q2 + Q3 ... + Q15)

When the average group mean scores of the summations were compared using a t-test the following 2-tail probabilities were obtained:

- Supt. vs S.B.P. 0.191
- Supt. vs T.A.P. 0.112
- Supt. vs PTA 0.000 (Significant with p < 0.01)
- S.B.P. vs T.A.P. 0.773
- S.B.P. vs PTA 0.000 (Significant with p < 0.01)
- T.A.P. vs PTA 0.000 (Significant with p < 0.01)

These t-test results showed that the PTA leaders were significantly more supportive of community involvement in teacher negotiations than the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presi-
dents. These results also showed that the attitudes of the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different.

Comparing Responses Within School Leadership Groups

To test the last three hypotheses, the responses within each school leadership group were compared by analyzing how these responses differ when three selected variables are considered: (1) the Kl-12 enrollment or size of the school district, (2) the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table, and (3) the occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district.

The responses within each leadership group were analyzed as follows:

1. By using an analysis of variances, the responses of the school leaders in each of the four enrollment groups (under 1,500, 1,500-2,999, 3,000-15,000 and over 15,000) were compared,

2. By using a t-test the responses of the school leaders whose school board had used an outside negotiator at the teacher bargaining table were compared with the responses of the school leaders whose school board had not used an outside negotiator.

3. By using a t-test the responses of the school leaders whose teacher association had used an outside negotiator at the bargaining table were compared with the responses of the school leaders whose teacher association had not used an outside negotiator, and

4. By using a t-test the responses of the school leaders who had a teacher strike in their school district were compared with the responses of the school leaders who had not had a teacher strike in their school district.

1. Analysis of Variances Technique on Each School Leadership Group - Size of the Kl-12 Enrollment of the School District
About 31.3% of the responses were from school leaders in districts with under 1,500 enrollment; about 36.4% were from districts with 1,500-2,999 enrollment; about 30.9% were from districts with 3,000-15,000 enrollment; and about 1.4% were from districts with over 15,000 enrollment. The results of the analysis of variances for all four school leadership groups for all fifteen community involvement questions indicated no significant differences (p < 0.01), hence, no table of values has been shown. Since no significant differences exist, the attitudes of the superintendents, the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and the PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different when the size of their school district is considered. Therefore, the size of the school district in which the school leaders are involved has no significant impact on their attitudes toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

2. T-Test Technique on Each School Leadership Group - School Board Use of an Outside Negotiator

Over 38.9% of the responding school leaders indicated that their school boards have used an outside negotiator at the bargaining table at one time or another. The results of the t-test are shown in Table 30 with an asterisk marking where a significant difference (p < 0.01) existed between the attitudes of the school leaders whose board had used an outside negotiator and the attitudes of the school leaders whose board had not used an outside negotiator.
TABLE 30

2-TAIL PROBABILITIES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WHEN "BOARD OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR" SCHOOL LEADERS ARE COMPARED WITH "NO BOARD OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR" SCHOOL LEADERS USING A T-TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2-Tail Probabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference between groups with $p < 0.01$

The results of the t-tests for all four school leadership groups for all fifteen community involvement questions indicated only one test for which there was a significant difference ($p < 0.01$). With both groups opposed to the concept, the "board outside negotiator" school board presidents were significantly more supportive of the community having an opportunity to express its views at a public hearing before actual negotiations begin (Question 5) than the 'no board outside negotiator' school board presidents. Since only one of the 60 t-tests showed a significant difference ($p < 0.01$), the attitudes of the superintendents, the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and the PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different when the board of education use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.
3. **T-Test Technique on Each School Leadership Group - Teacher Association Use of an Outside Negotiator**

Over 53.9% of the responding school leaders indicated that their teacher associations have used an outside negotiator at the bargaining table at one time or another. The results of the t-test are shown in Table 31. No asterisk is shown in this table because no significant differences (p < 0.01) existed between the attitudes of the school leaders whose teacher association had used an outside negotiator and the attitudes of the school leaders whose teacher association had not used an outside negotiator for any of the 60 t-tests.

**TABLE 31**

2-TAIL PROBABILITIES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WHEN "TEACHER OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR" SCHOOL LEADERS ARE COMPARED WITH "NO TEACHER OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR" SCHOOL LEADERS USING A T-TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2-Tail Probabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since no significant differences exist for any of the t-tests, the attitudes of the superintendents, the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different when
teacher association use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

4. **T-Test Technique on Each School Leadership Group - Strike vs No Strike**

Over 23% of the responding school leaders indicated that their school districts have experienced a teacher strike at one time or another. The results of the t-tests are shown in Table 32. No asterisk is shown in this table because no significant differences \((p < 0.01)\) existed between the attitudes of the "strike" school leaders and the attitudes of the "no strike" school leaders.

**TABLE 32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2-Tail Probabilities Supt.</th>
<th>S.B.P.</th>
<th>T.A.P.</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since no significant differences exist for any of the 60 t-tests, the attitudes of the superintendents, the school board presidents, the teacher association presidents, and the PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different when the occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district is considered.
Summary

In this chapter a tabulation of the responses of the four groups of school leaders to the twenty-five questions on the questionnaire were presented. All the responses were shown to be significant to at least the 89% level of confidence by using a test of significance.

The responses of the non-responding school board presidents and PTA leaders were shown not to be significantly different from the responses of the responding school board presidents and PTA leaders. The responses of the non-responding teacher association presidents were not studies because the Ohio Education Association would not release the necessary information. No effort was made to study the attitudes of the non-responding superintendents because over 90% of the superintendents responded.

The responses of the school leaders were analyzed and compared between school leadership groups and within school leadership groups by using t-test and analysis of variances techniques. The first six hypotheses were studied between school leadership groups by analyzing the responses of the school leaders to each of the fifteen community involvement questions individually and by analyzing the summation of responses to the fifteen questions.

The last three hypotheses were studied within school leadership groups by analyzing how the responses of the school leaders differed when the three selected variables were considered: (1) student enrollment, (2) use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table, and (3) occurrence of a teacher strike.

The data were analyzed using Ohio State University's Statistical Package for Social Studies. Significant differences with p < 0.01 were noted.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The main purposes of this study were to compare and analyze the differences in the attitudes of four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in collective bargaining and to identify how these attitudes differ when three selected variables are considered: (1) student enrollment; (2) use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table; and (3) occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district.

To gather the data a questionnaire was sent to 375 Ohio PTA leaders and to every local, city, and exempted village school superintendent, school board president, and teacher association president in the state of Ohio, except for the leaders of the four island school districts. A total of 2,200 Ohio school leaders were sampled - 612 superintendents, 612 school board presidents, 601 teacher association presidents, and 375 PTA leaders. Over 61.6% of the school leaders responded to the questionnaire - 551 superintendents, 322 school board presidents, 342 teacher association presidents, and 141 PTA leaders.
Two statistical techniques were used to analyze and compare the attitudes of the four groups of school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations, to identify how these attitudes differ when three selected variables are considered, and to test nine null hypotheses. These hypotheses are as follows:

- $H_0^1$. The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of school board presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.
- $H_0^2$. The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.
- $H_0^3$. The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.
- $H_0^4$. The attitudes of school board presidents are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.
- $H_0^5$. The attitudes of school board presidents are not significantly different from the attitudes of PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.
- $H_0^6$. The attitudes of PTA leaders are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.
- $H_0^7$. The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the size of the school district is considered.
- $H_0^8$. The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.
- $H_0^9$. The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the occurrence of a teacher strike is considered.

Null hypotheses one through six and nine were tested by using both a t-test and an analysis of variances technique. Null hypotheses seven and eight
were tested by using a t-test technique. The summaries of these tested null hypotheses are presented in this chapter.

This chapter also reviews the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward the scope of teacher negotiations, toward the need for a collective bargaining law, toward one preferred provision in a new collective bargaining law, and toward mandating some form of community involvement in teacher negotiations.

Conclusions, implications, and recommendations based on the thesis data will also be presented in this chapter.

Null Hypotheses One to Six

Each of the first six null hypotheses were tested in four ways:

1. An analysis of variances technique was applied to the responses to each of the fifteen community involvement questions;

2. A t-test technique was also used on the responses to each of the fifteen community involvement questions;

3. An analysis of variances technique was applied to the summation of responses (Q1 + Q2 + Q3 + ... + Q15) to the fifteen community involvement questions; and

4. A t-test technique was also used on the summation of responses to the fifteen community involvement questions.

For tests one and two above the researcher determined whether a significant difference in the attitudes of the school leaders existed with \( p < 0.01 \) for each of the fifteen community involvement questions. If there was a significant difference \( (p < 0.01) \) for a majority (eight or above) of the fifteen community involvement questions for one of the tests, then the entire set of questions for that test were considered to be significantly different.
For the last two tests above a summation of the fifteen responses was used, so the researcher could determine whether a significant difference in attitudes existed with $p < 0.01$ for the entire set of questions considered as a group.

A null hypothesis will be accepted if no significant difference in attitude with $p < 0.01$ existed for each of the four tests. A null hypothesis will be rejected if a significant difference in attitude existed for all four tests.

1. Null Hypothesis One (Superintendents vs School Board Presidents) - The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the school board presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

   Test 1 - The analysis of variances showed a significant difference for only one question (Question 1), so by this test the attitudes of the superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the school board presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

   Test 2 - The t-test showed a significant difference for only two questions (Questions 1 and 12), so by this test the attitudes of the superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the school board presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

   Test 3 - The analysis of variances of the summation showed no significant difference between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the school board presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.

   Test 4 - The t-test on the summation showed no significant difference between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the school board presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.

Since all four tests showed no significant difference between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the school board presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions, Null Hypothesis One is accepted.
2. Null Hypothesis Two (Superintendents vs Teacher Association Presidents)

The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

Test 1 - The analysis of variances showed a significant difference for only three questions (Questions 1, 2, and 4), so by this test the attitudes of the superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the teacher association presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

Test 2 - The t-test showed a significant difference for only five questions (Questions 1, 2, 4, 8, and 13), so by this test the attitudes of the superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the teacher association presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

Test 3 - The analysis of variances of the summation showed no significant difference between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the teacher association presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.

Test 4 - The t-test on the summation showed no significant difference between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the teacher association presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.

Since all four tests showed no significant difference between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the teacher association presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions, Null Hypothesis Two is accepted.

3. Null Hypothesis Three (Superintendents vs PTA Leaders) - The attitudes of superintendents are not significantly different from the attitudes of PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

Test 1 - The analysis of variances showed a significant difference for twelve of the fifteen questions (Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15), so by this test the attitudes of the superintendents are significantly different from the attitudes of the PTA leaders toward the fifteen community involvement questions.
Test 2 - The t-test showed a significant difference for all fifteen questions, so the attitudes of the superintendents are significantly different from the attitudes of the PTA leaders toward the fifteen community involvement questions by this test.

Test 3 - The analysis of variances of the summation showed a significant difference (p < 0.01) between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the PTA leaders for the fifteen community involvement questions.

Test 4 - The t-test on the summation showed a significant difference (p < 0.01) between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the PTA leaders toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

Since all four tests showed a significant difference (p < 0.01) between the attitudes of the superintendents and the attitudes of the PTA leaders for the fifteen community involvement questions, Null Hypothesis Three is rejected.

4. Null Hypothesis Four (School Board Presidents vs Teacher Association Presidents) - The attitudes of school board presidents are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

Test 1 - The analysis of variances showed a significant difference for only three questions (Questions 1, 2, and 4), so by this test the attitudes of the school board presidents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the teacher association presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.

Test 2 - The t-test showed a significant difference for only four questions (Questions 1, 2, 4, and 12), so by this test the attitudes of the school board presidents are not significantly different from the attitudes of the teacher association presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

Test 3 - The analysis of variances of the summation showed no significant difference between the attitudes of the school board presidents and the attitudes of the teacher association presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.
Test 4 - The t-test on the summation showed no significant
difference between the attitudes of the school board
presidents and the attitudes of the teacher association
presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.

Since all four tests showed no significant difference between the attitudes
of the school board presidents and the attitudes of the teacher association
presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions, Null Hypo-
thesis Four is accepted.

5. Null Hypothesis Five (School Board Presidents vs PTA Leaders) - The
attitudes of school board presidents are not significantly different
from the attitudes of the PTA leaders toward community involvement in
teacher negotiations.

Test 1 - The analysis of variances showed a significant difference
for twelve of the fifteen questions (Questions 2, 3, 4, 5,
6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15), so by this test the
attitudes of the school board presidents are significantly
different from the attitudes of the PTA leaders toward the
fifteen community involvement questions.

Test 2 - The t-test showed a significant difference for all fif-
teen questions, so the attitudes of the school board
presidents are significantly different from the attitudes
of the PTA leaders toward the fifteen community involve-
ment questions by this test.

Test 3 - The analysis of variances of the summation showed a
significant difference (p < 0.01) between the attitudes
of the school board presidents and the attitudes of the
PTA leaders for the fifteen community involvement ques-
tions.

Test 4 - The t-test on the summation showed a significant differ-
ence (p < 0.01) between the attitudes of the school board
presidents and the attitudes of the PTA leaders toward
the fifteen community involvement questions.

Since all four tests showed a significant difference (p < 0.01) between
the attitudes of the school board presidents and the attitudes of the
PTA leaders for the fifteen community involvement questions Null Hypothesis
Five is rejected.
6. **Null Hypothesis Six (PTA Leaders vs Teacher Association Presidents)**

- The attitudes of PTA leaders are not significantly different from the attitudes of teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

**Test 1** - The analysis of variances showed a significant difference for twelve of the fifteen questions (Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15), so by this test the attitudes of the PTA leaders are significantly different from the attitudes of the teacher association presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

**Test 2** - The t-test showed a significant difference for all fifteen questions, so the attitudes of the PTA leaders are significantly different from the attitudes of the teacher association presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions by this test.

**Test 3** - The analysis of variances of the summation showed a significant difference \( p < 0.01 \) between the attitudes of the PTA leaders and the attitudes of the teacher association presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions.

**Test 4** - The t-test on the summation showed a significant difference \( p < 0.01 \) between the attitudes of the PTA leaders and the attitudes of the teacher association presidents toward the fifteen community involvement questions.

Since all four tests showed a significant difference \( p < 0.01 \) between the attitudes of the PTA leaders and the attitudes of the teacher association presidents for the fifteen community involvement questions, Null Hypothesis Six is rejected.

**Null Hypotheses Seven to Nine**

Null hypothesis seven was tested by using an analysis of variances technique; null hypothesis eight was tested by using two t-test techniques; and null hypothesis nine was tested using a t-test technique.

1. **Null Hypothesis Seven (Size of the School District)** - The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community
involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the size of the school district is considered.

An analysis of variances technique was used to determine if there was a significant difference in attitude with a $p < 0.01$ within school leadership groups when the size of the school district is considered. Four different sizes of school districts were examined: (1) under 1,500, (2) 1,500 - 2,999, (3) 3,000 - 15,000, and (4) over 15,000, and the responses of each leadership group to each of the fifteen community involvement questions were studied.

No significant difference in attitude was found for any of the four school leadership groups for any of the fifteen community involvement questions. Since no significant difference in attitude existed for any of the sixty analysis of variances tests, the seventh null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the attitudes of each of the four school leadership groups toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different when the size of the school district is considered.

2. Null Hypothesis Eight (Use of an Outside Negotiator) - The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

Two t-tests were used to determine if there was a significant difference with a $p < 0.01$ within each school leadership group when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered. One t-test examined the difference in the attitudes of each of the school leadership groups for each of the fifteen community involvement questions when the school board used an outside negotiator. The other t-test
examined the difference in the attitudes when the teacher association used an outside negotiator.

The eighth null hypothesis will be rejected if a significant difference in attitude exists for any of the school leadership groups for a majority of the fifteen community involvement questions for both tests, that is, both when the school board uses an outside negotiator and when the teacher association uses an outside negotiator.

2.1 Superintendents - There were no significant differences for neither the board outside negotiator case nor for the teacher outside negotiator case, so the attitudes of the superintendents were not significantly different when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

2.2 School Board Presidents - There was a significant difference for only one (Question 5) of the fifteen t-tests for the board outside negotiator case and none for the teacher outside negotiator case, the attitudes of the school board presidents were not significantly different when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

2.3 Teacher Association Presidents - There were no significant differences for neither the board outside negotiator case nor for the teacher outside negotiator case, so the attitudes of the teacher association presidents were not significantly different when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

2.4 PTA Leaders - There were no significant differences for neither the board outside negotiator case nor for the teacher outside negotiator case, so the attitudes of the PTA leaders were not significantly different when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

Since there is not a significant difference in attitude for a majority of the fifteen community involvement questions for any of the school leadership groups, the eighth null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the attitudes of each of the school leadership groups toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.
3. Null Hypothesis Nine (Occurrence of a Teacher Strike) - The attitudes of each of the four groups of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations will not differ when the occurrence of a teacher strike is considered.

A t-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference with a $p < 0.01$ within school leadership groups when the occurrence of a teacher strike is considered.

The ninth hypothesis will be rejected if a significant difference in attitude exists for any of the school leadership groups for a majority of the fifteen community involvement questions.

No significant difference in attitude was found for any of the four school leadership groups for any of the fifteen community involvement questions. Since no significant difference in attitude existed for any of the sixty t-tests, the ninth hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the attitudes of each of the four school leadership groups toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are not significantly different when the occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district is considered.

Other Attitudes of Ohio School Leaders

Besides the fifteen community involvement questions, the school leaders were asked their attitudes on four other issues: (1) the scope of collective bargaining, (2) the need for a collective bargaining law in Ohio, (3) the provisions of a new collective bargaining law, and (4) their support of community involvement in teacher negotiations.

The results showed the following for the responding school leaders:
1. **Scope of Collective Bargaining** - The school leaders were split on how broad the scope of collective bargaining should be. The superintendents and school board presidents favored a narrow scope for collective bargaining. The teacher association presidents and PTA leaders favored a broad scope for collective bargaining.

2. **Need for a Collective Bargaining Law** - The school leaders were split on the need for a collective bargaining law. The superintendents (61%) and the school board presidents (79%) opposed the enactment of a collective bargaining law, while the teacher association presidents (97%) and the PTA leaders (58%) supported the enactment of a collective bargaining law.

3. **Provisions for a New Collective Bargaining Law** - The superintendents, school board presidents, and PTA leaders disagreed with the teacher association presidents on what provisions should be included in a new collective bargaining law. The superintendents, school board presidents, and PTA leaders favored outlawing the right of teachers to strike and limiting the scope of bargaining, while the teacher association presidents favored binding arbitration for impasses and affirming the right of teachers to strike.

4. **Support for Legislation Mandating Some Form of Community Involvement in Teacher Negotiations** - Only the PTA leaders (64%) supported legislation mandating some form of community involvement. The superintendents (75%), the school board presidents (85%), and the teacher association presidents (76%) opposed legislation mandating some form of community involvement in negotiations.

The researcher also asked the school leaders if their school board had ever opened their teacher negotiation sessions to the public. The results showed that over 6.9% of the responding school leaders indicated that their school board had opened their teacher negotiations to the public at one time or another.
Conclusions

Within the limitations of this study the following conclusions are warranted based upon the survey results and the statistical analyses:

1. Null Hypotheses One, Two, and Four were accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the attitudes of Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

2. Null Hypotheses Three, Five, and Six were rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the attitudes of Ohio PTA leaders and the attitudes of Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

3. The results showed that the responding superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents in Ohio would oppose any greater degree of community involvement in teacher negotiations.

4. The results showed the responding PTA leaders in Ohio would support a greater degree of community involvement in teacher negotiations.

5. Null Hypothesis Seven was accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the attitudes of Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations when the size or enrollment of the school district is considered.

6. Null Hypothesis Eight was accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the attitudes of Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders toward
community involvement in teacher negotiations when the use of an outside negotiator at the bargaining table is considered.

7. Null Hypothesis Nine was accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the attitudes of Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations when the occurrence of a teacher strike in the school district is considered.

Further Conclusions

The following additional conclusions appear to be warranted from the survey results, the statistical analyses, and the conclusions:

1. Most Ohio superintendents (93%), school board presidents (99%), and teacher association presidents (87%) believe the school board should take the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations, but they oppose any formal community involvement in the teacher negotiation process.

2. Most Ohio superintendents (92%), school board presidents (93%), and teacher association presidents (81%) believe the school board should consider the expressed concerns of the community when it formulates its teacher bargaining priorities, but they oppose structuring any formal way to hear the expressed concerns of the community.

3. Most Ohio superintendents (63%), school board presidents (65%), and teacher association presidents (61%) do not believe the community should be kept informed about all school board deliberations and decisions relating to the negotiation process, but most Ohio PTA leaders (80%) do believe the community should be kept informed.
4. Most Ohio superintendents (57%) and school board presidents (56%) do not believe the school board should establish a definite process for community input into teacher negotiations before actual negotiations begin, but most Ohio PTA leaders (88%) and teacher association presidents (58%) do believe a definite process should be established for community input.

5. Most Ohio superintendents (67%), school board presidents (65%), and teacher association presidents (56%) do not believe the community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues at a public hearing before actual negotiations begin, but most Ohio PTA leaders (71%) do believe the community should have an opportunity to express its views at a public hearing before negotiations begin.

6. Most Ohio superintendents (73%), school board presidents (71%), and teacher association presidents (69%) do not believe the community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through extensive public opinion surveys, but most Ohio PTA leaders (52%) do believe the community should have an opportunity to express its views through extensive public opinion surveys.

7. Most Ohio superintendents (54%), school board presidents (52%), and teacher association presidents (52%) do not believe the community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through Community Advisory Committees, but most Ohio PTA leaders (64%) do believe the community should have an opportunity to express its views through Community Advisory Committees.

8. Most Ohio superintendents (54%), school board presidents (58%), and teacher association presidents (61%) do not believe initial bargaining
proposals should be available for public review, but most Ohio PTA
leaders (81%) do believe they should be available for public review.

9. Most Ohio superintendents (72%), school board presidents (73%),
and teacher association presidents (75%) do not believe that any proposal
or counterproposal introduced at the bargaining table should be available
for public review, but most Ohio PTA leaders (66%) do believe that any
proposal or counterproposal introduced at the bargaining table should be
available for public review.

10. Most Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, and
teacher association presidents were strongly opposed to allowing anyone —
not committees, not community members, not the media — to observe or
participate in the negotiation process.

11. Most Ohio PTA leaders favor more community involvement in
teacher negotiations, but they oppose opening teacher negotiation sessions
to the media.

12. Most Ohio PTA leaders favor more community involvement in
teacher negotiations, but they oppose direct community involvement at
the teacher bargaining table. They would prefer that community members
become more involved through public hearings, public opinion polls, or
advisory committees.

13. Most Ohio superintendents (94%), school board presidents
(94%), teacher association presidents (96%), and PTA leaders (67%) are
strongly opposed to having the final agreement of teacher negotiations
ratified through a public referendum, but many of these same school
leaders, especially the PTA leaders (70%), would favor giving community
members an opportunity to express their views on the final agreement be-
fore ratification by the school board.
14. Even though the Ohio school board presidents and the teacher association presidents are on different sides of the collective bargaining table, their attitudes toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are basically the same. Both the board presidents and teacher association presidents want negotiations closed to the public, and both groups would resist any greater degree of community involvement in teacher negotiations.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

It is the researcher's hope that this study will serve as a baseline for future studies. Some recommendations for future studies are:

1. Study the attitudes of the school leaders in a state with a collective bargaining law and a long history of bargaining, such as New York or Michigan, and compare these attitudes with the attitudes of Ohio school leaders in this study.

2. Study the attitudes of the school leaders in a state with an open (fishbowl) bargaining law, such as Florida or Kansas, and compare these attitudes with the attitudes of Ohio school leaders in this study.

3. Repeat this study several years after the Ohio legislature enacts a collective bargaining law, if it ever does, and compare the attitudes of the school leaders in that study with the attitudes of the school leaders in this study.

4. Research the attitudes of the state legislature toward community involvement in teacher negotiations and then compare those attitudes with their voting record on past collective bargaining legislation.
Implications

The implications of this study are:

1. The results of this study indicate that the two lay groups - the school board presidents and the PTA leaders - have significantly different attitudes toward community involvement in teacher negotiations. Since they are both lay groups working toward the best education for their children, there may be a need for school board presidents and PTA leaders to examine jointly the role of lay representatives in the collective bargaining process and the role of the community in the process.

2. The results indicate that the attitudes of the PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations are very similar to the provisions embodied in the Rodda Act in California. Essentially this act provides for community input at the beginning of the negotiation process, provides for public review of the negotiation proposals, and provides for public review of the final agreement before ratification, but it does not provide for community participation at the bargaining table. It would appear that since the Ohio PTA leaders have attitudes toward community involvement in collective bargaining similar to those reflected in the provisions of the Rodda Act, that they may wish to make a careful study of this Act and the California experience under the Act, if additional collective bargaining legislation is proposed for Ohio schools.
3. The results indicate that the attitudes of the superintendents and PTA leaders are significantly different toward community involvement in teacher negotiations. The superintendents opposed each of the thirteen community involvement proposals, while the PTA leaders supported nine of the thirteen proposals. Since superintendents and PTA leaders already work cooperatively in many areas at both the local and state levels, it would appear that their differences in attitude toward community involvement in teacher negotiations would be a worthwhile topic for them to discuss mutually at both the local and state levels.

4. The results indicate that the superintendents, school board presidents, and teacher association presidents strongly favored the school board representing the community and considering the concerns of the community in teacher negotiations, but the results also indicate that they were opposed to each of the thirteen proposals to involve the community in teacher negotiations and hear their concerns. It would appear that these three groups may want to join in the search for other possible ways to hear the concerns of the community about teacher negotiations. In so doing they may more effectively represent the community's interest in teacher negotiations, which is one of the concepts each of these three groups strongly supported.

5. The results indicate that the teacher association presidents and the PTA leaders believed that Ohio needs a collective bargaining law, but that the superintendents and school board presidents opposed such legislation. Because superintendents and school
board presidents are key participants in the collective bargaining process, it would appear that the Ohio state legislature should investigate the concerns of the superintendents and the school board presidents toward collective bargaining legislation and understand their perspectives more thoroughly in the event that they attempt to develop a new collective bargaining law for Ohio.

The results indicate that the attitudes of the lay school leaders—school board presidents and PTA leaders—were significantly different toward community involvement in teacher negotiations. Since teachers, principals, and superintendents will be working closely with these lay leaders, it would appear that every effort should be made to help teachers, principals, and superintendents understand the differences in attitudes of the lay school leaders toward collective bargaining so that satisfactory means can be developed to resolve potential conflicts which may arise due to these differences in attitudes.
Appendix A

Endorsement letter from Buckeye Association of School Administrators
Endorsement letter from Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers
Letter of support from Ohio Education Association
April 17, 1979

To Whom It May Concern:

I have reviewed the questionnaire that you have before you. I believe that the information that it seeks will be beneficial to school administrators. Therefore, I would urge you to complete and return the questionnaire to doctoral student Richard Slaven.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John G. Hauck
Executive Director

[Encl.]
Richard L. Slaven
410 N. Adams Street
Loudonville, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Slaven;

The Ohio PTA is very pleased to have the opportunity to be a part of your research group for the questionnaire which will be part of your dissertation.

The Ohio PTA Legislation Program states, "It is our position that PTA should encourage local school boards to communicate freely with all their employees and to establish guidelines for collective bargaining...and Control of the public schools belongs to the taxpayers...". These two statements clearly indicate the concern of the members of the Ohio PTA in the collective bargaining process and those results. Public confidence in education can only be gained through continuous communication between the schools and the public.

The results of your study and your subsequent statement in your dissertation will be of great interest to our association and could very well assist us in setting a new direction as we address this problem.

The Ohio PTA heartily endorses your project.

Sincerely,

Barbara Sprague
Administrative Assistant
Ohio PTA

April 13, 1979
April 16, 1979

Mr. Richard L. Slaven
410 N. Adams Street
Loudonville, Ohio 44842

Dear Richard:

Thank you for the opportunity to review your proposal and the tentative questionnaire.

So there is no misunderstanding, I wish to restate OEA's position on the use of any of its mailing lists. First, we are interested in fostering educational research; however, our policy limits the use of names and addresses of OEA members.

Secondly, if a study will provide useful or new information in education, the Executive Secretary has from time to time permitted the restricted use of an OEA mailing list in the following manner:

1. The researcher will supply the materials to be mailed, envelopes, and postage. Mailing labels will be produced and paid for by the researcher.

2. All stuffing and mailing will actually be done by OEA and no mailing list will "actually" be supplied to the researcher.

Finally, I believe the questionnaire is loaded in that it does not at least recognize as one of the eleven statements that many citizens and teachers believe "the community has the right to expect its elected board of education to represent the community's interest in negotiations". Unless this or a similar statement is included, I do not believe it would be appropriate for the Association to lend any assistance to the project.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Miner
Deputy Executive Secretary

REM: dm
Appendix B

Cover letter to superintendents
Follow-up letter to superintendents
Cover letter to school board presidents
Follow-up letter to school board presidents
Cover letter to teacher association presidents
Follow-up letter to teacher association presidents
Cover letter to PTA leaders
Follow-up letter to PTA leaders
Dear Superintendent:

Enclosed is a questionnaire which will take about nine minutes to complete. It is part of a study of the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward collective bargaining and is being sent to all Ohio local, city and exempted village superintendents, school board presidents and teacher association presidents and to 350 selected Ohio PTA leaders.

This study is endorsed by the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, by the Ohio School Boards Association and by the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers and is part of a doctoral dissertation for Ohio State University.

All responses will remain anonymous and no attempt will be made to compare or contrast responses within individual school districts. There is a code number on your questionnaire but this is only to reduce the cost of a second mailing and to facilitate computer analysis of the results.

We would be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.

It is important for us to have your responses so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio school superintendents. Would you please take just a few minutes today to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in our self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

John Hauck
Executive Director
Buckeye Association of School Administrators

Richard L. Slaven, Graduate Student
Ohio State University
Past Superintendent of the
Loudonville-Perryville Schools
	serving the public school leadership team
Dear Superintendent:

Thank you for responding to the collective bargaining survey we sent you a few weeks ago. But if you haven’t had the time yet, would you please take just a few minutes right now to complete our questionnaire.

As you know, this survey is endorsed by the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, by the Ohio School Boards Association and by the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers. It is also a part of a doctoral dissertation for Ohio State University.

We need your response so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio superintendents. Would you please help us?

For your convenience we have enclosed another questionnaire and a self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation and understanding.

John Hauck
Executive Director
Buckeye Association of School Administrators

Richard L. Slayton
Graduate Student
Ohio State University
Past Superintendent of the
Loudonville-Perrysville Schools

P.S. We would be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.
Dear School Board President:

Enclosed is a questionnaire which will take about nine minutes to complete. It is part of a study of the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward collective bargaining and is being sent to all Ohio local, city and exempted village superintendents, school board presidents and teacher association presidents and to 350 selected Ohio PTA leaders.

This study is endorsed by the Ohio School Boards Association, by the Buckeye Association of School Administrators and by the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers and is part of a doctoral dissertation for The Ohio State University.

All responses will remain anonymous and no attempt will be made to compare or contrast responses within individual school districts. There is a code number on your questionnaire, but this is only to reduce the cost of a second mailing and to facilitate computer analysis of the results.

We will be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.

It is important for us to have your responses so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio school board presidents. Would you please take a few minutes today to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in our self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

David Martin
Executive Vice-President
Ohio School Boards Association

Richard Slaven, Graduate Student
The Ohio State University
Past Superintendent of the Loudonville-Perrysville Schools

serving the public school leadership team
Dear School Board President:

Thank you for responding to the collective bargaining survey we sent you a few weeks ago. But if you haven't had the time yet, would you please take just a few minutes right now to complete our questionnaire.

As you know, this survey is endorsed by the Ohio School Boards Association, by the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, and by the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers and is part of a doctoral dissertation for Ohio State University.

We need your response so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio school board presidents. Would you please help us?

For your convenience we have enclosed another questionnaire and a self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation and understanding.

David B. Martin
Executive Vice-President
Ohio School Boards Association

Richard L. Slavin, Graduate Student
Ohio State University
Past Superintendent of the Loudonville-Perrysville Schools

P.S. We would be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.
Dear Local Teacher Association President:

Enclosed is a questionnaire which will take about nine minutes to complete. It is part of a study of the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward collective bargaining and is being sent to all Ohio local, city and exempted village superintendents, teacher association presidents, and school board presidents and to 350 selected Ohio PTA leaders.

The study is part of a doctoral dissertation for Ohio State University. All responses will remain anonymous and no attempt will be made to compare or contrast responses within individual school districts. There is a code number on your questionnaire, but this is only to reduce the cost of a second mailing and to facilitate computer analysis of the results.

We will be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.

It is important for us to have your responses so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio teacher association presidents. Would you please take just a few minutes today to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in our self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Dr. Arthur E. Wohlers  Richard L. Slaven
Professor of Education  Doctoral Student
Ohio State University  Ohio State University
Dear Local Teacher Association President:

Thank you for responding to the collective bargaining survey we sent you a few weeks ago. But if you haven't had the time yet, would you please take just a few minutes right now to complete our questionnaire.

As you know, this survey is a part of a doctoral dissertation for Ohio State University and we need your response so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio teacher association presidents. Would you please help us?

For your convenience we have enclosed another questionnaire and a self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation and understanding.

Dr. Arthur E. Wohlers  Richard L. Slaven
Professor of Education  Doctoral Student
Ohio State University  Ohio State University

P. S. We would be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.
Dear PTA Leader:

Enclosed is a questionnaire which will take about nine minutes to complete. It is part of a study of the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward collective bargaining and is being sent to all Ohio local, city and exempted village superintendents, school board presidents and teacher association presidents and to 350 selected Ohio PTA leaders.

This study is endorsed by the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, by the Ohio School Boards Association and by the Buckeye Association of School Administrators and is part of a doctoral dissertation for Ohio State University.

All responses will remain anonymous and no attempt will be made to compare or contrast responses within individual school districts. There is a code number on your questionnaire but this is only to reduce the cost of a second mailing and to facilitate computer analysis of the results.

We would be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.

It is important for us to have your responses so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio PTA leaders. Please take just a few minutes today to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in our self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Mrs. Charles Overbeck, President
Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers

Richard L. Slaven, Graduate Student
Ohio State University
Past Superintendent of the
Loudonville-Perryville Schools
Dear PTA Leader:

Thank you for responding to the collective bargaining survey we sent you a few weeks ago. But if you haven't had time yet, would you please take just a few minutes right now to complete our questionnaire.

As you know, this survey is endorsed by the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, by the Ohio School Boards Association and by the Buckeye Association of School Administrators and is part of a doctoral dissertation for Ohio State University.

We need your response so we have an accurate reflection of the attitudes of Ohio PTA leaders. Would you please help us?

For your convenience we have enclosed another questionnaire and a self-addressed, postage free envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation and understanding.

Mrs. Charles Overbeck, President  Richard L. Slaven, Graduate Student
Ohio Congress of Parents and  Ohio State University
Teachers  Past Superintendent of the
Loudonville-Perrysville Schools

P.S. We would be glad to send you a copy of the results of this survey. Just put your name and address on a separate sheet of paper and forward it to us along with your questionnaire or in a separate envelope.
Appendix C

Collective Bargaining Survey Form
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SURVEY

Collective bargaining is one of the major concerns of school leaders across the nation. Thirty-three states now have collective bargaining laws that affect education and over 60% of America's teachers work pursuant to collective bargaining contracts. Four states have a collective bargaining law requiring that all teacher negotiation sessions be held in public, while eleven other states have sunshine laws requiring either open negotiations or some form of community involvement in teacher negotiations.

A recent study showed that Florida's school leaders have mixed feelings toward community involvement in teacher negotiations. This questionnaire attempts to assess the attitudes of Ohio school leaders in this important area. By completing this questionnaire you will be helping us to understand better the attitudes of Ohio school leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations.

The following statements represent the entire span of community involvement in teacher negotiations. Needless to say, some school leaders believe the community should be involved in teacher negotiations only through its school board, while others feel the community should be involved as an independent third party at the bargaining table. How do you feel?

Please indicate whether you agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree or disagree with each of the following fifteen statements:

1 = agree
2 = tend to agree
3 = tend to disagree
4 = disagree

Circle the appropriate response.

1. The school board should take the responsibility for representing the community's interest in teacher negotiations.

2. The school board should consider the expressed concerns of the community when it formulates its teacher bargaining priorities.

3. During the period of teacher negotiations the community should be kept informed about all school board deliberations and decisions relating to the negotiation process.

4. The school board should establish a definite process for community input into teacher negotiations before actual negotiations begin.

5. The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues at a public hearing before actual negotiations begin.

6. The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through extensive public opinion surveys.
7. The community should have an opportunity to express its views on current negotiation issues through Community Advisory Committees.

8. The initial bargaining proposals of the teacher association and the school board should be available for public review through such means as public meetings or media releases.

9. Any proposal or counterproposal introduced at the bargaining table should be available for public review through such means as public meetings or media releases.

10. A Community Advisory Committee should be allowed to observe teacher negotiation sessions but not participate in them.

11. Community members and the media should be allowed to observe all teacher negotiation sessions.

12. Community representatives should be allowed to participate at the bargaining table, prior to impasse, as mediators of disputes.

13. Community representatives should be allowed to participate at the bargaining table as an independent third party.

14. Community members should have an opportunity to express their views on the final agreement at a public hearing before ratification by the school board.

15. The final agreement of teacher negotiations should be ratified through a public referendum.

16. The scope of teacher negotiations should be limited to discussions on the following: (Check only one response.)

1) Salary and fringe benefits only
2) Salary, fringe benefits and conditions of employment (class size, seniority, planning time, reduction in force, etc.)
3) Any item of concern to either party

17. Do you believe Ohio needs a collective bargaining law for public employees? (Circle the appropriate response.)

YES  NO

18. Suppose that a collective bargaining law were being written by the state legislature today, and you (personally) had an opportunity to guarantee that one provision would be put into the law. Please check the one provision that would be your highest priority for a collective bargaining law.

1) Limiting scope of bargaining to salary and fringe benefits only
2) Establishing a broad scope of items that are subject to bargaining
3) Outlawing the right of teachers to strike
4) Affirming the right of teachers to strike
5) Binding arbitration to settle negotiation impasses
6) Binding arbitration as the last step of the grievance procedure
7) Agency shop provision
8) Other (Explain: ____________________________ )
19. Would you support legislation mandating some form of community involvement in teacher negotiations? (Circle appropriate response.)

YES NO

20. Does your school board negotiate with its teacher association? (Circle appropriate response.)

YES NO

21. Has your school board ever opened its teacher negotiation sessions to the public? (Circle appropriate response.)

YES NO

22. Has your school district ever experienced a teacher strike? (Circle appropriate response.)

YES NO

23. Has your school board ever used an outside negotiator at the teacher negotiation bargaining table? (Circle appropriate response.)

YES NO

24. Has your teacher association ever used an outside negotiator at the bargaining table? (Circle appropriate response.)

YES NO

25. What is your present student enrollment in Grades K-12, including Joint Vocational School students? (Circle appropriate response.)

under 1500 1500-2999 3000-15,000 over 15,000

26. Do you have any further suggestions or comments which would help us to understand better your attitudes toward community involvement in teacher negotiations or related items?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your cooperation and understanding.
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