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Introduction and Significance of the Study

The activities surrounding collective bargaining in Ohio schools have been without the guidance of any state legislation. Only the Ferguson Act, (R.C. 4117.01) which forbids strikes by public employees, provides any information. As a result of this statutory void, administrators throughout the state of Ohio are bargaining within various levels of sophistication and without the relevant information regarding what is happening in other Ohio schools. Decision and policy making without this information increases the uncertainty under which administrators must attempt to make decisions.

In August 1974, the Ohio School Boards Association (OSBA) began a project to "assess and monitor the activity of school districts in the area of collective bargaining." It was also the goal of this OSBA project to illustrate precisely what negotiation activity was occurring and provide this information to Ohio administrators.

The initial survey forms, distributed during the summers of 1974 and 1975, collected data regarding negotiated agreements and employee activity during the 1973-74 and 1974-75 school years. More than 63% of the school districts responded to the surveys. In the fall of 1977, surveys were again distributed requesting data pertaining to the terms and conditions of employment effective during the previous (1976-77) school year. Over 67% of the 616 city, exempted village and local districts responded. These districts employed 73% of all the public classroom teachers in the State of Ohio. More than 74% of the operational joint vocational school districts also responded to the survey.
The data collected from the responding districts has been extrapolated to reflect statewide practices and trends.²

Attempting to determine what the key issues influencing education have been, are, or what they will be has always been problematic for public school administrators. The atmosphere of uncertainty created by the lack of uniform statute controlling public sector collective bargaining and the lack of current and relevant information have made decision making most difficult and added to the complexity of any long range planning.

During the past ten years, discussion and debate on public education collective bargaining have been on the increase. Of the 271 Ph.D. dissertations written since 1960 relating to educational collective bargaining, 216 have been written since 1970. In the five year period between 1970 and 1975, 109 dissertations were written, and in the three year period between 1975 and 1978, 97 dissertations have been written.

As recently as November 1979, a dissertation by Richard L. Slaven examined the attitudes of various groups toward community involvement in the negotiation process.³ The purpose of Slaven's study was to:

compare and analyze the differences in attitudes of Ohio superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents and PTA leaders toward community involvement in teacher negotiations and to identify how these attitudes 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.
This study also indentified the attitudes of Ohio School leaders toward the enactment of collective bargaining legislation for Ohio public employees, toward legislation mandating community involvement in teacher negotiation, and toward the scope of teacher negotiations.

The answers to Slaven's hypotheses and the implications found in his study provide additional information for administrators
in Ohio to minimize uncertainty when formulating negotiations decisions.

In addition to the numerous local and state surveys and studies being done, the literature is replete with national studies concerning education and collective bargaining. An excellent example is Trends in Collective Bargaining in Public Education by the American Association of School Personnel Administrators (AASPA). The major problem of this study was:

...to investigate current trends in collective bargaining in the public schools (K-12) in the United States and to analyze the percentages of the following groups with respect to collective bargaining practices in their school districts: (a) administrators who are members of AASPA, (b) leaders of teachers' associations and unions, and (c) members of the National Association of Educational Negotiators.

Sponsored by AASPA's Negotiations Committee, questionnaires were sent to 250 randomly selected school administrators who were members of AASPA, the teacher union or association leader in the districts represented by the 250 school administrators, and 250 randomly selected members of the National Association of Educational Negotiators.

These three studies (AASPA, Slaven, and OSBA) provide information covering a wide scope of collective bargaining issues. However, when the scope of study is broad, depth and detail are often sacrificed. When school districts bargaining the year round are averaged in with districts who meet for 2 1/2 hours to bargain a three year agreement, a very non-representative depiction may occur.

With an ever increasing need for relevant information to facilitate decision making in collective bargaining, an in-depth case study is needed to supplement the vast amount of hortative literature that is being written. The literature that pertains to strikes specifically is limited to describing one aspect of a strike situation, i.e., planning or communicating. The in-depth studies have been limited to
one or two specific school systems and the unique experiences they had. The Pigors state in their book: "We study cases about social relationships with the aim of learning how to do better in our own relationships with people." "What lies ahead in the area of collective bargaining in education will, in a large measure, be determined by what groundwork is laid today and what actions are taken." One thing is certain, nothing can be done unless an attempt is made to determine what the future trends might be through a look at what has happened and is happening - this is the basis for good planning. It is therefore the purpose of this study to investigate the perceptions, attitudes, and roles of those who were involved in a strike situation so that this information can provide a baseline for future decision making and planning.

Statement of the Problem

The various contingencies impinging upon the school system make a "cookbook" of answers to bargaining questions impossible. Since many quantitative studies of Ohio and national bargaining issues are available, a more in-depth, qualitative study of selected Ohio schools is needed to investigate and discover the specific reasons, attitudes, perceptions, planning, decision making and communicating that led to some of the issues identified in the quantitative studies.

Simply stated, does the comparison of broad based studies on collective bargaining with an in-depth study of the perceptions, attitudes, and roles of the superintendent, board president, teachers' association representative, and PTA president, who have been involved in a strike situation, provide any specific information which would aid in or facilitate communication, planning, and decision making before, during, and after a strike.

The following general research questions are analyzed in order that present and future strike participants will better understand and be prepared to avoid a strike or to anticipate the communicative, procedural, and emotional needs during a
strike. The data necessary to answer these questions will be collected through the use of the interview guide found in Appendix A of this paper.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association representative, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same in the future?

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

VI. Are the answers to these questions similar when school district geographic location and enrollment are considered?

In addition to these general questions, the following specific questions relating to the general questions will be analyzed:

I. a. Are the negotiations at the bargaining table open to the public?
   b. When was the possibility of a strike first realized by each of the four interviewed groups?
   c. Were there any written procedures for handling a strike situation made by the board of education before, during, or after the strike?
   d. What did each group perceive as the key issues causing the strike?
   e. In the opinion of each interviewee, what percentage of the teachers supported the strike?
   f. What kinds of pressures were perceived by the four groups as being part of the strike experiences?
   g. Did any of the four perceive anxieties during the strike among: teachers? students? administrators? parents? non-parent community members?
   i. What were the reactions of each group as to how these threats and acts of violence were handled?
j. Were local law enforcement agencies called in during the strike? What were each group's perceptions as to why they were called in? How often were they called in?

k. Was an outside negotiator used by the board of education? By teachers?


II. a. What were the attitudes of the four groups toward the role played by the board of education's outside negotiator?

b. In your opinion, did the board's negotiator bring any preplanned attitudes, goals, or opinions to the negotiation process?

c. Did any of the four groups perceive that fewer emotional issues were discussed because of the presence of the outside negotiator?

d. Did any of the groups perceive a change in the attitudes of any of the parties toward collective bargaining as a result of the role played by the board's outside negotiator? How were these attitudes changed?

e. Did any of the groups perceive the board's negotiator's role effecting the size or type of final settlement?

f. Did any of the groups perceive the board's negotiator's role effecting the length of the bargaining process? Length of the strike?

III. a. The same questions from the general statement II are used, but the questions are addressed to the teachers' association outside negotiator.

IV. a. Steps to impasse

b. Anxiety

c. Threats of violence

d. Violence

e. The use of substitute teachers

f. Press and media coverage

g. Settling the strike

V. a. Would the group you represent support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff? Why or why not?

b. Would the group you represent support legislation prohibiting teachers' strikes? Why or why not?

c. Would the group you represent support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step? Why or why not?
d. Would the group you represent support binding arbitration as an alternative to strikes? Why or why not?

e. What kind of legislation, if any, would your group support? Why?

VI. a. Does the awareness of the strike related issues by the four groups vary when geographic location or enrollment is considered?

b. Does the influence of the board of education's outside negotiator on the bargaining or strike process vary when geographic location or enrollment is considered?

c. Does the influence of the teachers' association's outside negotiator on the bargaining or strike process vary when geographic location or enrollment is considered?

d. Does the way special strike related issues are handled vary when geographic location or enrollment is considered?

e. Does the type of legislation or type of persons supporting that legislation vary when geographic location or enrollment is considered?

In order that the data from this case study may be compared to specific broad-based surveys, the following questions from the Slaven and AASPA studies will be included in the interview guide:

From the Slaven study:
1. Should negotiations be open to the public?
2. Who supports community involvement in the negotiations process?
3. Are the answers to the first two questions affected by the districts geographic location or ADM?
4. Who supports legislation mandating community involvement in collective bargaining?
5. Who supports legislation outlawing teachers the right to strike?
6. Who supports legislation mandating collective bargaining with teachers?

From the AASPA study:
1. Who negotiates for the board of education?
2. Are negotiations open to the public?
3. Should negotiations be open to the public?
4. What type of third party impasse resolution is most frequently used?
5. What is the most frequently used final grievance procedure step?
6. Who favors legislation mandating collective bargaining with teachers?

Finally, the following quantitative questions from the OSBA survey will be asked in a questionnaire (See Appendix B) to each of the responding superintendents:

From the OSBA study:
1. Who negotiates for the board of education?
2. What type of third party intervention is used most frequently?
3. What is the estimated number of hours spent by the superintendent on negotiations?
4. What is the estimated number of hours spent by the board of education on negotiations?
5. What is the estimated number of hours spent by other administrators on negotiations?
6. What is the estimated number of hours spent by clerical personnel on negotiations?
7. What is the final step of the grievance policy?

Methodology

This study will be conducted as a case study.

A case study is similar to a survey, but instead of gathering data concerning a few facts from a large number of social units, the investigator makes an intensive study of a limited number of representative cases. A case study is narrower in scope but more exhaustive and more qualitative in nature than a survey. Because word descriptions reveal a wealth of enlightened information that a quantitative study might not be able to produce, the case study is often used to supplement the survey method.10

The case study proposed here will include data from collective negotiations before, during, and after a strike. An investigator may examine the total life cycle of a social unit or focus attention on some specific phase of it.11

A stratified random sampling procedure will be used to select the districts to be interviewed.
Since a randomly selected sample, particularly a small sample, may by chance have an undue proportion of one type of unit in it, an investigator may use stratified random sampling to get a more representative sample. When employing this technique, he divided his population into strata by some characteristic which is known from previous research or theories to be related to the phenomenon under investigation, and from each of these smaller homogeneous groups he draws at random a predetermined number of units.12

Twelve Ohio school districts that have experienced a teachers' strike during the 1977-78 or 1978-79 school year will be randomly selected. For the purposes of this study, the 36 school districts (JVS and TMR districts not included) which experienced strikes will first be placed in ascending order by enrollment or average daily membership (ADM). This ascending order list will then be divided into four equal groups of nine (9) districts each. In ascending order of ADM, the first nine districts will be assigned to group A, the next nine districts to group B, the next nine to group C, and the final nine districts to group D. (See Table 1 for group assignments).

For a geographic comparison the eighty-eight (88) counties in the State of Ohio will be divided into geographic quadrants of twenty-two (22) counties each: northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest. (See Figure 1 for map of Ohio counties and locations of school districts and Table 1 for county assignment to quadrant).

The districts to be selected represent one-third of the total striking districts or twelve (12) districts. Three districts will be randomly selected from each group. Since twenty of the thirty-six striking districts are found in the northeast quadrant, one northeastern district will be selected from each group, the other two districts from each group will alternate between the other three quadrants.
With each district selected, the superintendent, board president, teacher association representative, and PTA president in those positions at the time of the strike will be interviewed. As stated in the Problem Statement, both a questionnaire and an interview will be used to collect data. "When we design a research strategy, we must not assume that we need to choose between a mailed questionnaire or an interview. It is possible to collect a part of the information in one way and part in the other." Any district chosen which declines to participate will be replaced by another district from the same group and if possible, from the same quadrant.

In the event that any of the participants within a school district decline to be interviewed, a designee may be made by the person originally contacted. For example: a superintendent may decline to be interviewed because the strike was handled by an assistant superintendent. A school board president may decline to be interviewed because another member of the board was more actively involved during the strike. A PTA president may decline to be interviewed because another member of the community was more actively involved in the strike.

If four participants, either the original four or their designee, can not be interviewed from each district, that district will be replaced by another; of comparable size and location if possible.

**Data Collection Sequence**

1. A contact letter (see Appendix C) will be sent to the stratified random sample of twelve superintendents.

2. Within a week to ten days of the mailing of the contact letter, a phone call will be made to each superintendent requesting an appointment for an interview.

3. Those superintendents expressing a willingness to participate will be asked for the names of those persons in
Table 1
Ohio counties: Divided by Halves and Quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Half</th>
<th>Southern Half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest Quadrant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Northeast Quadrant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auglaize</td>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>Columbiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin</td>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Geauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Huron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulding</td>
<td>Lorain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>Mahoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>Portage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Richland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Wert</td>
<td>Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast Quadrant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Southeast Quadrant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Coshocton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Gallia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke</td>
<td>Hocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>Licking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Meigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Muskingum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Noble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickaway</td>
<td>Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>Scioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preble</td>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Vinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their system who held the office of school board president, PTA president, and teachers' association representative during the strike.

4. Each board president, PTA president, and teachers' association representative will be contacted by telephone to request an appointment for an interview.

5. Any district in which at least three of the interviewees will not respond will not be used and will be replaced by a district in the same geographic quadrant and same enrollment group, if possible.

6. A questionnaire (see Appendix B) and interview date confirmation letter (see Appendix D) will be sent to each superintendent as soon as interviews are scheduled with at least three of the participants in each system. This questionnaire will be collected at the time of the superintendent's interview.

7. An interview confirmation letter (see Appendix E) will be sent to each board of education president, PTA president, and teachers' association representative that agrees to an interview.

8. The interviews will be conducted as scheduled.

Each superintendent, board president, teacher representative and PTA president will be personally interviewed by this writer.

Even where facts are readily available from other sources perhaps more accurately than they could be determined from an interview, it is frequently important to find out how the individual feels about the facts, how they seem to effect his opinions, attitudes, and behavior.

The interview is often the only means available to obtain these subjective facts of attitude preference and opinion as well as objective facts known only to the individual being interviewed.

The same interview guide will be used for all four interviews so that inconsistencies of responses can be determined among respondents from the same districts.

The first stage of data analysis will involve the quantitative summarization of the questionnaire data.
These data will be placed in tabular form as follows: a frequency analysis to the questionnaire by district group, district location, and frequency analysis by all respondents, with modal tendencies indicated.

The mean responses by all respondents to the questionnaire will be compared, in tabular form, to the following questions and results found in the Ohio School Boards Association study, Negotiation Benchmark: Where We Are Today.

1. Who negotiates for the board of education?
2. What type of third party intervention is used most frequently?
3. What is the estimated number of hours spent by the superintendent on negotiations?
4. What is the estimated number of hours spent by the board of education on negotiations?
5. What is the estimated number of hours spent by other administrators?
6. What is the estimated number of hours spent by clerical personnel on negotiations?
7. What is the final step of the grievance policy?

A qualitative analysis and summarization of these two studies will then be made. "A qualitative analysis provides an explicit rendering of the structure, order, and patterns found among a set of participants."15

The interview data will be subjected to a sample frequency analysis for each type of interview (superintendent, board of education president, teachers' association representative, and PTA president). This analysis will summarize responses to those interview questions for which frequency of responses is a useful appropriate measure. For example, question number 3 on the interview guide asks: "Are negotiations at your bargaining table open to the public?" The responses to this question can be easily and meaningfully summarized according to the frequency with which categories of responses are made. Since many of the items in the interview are open-ended, the frequency analysis can not be based upon pre-existing response categories. In addition,
a chart will be made from the frequency analysis indicating consistent and inconsistent responses from the various interviewees. For example, 4 out of 12 superintendents might disagree with the other people in their district that were interviewed as to the amount of post-strike anxiety.

In addition, the findings and conclusions to the following questions, found in the interview guide, will be compared in tabular form to the findings and conclusions of the same questions asked in the Slaven and AASPA studies:

From the Slaven study:
1. Should negotiations be open to the public?
2. Who supports community involvement in the negotiation process?
3. Are the answers to the first two questions affected by the district's geographic location or ADM?
4. Who supports legislation mandating community involvement in collective bargaining?
5. Who supports legislation outlawing the right of teachers to strike?
6. Who supports legislation mandating collective bargaining with teachers?

From the AASPA study:
1. Who negotiates for the board of education?
2. Are negotiations open to the public?
3. Should negotiations be open to the public?
4. What type of third party impasse resolution is most frequently used?
5. What is the most frequently used final grievance procedure step?
6. Who favors legislation mandating collective bargaining with teachers?

A qualitative summarization of all of the interviews will be made to provide explicit rendering of the structure, order, and patterns found among the respondents, including any influence district ADM or geographic location might have on the findings.

It should be emphasized that the interview guide is only an outline. Since many of the items on the guide are open-ended, various responses from the respondents may suggest or require unplanned questions for clarification of the response.
If any unexpected patterns develop among the respondents in the form of unplanned questions, they will be added to the appropriate section of analysis.

Limitations of the Study

During the interview process, no attempt will be made to record nonverbal communication: prozemics, chronemics, kinesis, or paralinguistics. To record these kinds of nonverbal observations requires the development of observational skills for which this researcher does not have the resources or time required to develop these skills.

The validity of the data will be limited to the ability and willingness of the respondents to respond truthfully and candidly.
Footnotes for Chapter I


2Ibid., p.3.


4Ibid.


6Ibid., p.3.

7Ibid., p.3.


9Evans, op. cit., p.38


11Ibid., p. 208.

12Ibid., p.322.


14Ibid., p.8.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Since the position of a school executive head was first conceived, no one fact has or possibly will affect his role as much as collective bargaining. This dissertation is based on the three assumptions used by Charles Young:

1. Teacher militance will continue at an accelerated rate and intensity, and it will manifest itself in reasonably predictable patterns as it reaches all regions of the country.

2. Teachers' organizations and state statutes will obligate the educational community to use the collective bargaining model patented by the private sector of our economy.

3. The single most significant determinant of the character of the superintendency in the foreseeable future will be teacher militance and its chief instrument - collective bargaining.

The topics reviewed will be presented in the order they might be expected to appear in the event of a work stoppage: before, during, and after the strike.

Brief History of Collective Bargaining in Public Education

Although collective bargaining in education did not begin to intensify until 1960, the first teachers' strike in the United States took place in Norwalk, Connecticut, in 1946.\footnote{18} The strike left scars that took a long time to heal. Feelings ran high, citizens were indignant, and teachers embittered. Better teachers avoided employment there, and education-minded parents looked elsewhere for schools for their children
In 1961, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) won a landmark victory in New York City by winning an election to represent the entire city. Before this election, over 90 agents were representing different groups of teachers in various schools.3

President Kennedy, in 1962, issued Executive Order 10988 which affirmed the right of federal workers to organize and negotiate, but not to strike. This right was only extended to those federal employees whose secretary decided to accept the right; i.e. the Secretary of Defense did not extend the right to negotiate to the military. The order did, however, affect teachers working in federal establishments. Many non-federally employed teachers saw a natural transition to them from this order and began bargaining demands despite local restrictions.

As early as 1971, 26 states4 had permissive or mandatory statutes governing board-staff relationships. Among these various methods only a very few had a limited right to strike clause. In some states, all employees are covered except the chief officer, whereas in others, principal and other "middle management" are not covered by the legislation.

Despite the legislation and Executive Orders against strikes, the decade of the 60's was plagued by teacher strikes. The 1960-61 school year began the decade with three teacher strikes while the 1969-70 school year closed the decade with 180 teacher strikes. All totaled, this turbulent ten year period spawned 500 strikes and cost over 1/2 million man days of instruction.5

accounted for 85 per cent of all the decade's strikes and 80 per cent of the man days lost. 6

Most of these teacher work actions can be related to one of six basic issues: 1. representation disputes between school boards and the teachers, 2. negotiation impasses, 3. disagreements over implementation of various items already negotiated, 4. disputes over local and state financing, 5. occasional refusal of some teachers to cross picket lines of other striking groups, and 6. unsafe working conditions or disorders within school buildings. 7 It is also interesting to note that the absence or presence of mandatory negotiation legislation did not seem to help. Michigan, the state with the largest number of strikes, passed permissive legislation in 1965, while Ohio, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, states with the next highest level of strike activity, had no legislation.

Since 1965 Pennsylvania has passed permissive legislation, 8 while Ohio and Illinois have not. As of 1978 twenty states have passed legislation which includes the right of middle management to bargain as a unit. 9 As of this same year thirty nine states have allowed some type of grievance procedure to be bargained, and forty seven states have allowed for impasse procedures within the permissive legislation. 10

In Ohio, strike activity reached its height during the 1973-74 school year when 28 teacher strikes were called. From the 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. 11

In Ohio, there was a decrease in strike activity as the 1970's waned, with a dramatic increase the last two years: 21 strikes in 1972-73, 28 strikes in 1973-74, 18 strikes in 1974-75, 16 strikes in 1975-76, 16 strikes in 1976-77, 22 strikes in 1977-78, and 24 strikes in the 1978-79 school year. 12
The Bargaining Process

Most public employee bargaining laws use the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) as a model. In the private sector, the NLRA defines the duty to bargain in Section 8 (d):

The mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment,... but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of concessions...

"Unfortunately, evidence suggests that state laws that emulate them (NLRA) are not very successful in transferring private sector bargaining processes to the public sector." What then are the differences between public and private sector collective bargaining that makes transfer difficult?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Selects its target populations for marketing products</td>
<td>1) Must accept clients who live within the district boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Prices can be increased by management</td>
<td>2) Citizens vote on most tax increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Can change its location seeking more favorable work force</td>
<td>3) School district can not move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Can go out of business if unable to meet union demands</td>
<td>4) School districts stay in business no matter what happens (almost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Can share profits with workers</td>
<td>5) Schools have no profits to share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Customers select and pay for the products or services they want</td>
<td>6) All citizens pay for school services whether or not they use them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of these "differences" are a result of the political nature of public sector bargaining, the impact of the political nature on decision making, the changing political climate, and the changing economic climate. Lewin, Feuille, and Kochan state that:

the political nature of government is the key feature from which flow most of the important differences between public and private sector labor relations,...

School systems, being a part of government, are limited by legislative mandates and organization. The assignment of specific groups of students to specific districts has been deemed the most efficient way to organize the education of large groups of students. The policy setting body of this organization is the school board. Be that board elected or appointed, the board makes the final decision making body directly dependent to the consumer for their position or membership on the board. Therefore, when management in this case the administration, begins to bargain, the employee union or teachers have multiple points of access to decision makers. They can appeal to administration, the board, and the public who elects the board and pays for the schools. "Although this is a problem that faces all employers when bargaining arrives on the scene, the political nature of public employers and the traditions of separation of powers, representative government, and multiple points of access to decision makers increase the magnitude of the problem for the public employer." More recently the economic environment has placed additional pressures on public sector bargaining. "The tightening economic constraints are partly a function of the prolonged and deep recession accompanied by high levels of inflation that the American economy experienced in early and mid-1970's, and partly a function of the longer term economic and social decline of many American cities."
During this time, state and local government, including schools, have found themselves in a period of "catchup" in wages. With the increased demands for wages, inflationary costs of utilities, and the loss of or at best constant tax bases, the schools have had to repeatedly go to the public for more funds.

The changing economic environment and political nature of public sector bargaining has forced politicians to take a different approach to bargaining. Since labor costs are the biggest single controllable item in state and local government budgets, politicians have turned to a hard-line bargaining policy as one means of dealing with their economic problems. This strategy partly reflects economic necessity, and partly a reaction or backlash to the perceived excesses of bargaining settlements, that were negotiated during the first generation, especially in the areas of pensions and other fringe benefits.19

The concern for the economic well-being in public sector bargaining has created yet another difference between private and public sector bargaining.

Public Participation in Bargaining

"It may be your contract," a Milwaukee mother screamed at a local teacher union leader recently, "but it's my taxes and my kid's education."20 This outburst, however filled with rage and frustration, is not an isolated incident. In a 1979 study, Ohio PTA leaders supported community input at the beginning of the negotiation process, supported public review of negotiation proposals, and supported public review of the final agreement before ratification by the school board.21 This same study found that "Ohio PTA leaders supported legislation mandating some form of community involvement in teacher negotiations, while superintendents, school board presidents, and teachers association presidents opposed such legislation."22
According to a recent Gallup study commissioned by the National School Boards Association, "an overwhelming majority of the adult public doesn't know with whom teacher unions negotiate, much less understand what the school board's role is in the bargaining process."^3

But who is the "public" in a school district? If the majority of the "adult public does not understand the bargaining relationship, then who is demanding to be included? Jones believes a very small number of the education community turned citizen advocate. "These are persons who, with a trendy toehold on the bicentennial bandwagon, are beating the barrios, the ghettos, and even the suburbs in a well-intentioned attempt to drum up enthusiasm for a return of 'participatory democracy' to public education."^4

Parents and community groups form the public in Detroit and have been rebellious of the "closed society" (i.e. collective bargaining) procedures employed by the school board and the teachers' union. These parent and community groups are demanding a seat at the bargaining table. The major reason for the community's adamant stance is that decisions made at the bargaining table have profound implication for educational policy.

...the most recent master contract (i.e., 1977-78) with the Detroit Federation of Teachers contained many educational issues that concerned parents. These included curriculum offerings in middle schools, class size, attendance at teacher in-service workshops, attendance at parent-teacher meetings, selection of security personnel, report card system and student grading, length of class period, and discipline procedures.^5

Many parents believe that the absence of public voice in the collective bargaining process is a clear violation of the basic American belief of "no taxation without representation," and it runs counter to the principle that those who are directly affected by public decisions should
participate in making those decisions.\textsuperscript{26} 

Some groups perceive that teacher unions have increased their own power, security, and finances with "no discernable benefit" to the client, the student. In a monograph developed by the Detroit Schools, the achievement levels for Detroit's students in reading and mathematics have been reported to be below national averages.\textsuperscript{27} Jones goes so far as to say that:

\begin{quote}
Unless we get a third force, representing citizen interests in education, I see no way to turn back this tide of teacher power. School boards will become increasingly important, and therefore, I see the governance of education basically being turned over to the teacher unions in the next decade.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

Task Force '74 (an offshoot of the C.F. Kettering Foundation supported National Commission on Reform of Secondary Education) also strongly favors an expanding of the collective bargaining process to include a greater degree of public involvement:

\begin{quote}
The chief reason, says the report of the task force, is to keep school systems accountable to the public: The battle to make school personnel accountable for the outcome of their work can be lost in the negotiating room, and the public will never get a chance to say anything about it.\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}

The Task Force '74 goes on to suggest that before a contract is signed, "Upon completion of privately conducted negotiations - but prior to the signing of any collective bargaining agreement - the school board should be required to hold a series of public hearings to allow maximum citizen input before final contract approval."\textsuperscript{30}

Critics of public involvement in bargaining maintain that:

\begin{quote}
Participation of the public in contract negotiations between school boards and teacher organizations in principle appears to be a worthwhile idea, but it has one flaw. It just will not work.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}
Leddy believes that the one man, one vote approach will only accomplish "dreary speechmaking, heated irrelevancies, and perhaps, mass rioting." Is the public then not to be represented at the bargaining table? Leddy maintains that: "it is already represented and will continue to be represent­ed by the very group which the public has voted to represent it since school districts were first established - the board of school directors, or school board."33

No definitive answer to open bargaining appears to have been reached. Advocates of both sides maintain such an answer will come in the decade of the 80's. A more pressing question may be why school teachers organize and bargain so strongly against school boards and their administrations.

Planning and Preparing for a Strike

Regardless of the depth of your commitment and the soundness of your psychological preparation, you cannot expect to operate your schools with some semblance of normalcy during a strike unless you've devised a detailed and carefully thought-out plan that is ready for immediate execution the moment a strike is called.34

Basically two reasons exist for preparing a strike plan before the strike actually occurs. First, during the early hours of the strike a violent action such as a brick through the board president's front window would normally cause fear and confusion, both of which would color judgment at that time. "The lesson: have a plan that anticipates the likelihood of your judgments being distorted by emotion and that forces you to adhere to earlier decisions that were made when a calmer atmosphere prevailed; then follow that plan religiously even though the fear in your heart and gut may tell you to grab a machine gun."35 Secondly, a carefully made plan will make many decisions during the strike automatic, providing time for the administration and the board to deal with unanticipated problems.
Robert Chain, deputy executive secretary and general counsel for the National Education Association (NEA) admits:

...school boards now realize that they can take a strike, that there are weapons to use to fight a strike, and that boards can effectively use these weapons. When teachers use the word 'strike' school boards no longer are panicked.\cite{36}

Reasons for this new found strength among school boards vary. Some point to recent Supreme Court decisions supporting school boards. \cite{Hortonville Education Assn. v. Hortonville Joint School District N.1,66 Wis. 2d 469, 225 N.W. 2d 658 (1975).} In this case the court upheld the firing of illegally striking teachers and the hiring of scabs. Another reason for school boards militance is the experience and maturing of these boards of education through the turbulent and uncertain times of the 1970's.

Boards aren't running to the courts to seek injunctions, but instead are taking actions on their own. Boards have learned how to use the press to tell their side of the story, and have reaped the benefit of increased public support. And boards have learned that there are lots of unemployed teachers who are more than willing to step in and keep schools open during a teacher strike.\cite{37}

Curtailing the effectiveness of a strike appears to rest on one factor, careful planning. "Faced with the possibility of a strike we asked ourselves a series of questions. The answers to these questions helped to formulate a plan to deal with a strike."\cite{38} The questions and answers to pre-strike decisions may vary from school to school, depending upon the environment, economic, geographic, financial, and political contingencies impinging upon that school district. The next few paragraphs will attempt to deal with the basic questions that might be found in every school system.
Should Schools Remain Open During the Strike?

Most states make it clear that school boards and their administrators are responsible for keeping schools open. However, unless most of the following questions can be answered in the positive, keeping schools open may not be possible.

1. A teacher strike is not the worst thing that can happen to public education in your community.
2. Nobody ever should have promised you that service on a school board – much less as a superintendent – would be rosy all of the time.
3. Your task is neither to provoke a strike nor to bait the union.
4. A strike is serious, ugly business; it will cause you grief and even personal fear; you must be prepared to face this certainty.
5. Once you’ve resolved to hold fast to your responsibility to keep schools operating for the public during a strike, the most disastrous thing you can do is cave in.39

The answers to these questions will help to determine if the board and administration have proper attitudes and commitments to keep schools open. Hatch suggests that the next step in developing the plan is:

1. With your attorney, review all pertinent legislation and other legal incumbencies that apply to your situation.
2. Review all pertinent board policies and modify those that are too vague or too rigid.
3. Line up replacement teachers and have them briefed and ready to go.
4. Plan a public information center – its whereabouts, its staff, and its equipment.
5. Plan an internal communications center – its whereabouts, its staff, and its equipment.
6. Have a comprehensive security plan in place well in advance of the anticipated strike date.40

Numerous guides and lists can be added to this one by Hatch, Cochran,41 Kohler and Hill,42 Winston,43 and Cramer44 all provide extensive lists and suggestions of things a strike plan should include. One factor seems to overshadow the
questions asked, have a plan. "These kinds of questions (and many others), many board members now realize should have been decided earlier, and plans should have established long before the first pickets appeared."

Will An Injunction be Sought?

"Most certainly, nothing your school board decides under pressure of an actual strike is likely to be cool. So prepare: thrash out the pros and cons of injunction-seeking now, before teachers pick up their placards."

There are many factors which effect the decisions to go for an injunction: probable attitude of the court, the expectations of the community, the prospects for a settlement, state labor laws, the possible rivalries among competing teacher groups, unique characteristics of each school, the relative capacities of board and union to absorb the financial, psychic and pedagogic costs of an injunction.

Sometimes injunctions will stop a strike. To illustrate, consider the New York City teacher walkout of 1962. "Teachers in that one were back to work almost before the ink was dry on the judges writ."

However, injunctions are sometimes denied, leaving the board and administration charged before the union, the community, and the press. A survey conducted by the American School Board Journal suggests a sharp division of opinion about the desirability of going to court during a strike. The American School Board Journal sent questionnaires to 101 school systems that had been hit by strikes at the beginning of the 1975-76 school year. The results of this study were as follows:

Only 43 per cent of school systems that were struck sought injunctive relief. The others were divided into two distinct categories. One group - 23 per cent of the total - reported that a settlement was reached before an injunction was sought... Thirty-four per cent of the districts sought no injunctions and...
A second finding may be more significant. Nearly 90 per cent of the school systems said they would repeat their action of 1975 if teachers went on strike again. Sixty-one per cent thought a legal obligation exists to seek injunctive relief; 50 per cent thought an injunction would stop the strike; 42 per cent said the public expects the school district to seek an injunction; 32 per cent thought court involvement brings both sides together; 16 per cent doubted that an injunction can end a strike but viewed a court order as strengthening management's position; 16 per cent expressed miscellaneous other views.

Another source of controversy is dissent about the proper role of courts in school affairs. "In 1930, Felix Frankfurter argued that the use of antistrike injunctions undermined the legitimacy of the judicial system." His argument helped pave the way for the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which severely restricted the use of antistrike injunctions in the private sector (but not in the public sector). A similar argument could be made today: thousands of teachers have defied antistrike injunctions, and that fact surely has affected youngsters' emerging conceptions about the rule of law in a free society."

In Hawaii, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, teacher strikes are permitted under these conditions:

- The strike is being called by the exclusive bargaining agent;
- All impasse procedures have been exhausted;
- A specified number of days has elapsed since the fact-finding board made its recommendations public;
- The exclusive bargaining agent has given notice of its intent to strike;
- The employer has had an opportunity to petition the public employee relations board or a court of law in the event of danger to the public's health and safety.

In common law, there is no right to strike in the public or private sector. While the U.S. Constitution under the first amendment does include rights of association, free speech, and equal protection under the law, it does not
include a right to strike. In Ohio we have the "Ferguson Act." R.C. 4117.01 to 4117.05. "No public employee shall strike." (R.C. 4117.02). Furthermore,

No person exercising any authority, supervision, or direction over any public employee shall have the power to authorize, approve, or consent to a strike by one or more public employees, and such persons shall not authorize, approve, or consent to such strike.

Before an understanding of law can be perceived, a definition of a strike in order. A strike is defined in two places in the Ferguson Act. To strike means:

the failure to report for duty, the willful absence from one's position, the stoppage of work or the abstinence in whole or in part from the full, faithful and proper performance of the duties of employment, for the purpose of inducing, influencing or coercing a change in the conditions, compensation, rights, privileges, or obligations of employment, or of intimidating, coercing, or unlawfully influencing others from remaining in or assuming such public employment.

That is the definition given in 4117.01 of the Revised Code. Just three sections later in 4117.04 still another definition - for no apparent reason - appears:

Any public employee who, without the approval of his superior, unlawfully fails to report for duty, absents himself from his position, or abstains in whole or in part from full, faithful, and proper performance of his position for the purpose of inducing, influencing, or coercing a change in the conditions, as compensation, rights, privileges, or obligations of employment or of intimidating, coercing, or unlawfully influencing others from remaining in or from assuming such public employment is on strike, provided that notice that he is on a strike shall be sent to such employee by his superior by mail addressed to his residence as set forth in his employment record.

Despite the Ferguson Act's stipulations against public employee strikes, one exception was made in 1941. In the case of Board of Trustees v. Now, 9 L.R.R.M. 789 (Common Pleas Court for Mercer County, 1941, No. 14383), the court
ruled that employees of a municipally owned light plant could lawfully strike because the village of Celina in operating its light plant was engaged in proprietary function "and as such has the powers of and is liable to the same law as an individual, or private corporation, upon whom a franchise has been conferred to operate such plants."

Except for the Now case and the states that have passed legislation including a right to strike clause for public employees, the common law cases against public employees, is voluminous:


Even with this overwhelming judicial review and legislation, there were 108 teacher strikes in Ohio from the 1972-73 school year through Nov. 1977. What then are the administrative alternatives?

Can an administrator willingly take a strike and "wait the teachers out?" The 1978-79 school year strike in Logan, Ohio, would indicate a willingness of the administration not to comply with their responsibilities by not enforcing the Ferguson Act, while the union appeared willing to strike in disregard of the act. Several months later the strike was settled with out intervention by the courts. Does this mean the courts are willing to turn their heads? In Goldberg v. Cincinnati, Hamilton County first appellate decision 11195 would indicate a negative response.

Between January 5, 1970, and February 5, 1970, the Cincinnati garbagemen went out on strike. After winning their
demands, the garbage collectors came back to work and began going into debt for items they intended to pay off with their new wages. A private citizen filed suit claiming violation of the Ferguson Act. The city administration felt quite confident in its defense which maintained that they had not given notice to the workers, they did not want to give notice to the workers, and the Ferguson Act was not self-invoking. The court ruled against all three options by quoting the act: "No person exercising any authority. . . shall have the power to authorize. . . a strike."

The court held that the pay increases granted were in violation of the law and restrained the city from paying the additional compensation to its employees.

The Ohio courts more specifically addressed schools in State ex rel Edward Gentieu v. William N. Thomas et al, Lucas County Common Pleas Court, No. 70-1429. Decided in 1970, the following statement by the court indicates the final decision:

It is the further opinion of this court that both the school administration and their Cleveland negotiator and the teachers' representatives and their New Jersey negotiator desire this legal confrontation, either to use it as a bargaining wedge, to test the validity of the Ferguson Act or challenge the court's courage to enforce it against teachers. They will be obliged.

Sections 4117.01 through 4117.05, commonly known as the Ferguson Act, applies specifically to "any person holding a position by appointment or employment... in the public school service." The Ferguson Act is mandatory and self-executing. Under existing law no discretion is left to the administration of any named local government body, but to act if an employee strikes. And if said administration fails to invoke the provisions of this act, a court upon relief sought and evidence of its violation has no alternative but to enforce its provisions.

What then are the alternatives?
Three impasse procedures mentioned earlier (mediation, factfinding, and arbitration) plus political and public persuasion are a few of the pragmatic alternatives to a strike. The advantages and disadvantages of the three basic impasse resolutions were discussed in some detail earlier, but the power of the public and political persuasion needs more attention. Although there is no financial leverage over school board members or other elected officials, there is power of the media, recall, and public opinion. Voters are capable of asserting tremendous pressure on both teachers and school board members to voluntarily settle their impasse issues. "Because of the pandemonium created by the present law forbidding strikes, an equitable alternative is necessary." At this time, no such alternative exists in Ohio.

Becker probably says it best:

What is needed is a wise legislative solution rather than the legislative endorsement of an extreme form of protest. After twenty-five years and more than a thousand teacher strikes, there should be no doubt that there is urgent need for an effective mechanism...Legislation should be enacted to provide binding arbitration as the final step in settling collective bargaining impasses. It is time for the responsible, sensible people in all communities to call for constructive, effective legislation.

Selecting a Head Negotiator

During the course of negotiations, the board of education and/or the superintendent may wish to engage the services of an outside consultant. This consultant may be helpful in bringing in supplemental information or assessing the merits of proposals and counter-proposals.

The Ohio Revised Code in Section 3313.171, provides that a board of education may engage consultants for business management. Since the contracts involved in negotiations are related to the administration of the school's business, a
consultant may be hired.

Outside negotiators are obtained from five basic sources: 1. attorneys, 2. professional organizations such as The Ohio School Boards Association (OSBA), 3. college professors from the fields of education, economics, labor, or law, 4. other administrators, and 5. free lance negotiators.

If the board chooses an attorney, they will have the advantage of a legal and negotiations skilled person. However, attorneys charge from $50 to $75 per hour and are not skilled in the functions of schools. Professional organizations provide negotiators who may or may not be skilled in negotiations and law, each negotiator must be judged on his reputation. Professional organizations are sometimes accused of bringing in the goals of their particular organization and forcing them on the employing board of education, while trying to defend their ego against the negotiator or make up for a point they lost against the same negotiator last week in a different district. College professors may or may not have the background to function as a negotiator, but they usually do have a time limit they can spend on a particular school. Former or current administrators from other districts may have the negotiating experience and should know the functions of a school. They are usually less expensive to hire than some of the others. Free lance negotiators have probably been in one of the above categories before and have decided to attempt to make a living at negotiating. Some boards fear these types perpetuate strikes for their own benefit, however, it is best to check the past record of each before hiring them.

**Roles Currently Being Played**

In 1976, the National School Board Association conducted a survey at their annual convention concerning the bargaining
practices and attitudes of those administrators attending. Of the 1,632 persons responding to the survey, 1,390 were school board members (85%) and 242 were administrators, mostly superintendents. The geographic breakdown of those responding was as follows: 22 per cent from the eastern states, 42 per cent from the midwestern states, 15 per cent from the southern states, and 21 per cent from the western states.

Their perception of the role of the superintendent in negotiations was: 1. should not be involved - 17 per cent, 2. should be neutral and act as a resource to both sides - 13 per cent, 3. should support and advise the board of education - 43 per cent, 4. should sit at the table as a member of the team - 22 per cent, 5. should be chief negotiator 4 per cent, and 6. other - 1 per cent.

**Roles Played in Ohio**

A survey taken by the Ohio School Boards Association comparing the actual roles played was conducted in 1977. In a questionnaire sent to all members of the association, a decline was shown for superintendents and board members to be head negotiators. This decline resulted in an increase in dependency on administrators other than the superintendent and in a higher use of consultants.

**The Role of the Superintendent**

The role of the superintendent in professional negotiations is likely to be the most complex problem to ever face the superintendent. Can he effectively be executive head of a school system, leading a professional staff one day and arguing across a collective bargaining table the next? Does he have the training, expertise, or charisma to face the highly trained teacher representatives? Should he be a "go fer" for the school board, scurrying back and forth between the teachers and the board of education? Or should he don a black and white
striped shirt and referee between the teachers and the board of education?

Since the first teachers' strike in Norwalk in 1946, many opinions, positions, and roles have been suggested for the superintendent in confronting collective bargaining. In 1965, Becker et al. suggested that:

Every superintendent should recognize that he is an agent and not a principal party. It is natural for the teachers' organization to want direct channels of communication with the board which is the principal party. This is not a reflection on the superintendent or his role. At least some of the time and on vital issues the teachers' organization wants to talk directly to the board.\(^\text{58}\)

This "end run" philosophy of teacher bargaining was quickly refuted in 1966 by Grieder when he stated:

It is becoming apparent that the superintendent's proper role is to represent management, i.e. the board of education, and through it the public. He cannot be a go-between...the man in the middle between teaching personnel, other employee groups, and the board of education.

In many cases teachers' groups have demanded and won the right to deal directly with the board, by-passing the board's chief executive. This is analogous to a labor union's insisting on collective bargaining with a company board of directors, which is rare, if indeed it is ever done. Unions bargain with company executives or their bargaining representation, not with the board of directors.\(^\text{59}\)

The superintendent's role as defined by Becker et al. was completely in line with the NEA's 1963 position statement, while in that same year AASA suggested the superintendent should remain neutral. To be neutral or to act as an agent, Grieder points out, can be a legal question.

In universities we have taught and written for many years that the superintendent is the board of education's executive officer, and in some states the position is so defined by law. Unless the status is to be changed, I do not see how the superintendent can be excluded from the negotiation or bargaining process. Experts may still be employed to assist management in
bargaining as employee groups may see fit to do, but the superintendent remains the board's chief representative.  

The superintendent often finds himself cast as a "middle man," as Dr. Grieder stated. In this position, the superintendent soon finds himself running back and forth between the board and teachers with no authority of his own. This "shuttle" negotiating takes tremendous amounts of time, much more than the superintendent can afford to give up. With no decision making or recommendation powers, the superintendent is helpless to make a decision on an item which he feels that the teachers are ready to compromise or on an item which is against the school's goals and philosophies.

Often school board members feel an obligation to be a part of the negotiating team and make the superintendent only a part of this "committee of the whole." In 1969, Young established six roles for the superintendent which included a role which suggested the superintendent should not be any part of the board's team, but act as an agent and facilitator.

Role 1. In the collective bargaining setting the superintendent is an agent of management.

Role 2. The superintendent should not be a member of the board's negotiating team.

Role 3. After the master agreement has been negotiated, the superintendent's administrative skill is put to one of its severest tests. He and the board's negotiating team must interpret the language and terms of the contract to those administrative colleagues who will carry the contract back to their buildings and make it work to the best interests of the educational program.

Role 4. The superintendent must assume major responsibility for helping the community, the board, administrators, and the rank and file of teachers to grow in understanding of the origins, meanings, ritual, and tactics of collective bargaining.

Role 5. The superintendent must exemplify and demand from subordinates moral and ethical standards of administrative function which remove any
doubt teachers may have about the credibility and integrity of administrative motivation and behavior.

Role 6. Finally, and above all, the superintendent must use his unique vantage point to be the consistent champion of interests and welfare of children.61

The literature of the 1960's indicates that the role of the superintendent was not one which was agreed upon. The only consistent opinion expressed seemed to be that the role was constantly and is constantly changing. The literature of the 1970's has expanded the role expectations of the superintendent to include opinions of teachers.

Teachers perceive the superintendency role in negotiations in various ways, depending largely on their own behavior in the profession, and their willingness to perform actively in policy-making and decision-making process.62

Andree based his opinions, in part on a doctoral dissertation by Ted Urich. Urich found that "teachers in both rural and large-city districts tended to permit their administrators wide latitude in his behavior and degree of involvement in negotiations."63 This study also found further, that teachers in a central range of urban population (small cities and suburbs) sought involvement and power through the negotiation process. Superintendents, faced with the immediacy of this teacher action, appeared more willing to share policy making and decision-making processes with their staffs, and actively encouraged teachers to organize, seek recognition, and bargain collectively.64

More recently, the literature has projected the role of the superintendent to be that of the "board's man." Typical among this literature is Kanner's 1977 article in the NASSP Bulletin.

In the past, teacher participation in the management of school affairs was indirect, sporadic, and usually unrecognized. As a result, the superintendent had an organizational function to perform as the interpreter
The superintendent traditionally has seen himself as a "middle man" between the board and the teachers. In this guise, he interpreted the board to the professional staff and acted as the teachers' spokesman to the board. With the rise of militant teacher organizations and this resultant direct negotiation structure, he can no longer serve this function. He can no longer wear the two hats he once did. He is seen, and rightfully so as the board's man. He is in fact as well as in theory, the school board's chief executive officer."

A look into the future would indicate a great deal of time spent by the superintendent planning, assisting the board, coordinating activities, and executing policy. However, research would indicate that superintendents will be turning the role of head negotiator over to someone else. "A noticeable shift has occurred during the past two years regarding the chief negotiator for school districts. During the 1976-77 school year, outside negotiators were used by 19.4 per cent of the districts - double the number from just two years ago."66

Fence Mending

"All in all it is safe to say that when the strike is over the feelings - deep feelings engendered in people of dedication - are still rampant and preying upon all efforts to put aside a bad experience."67

The bringing-together of the two sides will demand careful planning by the superintendent. Strike leaders who are suddenly out of the limelight will be seeking every opportunity to relive their finest hour. School board members whose original light regard or even high regard for teachers as a professional group had degenerated to enmity, spite, and vengeance. Suggestions by the administration to benefit the teachers in any way will be rejected. Many board members will be reacting to a community who believes they "gave away the store." These board members may be the best argument for a
school district's having a professional negotiator who will keep the school board removed from the frustrations and heated emotions of the bargaining table.68

The unwillingness of teachers and board members to "forgive and forget" usually will manifest itself in a large number of grievances. "Look for intimidation and a steady stream of grievances from this group (union leaders) who wish to maintain, at any costs, their new-found recognition."69

The coming-together nevertheless is important to the constructive implementation of the new contract agreement. The personality duties which are required of the superintendent are essential at this time to avoid further turbulence and uncertainty.

1. He must see that references to the strike are kept at a minimum, if necessary at all.
2. He must make provisions that reprisals, recrimination, or intimidation of strikers or non-strikers is not tolerated.
3. He must see that efforts are made to ease parents and teachers back into communication; this is particularly important where the public has taken sides in the shouting matches usually associated with strikes in small districts.
4. The superintendent must encourage his principals to take an active role in relieving building tensions, in whatever ways seem feasible.
5. The superintendent should try to assure that the strike issues will not be worked over and over again in PTA and other type meetings.70

In summary, the superintendent who finds himself/herself in a post-strike situation will need to bring to bear every motivational, human resource, communication, and public relations skill he/she has to bring together both parties.

General Summary

The viable alternatives to impasse resolution for the public school superintendent seem to be limited in the state of Ohio. The inconsistent judicial interference when dealing
with strikes and the legislative procrastination toward a state wide bargaining bill have made negotiating from the management side difficult at best. The constitutionality of arbitration, the expense of fact finding, and the traumatic experiences of a job action create an atmosphere of uncertainty with which the administrator must cope.

Alternatives for choosing negotiating team members and establishing a role for the superintendent seem to be replete in the literature. Choosing the correct alternative to a strike is and will continue to be problematic. What has happened in the past, and in some instances what will happen in the near future has already been decided by groundwork which has or has not been already laid. "There is one thing certain, however; and that is nothing can be done unless efforts are exerted to determine what future trends might be in the next several years, for this forms the basis of good planning."
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CHAPTER III
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Twelve Ohio school districts that had experienced a teachers' strike during the 1977-78 or 1978-79 school year were randomly selected. These twelve districts represented all four geographic quadrants of the state and four different school enrollment sizes.

Once the twelve districts were randomly selected, the superintendents were contacted first by letter and then by a telephone call. Ten of the twelve superintendents initially contacted agreed to participate in the study. A northeastern and southeastern school district from enrollment group C declined to participate and were replaced by schools from the same enrollment group and geographic quadrant.

The twelve superintendents who agreed to participate were sent a questionnaire. (See Appendix B) All of the twelve questionnaires were returned.

Each superintendent contacted was asked to provide names and telephone numbers of the school board president, the teachers' association president, and the PTA president. In two districts contacted, the superintendent provided an alternative for himself. In one district the board president was not available and was replaced by the board vice-president. In four of the districts the teachers' association president declined to be interviewed and suggested another teacher as an alternative. In four of the districts contacted, no PTA existed; in these cases the superintendent suggested a person who was actively in school activities, but was not an employee of the school. In four other districts the superintendent
expressed doubt that any of the local PTA presidents could respond to any of the interview questions. Rather than include no responses or "did not know" responses to all of the questions for these four schools, the superintendent suggested a patron of the community who had lived there most of their lives and had been active in school and community activities, but not as a school employee. When analyzing data for PTA presidents, these eight alternatives will not be included. A detailed accounting of the persons contacted in each district is provided in Table 2.

Each person indicated in Table 2 was interviewed for approximately one hour. Forty-six of those people were interviewed in person and two by telephone. These interviews were conducted between April 8, 1980 and May 9, 1980. A copy of the interview guide may be found in Appendix A.

Tables 3 through 7 are presented to provide additional background information about the schools randomly selected. Table 3 contains data which indicate the instructional days lost, number of teachers employed at each school, and the average daily membership of the student body at each school. Tables 4 and 5 contain data which provide a geographic and ADM grouping comparison of the means of the same information found in Table 3. Table 6 contains data which indicate the distribution of strikes by geographic quadrant of the schools selected for this study, while Table 7 contains data which indicate the distribution of all the strikes that occurred in Ohio between 1977 and 1979.

Of the twelve questionnaires sent out, all twelve were returned. Of those twelve, only five questionnaires were completed in their entirety. In those cases where the strike issues were the non-renewal of personnel contracts rather than financial issues, a not appropriate (NA) response was recorded. Questions which were not answered are recorded as no response (NR). The responses to the questionnaire are found in Table 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School**</th>
<th>Those Interviewed</th>
<th>Geographic Quadrant</th>
<th>ADM Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Band Boosters president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/chief negotiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/chief negotiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community patron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community patron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/chief negotiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/Strike captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community patron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Service Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board vice-president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community patron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School**</td>
<td>Those Interviewed</td>
<td>Geographic Quadrant</td>
<td>ADM Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Citizens Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community patron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates superintendent is no longer employed in the school system.

** Identification numbers have been assigned to each school to insure anonymity to those responding to the interviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Instructional Days Lost</th>
<th>Teachers Affected</th>
<th>Students Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>5122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>8090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>10266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>52000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 4

Geographic Comparison of Instructional Days Lost and Personnel Affected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Location</th>
<th>Mean Number of Instructional Days Lost</th>
<th>Mean Number of Teachers Affected</th>
<th>Mean Number of Students Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1623.00</td>
<td>26,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>188.00</td>
<td>4,281.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>160.33</td>
<td>3,011.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>282.00</td>
<td>6,063.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>443.75</td>
<td>8,106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Half (NE&amp;NW)</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>666.33</td>
<td>11,674.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Half (SE&amp;SW)</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>221.17</td>
<td>4,537.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Half (NE&amp;SE)</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>176.14</td>
<td>3,7,7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Half (NW&amp;SW)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>818.40</td>
<td>14,222.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5

ADM Group Comparison of Instructional Days Lost and Personnel Affected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Group</th>
<th>Mean Number of Instructional Days Lost</th>
<th>Mean Number of Teachers Affected</th>
<th>Mean Number of Students Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>1,398.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>2,919.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>227.33</td>
<td>4,654.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1,332.67</td>
<td>23,452.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6

Number of Schools Interviewed in Each Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

Total Number of Strikes per Quadrant
Between 1977 and 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Number of Strikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party intervention used? Which kind?</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare agreement</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>$9,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party intervention used? Which kind?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Means/Modal Tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>$15,400</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$12,883.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$14,113.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>1,752.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party intervention used? Which kind?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>165.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>477.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>130.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$14,940.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare agreement</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 9**

**Questionnaire Data by ADM Group: Group A (920-2,100 ADM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$14,390</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>617.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final grievance step</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party interventions used? Which kind?</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>$7,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10
Questionnaire Data by ADM Group: Group B (2,200-3,685 ADM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$16,155</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$12,527.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$17,932</td>
<td>$9,309</td>
<td>$13,620.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Assist. Supt.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Insiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>363.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$6,888</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,944.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$66.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>$10,050</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$10,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>537.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Assist. Supt.</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party interventions used? Which kind?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>283.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$6,333.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>$13,556</td>
<td>$15,400</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$14,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>$14,640</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$16,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>4,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Assist. Supt.</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party interventions used? Which kind?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$40,833.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>$14,390</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$13,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
<td>$9,309</td>
<td>$10,309</td>
<td>$14,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Assist. Supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party interventions used? Which kind?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>5625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final grievance step</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Bind Arb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsiders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party intervention used? Which kind?</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Impasse Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$37,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 14
Questionnaire Data by Quadrant: Quadrant NW
### TABLE 15

**Questionnaire Data by Quadrant: Quadrant SE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>87.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Assist. Supt.</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party intervention used? Which kind?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes Fed. Med.</td>
<td>Yes Panel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>171.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of legal fees $</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$8,466.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Schools 5</td>
<td>Schools 9</td>
<td>Schools 11</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average compensation per teacher before the strike</td>
<td>$16,155</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$15,400</td>
<td>$15,777.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the strike</td>
<td>$17,932</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>$17,866.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM during the strike</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,407.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Assist. supt.</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party interventions used? Which kind?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent by supt. on negotiations</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By board of education</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>33.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By other administrators</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By clerical help</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of legal fees</td>
<td>$6,888</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,462.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days made up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to prepare Agreement</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Data

In addition to the questionnaire that was filled out by the superintendents, an interview of approximately one hour was held with each of the forty-eight participants in this study. The responses that lend themselves to frequency analysis and modal tendencies are recorded below and are presented by participant type.

Superintendents
Frequency Analysis and Modal Tendencies
of the Interview Responses

1. Q. Are negotiations at the bargaining table open to the public?
A. 12 - No

2. Q. When was the possibility of a strike first realized by the group you represent?
A. 1 - one day, 3 - two days, 3 - three days, 1 - four days, 1 - one week, 2 - three weeks, 2 - two months

3. Q. Were there any plans made for handling a strike made before, during, or after the strike?
A. Before - 9, During - 3, After - 0

4. Q. What percentage of the teachers participated in the strike?
A. 1 - 75%, 1 - 85%, 2 - 90%, 3 - 95%, 3 - 99%, 1 - did not know

5. Q. Were local law enforcement agencies ever involved?
A. 10 - yes, 2 - no

6. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the board of education?
A. 7 - Outsiders, 1 - superintendent, 4 - other administrators
7. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the teachers?
   A. 6 - outsiders, 2 - local teachers, 4 - local teacher with outside advice

8. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome of the strike?
   A. 9 - no, 2 - yes, 1 - did not know

9. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the board of education handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?
   A. 10 - yes, 2 - did not know

10. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
    A. 5 - yes, 6 - no, 1 - did not know

11. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
     A. 5 - yes, 6 - no, 1 - did not know

12. Q. Did the board's negotiator effect the length of the strike?
     A. 6 - yes, 6 - no

13. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome of the strike?
     A. 7 - yes, 2 - no, 3 - did not know

14. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the teachers handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?
     A. 9 - yes, 1 - no, 2 - did not know

15. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
     A. 6 - yes, 5 - no, 1 - did not know
16. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
   A. 5 - yes, 5 - no, 2 - did not know

17. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the length of the strike?
   A. 10 - yes, 1 - no, 1 - did not know

18. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff?
   A. 5 - yes, 3 - no, 1 - did not know, 3 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

19. Q. Would you support legislation prohibiting teachers the right to strike?
   A. 6 - yes, 4 - no, 1 - did not know, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

20. Q. Would you support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step?
   A. 6 - yes, 6 - no

21. Q. Would you support binding arbitration as an alternative to strikes?
   A. 1 - yes, 10 - no, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

22. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining be open to the public?
   A. 1 yes, 11 - no

23. Q. Was the Ferguson Act invoked?
   A. 12 - no

24. Q. Did you seek any type of injunction against the teachers?
   A. 8 - yes, 4 - no

25. Q. Did your group encourage the public to get involved?
   A. 3 - yes, 8 - no, 1 - no response
26. Q. Was the strike worth it?
   A. 6 - yes, 4 - no, 1 - did not know, 1 - compared to what?

27. Q. Did the administration keep schools open during the strike?
   A. 12 - yes

28. Q. Were substitute teachers used during the strike?
   A. 12 - yes

29. Q. What part did the PTA play in the strike?
   A. 12 - none

Board of Education Presidents
Frequency Analysis and Modal Tendencies of the Interview Responses

1. Q. Are negotiations at the bargaining table open to the public?
   A. 12 - no

2. Q. When was the possibility of a strike first realized by the group you represent?
   A. 1 - none, 4 - one day, 1 - four days, 1 - one week, 1 - three weeks, 1 - one month, 1 - two months, 2 - did not know

3. Q. Were there any plans made for handling a strike made before, during, or after the strike?
   A. 7 - before, 5 - during

4. Q. What percentage of the teachers participated in the strike?
   A. 1 - 50%, 2 - 80%, 2 - 85%, 1 - 90%, 3 - 95%, 1 - 98%, 1 - 99.5%, 1 - did not know

5. Q. Were local law enforcement agencies ever involved?
   A. 11 - yes, 1 - no
6. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the board of education?
   A. 7 - outsider, 1 - superintendent, 2 - assistant superintendent, 1 - superintendent with outside advice, 1 - principal

7. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the teacher?
   A. 4 - outsider, 6 - local teacher with outside advice, 2 - local teacher

8. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome of the strike?
   A. 1 - yes, 9 - no, 2 - did not know

9. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the board of education handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?
   A. 6 - yes, 3 - no, 3 - did not know

10. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
    A. 3 - yes, 9 - no

11. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
    A. 4 - yes, 8 - no

12. Q. Did the board's negotiator effect the length of the strike?
    A. 1 - yes, 10 - no, 1 - did not know

13. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome to the strike?
    A. 8 - yes, 2 - no, 2 - did not know

14. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the teachers handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?
    A. 6 - yes, 3 - no, 3 - did not know
15. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
   A. 6 - yes, 6 - no

16. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the size or type of the final settlement?
   A. 5 - yes, 6 - no, 1 - did not know

17. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the length of the strike?
   A. 8 - yes, 2 - no, 2 - did not know

18. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff?
   A. 6 - yes, 4 - no, 2 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

19. Q. Would you support legislation prohibiting teachers the right to strike?
   A. 4 - yes, 5 - no, 1 - did not know, 2 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

20. Q. Would you support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step?
   A. 2 - yes, 10 - no

21. Q. Would you support binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike?
   A. 2 - yes, 9 - no, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

22. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining be open to the public?
   A. 1 - yes, 9 - no, 1 - did not know, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

23. Q. Was the Ferguson Act invoked?
   A. 12 - no

24. Q. Did you seek any type of injunction against the teachers?
   A. 9 - yes, 3 - no
25. Q. Did your group encourage the public to get involved?
   A. 4 - yes, 8 - no

26. Q. Was the strike worth it?
   A. 6 - yes, 4 - no, 2 - did not know

27. Q. Did the administration keep schools open during the strike?
   A. 12 - yes

28. Q. Were substitute teachers used during the strike?
   A. 11 - yes, 1 - no

29. Q. What part did the PTA play in the strike?
   A. 12 - none

Teachers' Representatives

Frequency Analysis and Modal Tendencies
of the Interview Responses

1. Q. Are negotiations at the bargaining table open to the public?
   A. 12 - no

2. Q. When was the possibility of a strike first realized by the group you represent?
   A. 1 - 1/2 hour, 3 - one day, 1 - two days, 3 - one week, 1 - two weeks, 1 - one month, 1 - 5 1/2 months, 1 - seven months

3. Q. Were there any plans made before, during, or after the strike?
   A. 10 - before, 1 - during, 1 - none made

4. Q. What percentage of the teachers participated in the strike?
   A. 1 - 75%, 2 - 90%, 1 - 93%, 2 - 94%, 2 - 95%, 1 - 96%, 1 - 97%, 2 - 99%
5. Q. Were local law enforcement agencies ever involved?
   A. 12 - yes

6. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the board of education?
   A. 7 - outside, 2 - board with outside advice, 2 - assistant-superintendent, 1 - superintendent

7. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the teachers?
   A. 4 - outside, 4 - local with outside advice, 4 - local teachers

8. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome of the strike?
   A. 9 - yes, 2 - no, 1 - did not know

9. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the board of education handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?
   A. 7 - yes, 1 - no, 4 - did not know

10. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
    A. 6 - yes, 4 - no, 2 - did not know

11. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
    A. 6 - yes, 5 - no, 1 - did not know

12. Q. Did the board's negotiator effect the length of the strike?
    A. 8 - yes, 3 - no, 1 - did not know

13. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome to the strike?
    A. 5 - yes, 6 - no, 1 - did not know

14. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the teachers handle emotional issues better than an outside person would?
    A. 7 - yes, 1 - no, 4 - did not know
15. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
   A. 6 - yes, 5 - no, 1 - did not know

16. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
   A. 9 - yes, 3 - no

17. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the length of the strike?
   A. 5 - yes, 7 - no

18. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff?
   A. 9 - yes, 1 - did not know, 2 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

19. Q. Would you support legislation prohibiting teachers the right to strike?
   A. 8 - no, 4 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

20. Q. Would you support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step?
   A. 12 - yes

21. Q. Would you support binding arbitration as an alternative to strike?
   A. 10 - yes, 1 no, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

22. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining be open to the public?
   A. 1 - yes, 10 - no, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

23. Q. Was the Ferguson Act invoked?
   A. 1 - yes, 11 - no

24. Q. Did the board of education seek any type of injunction against the teachers?
   A. 9 - yes, 3 - no
25. Q. Did your group encourage the public to get involved?  
A. 10 - yes, 2 - no

26. Q. Was the strike worth it?  
A. 10 - yes, 2 - no

27. Q. Did the administration keep schools open during the strike?  
A. 12 - yes

28. Q. Were substitute teachers used during the strike?  
A. 11 - yes, 1 - no

29. Q. What part did the PTA play in the strike?  
A. 11 - none, 1 - did not know

PTA Presidents  

Frequency Analysis and Modal Tendencies of the Interview Responses

1. Q. Are negotiations at the bargaining table open to the public?  
A. 1 - yes, 3 - no

2. Q. When was the possibility of a strike first realized by the group you represent?  
A. 1 - no notice, 1 - two days, 1 - three days, 1 - three weeks

3. Q. Were there any plans made before, during, or after the strike?  
A. 1 - before, 1 - during, 2 - no plans made

4. Q. What percentage of the teachers participated in the strike?  
A. 1 - 90%, 2 - 95%, 1 - did not know
5. Q. Were local law enforcement agencies ever involved?  
   A. 4 - yes

6. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the board of education?  
   A. 2 - outside, 1 - board, 1 - assistant superintendent

7. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the teachers?  
   A. 3 - local teacher, 1 - local teacher with outside advice

8. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome of the strike?  
   A. 2 - no, 2 - did not know

9. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the board of education handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?  
   A. 1 - yes, 1 - no, 2 - did not know

10. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?  
    A. 2 - no, 2 - did not know

11. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?  
    A. 2 - yes, 1 - no, 1 - did not

12. Q. Did the board's negotiator effect the length of the strike?  
    A. 1 - yes, 2 - no, 1 - did not know

13. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome to the strike?  
    A. 2 - no, 2 - did not know

14. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the teachers handle emotional issues better than an inside person  
    A. 1 - yes, 2 - no, 1 - did not know
15. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
   A. 1 - yes, 1 - no, 2 - did not know

16. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
   A. 1 - yes, 2 - no, 1 - did not know

17. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the length of the strike?
   A. 3 - yes, 1 - did not know

18. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff?
   A. 3 - yes, 1 - no

19. Q. Would you support legislation prohibiting teachers the right to strike?
   A. 3 - yes, 1 - no

20. Q. Would you support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step?
   A. 1 - yes, 2 - no, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

21. Q. Would you support binding arbitration as an alternative to strikes?
   A. 3 - no, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

22. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining be open to the public?
   A. 1 - yes, 2 - no, 1 - did not know

23. Q. Was the Ferguson Act invoked?
   A. 4 - no

24. Q. Did the board of education seek any type of injunction against the teachers?
   A. 3 - yes, 1 - did not know
25. Q. Did your group encourage the public to get involved?
   A. 2 - yes, 2 - no
26. Q. Was the strike worth it?
   A. 4 - no
27. Q. Did the administration keep schools open during the strike?
   A. 4 - yes
28. Q. Were substitute teachers used during the strike?
   A. 3 - yes, 1 - did not know
29. Q. What part did the PTA play in the strike?
   A. 1 - played a part, 3 - none

PTA Alternatives

Frequency Analysis and Modal Tendencies of the Interview Responses

1. Q. Are negotiations at the bargaining table open to the public?
   A. 8 - no
2. Q. When was the possibility of a strike first realized by the group you represent?
   A. 1 - one day, 3 - two days, 1 - three days, 1 - one week, 1 - two weeks, 1 - no notice
3. Q. Were there any plans made before, during, or after the strike?
   A. 2 - before, 2 - during, 4 - none made
4. Q. What percentage of the teachers participated in the strike?
   A. 1 - 50%, 1 - 87%, 2 - 90%, 2 - 95%, 1 - 99%, 1 - did not know
5. Q. Were local law enforcement agencies ever involved?
   A. 6 - yes, 2 - no

6. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the board of education?
   A. 5 - outside, 1 - principal, 2 - assistant superintendent

7. Q. Who was the head negotiator for the teachers?
   A. 4 - local teacher with outside advice, 3 - outsider
      1 - local teacher

8. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator bring any preconceived goals, idea, or opinions of the outcome of the strike?
   A. 2 - yes, 3 - no, 3 - did not know

9. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the board of education handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?
   A. 1 - yes, 3 - no, 4 - did not know

10. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
    A. 4 - yes, 4 - no

11. Q. Did the board of education's negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
    A. 1 - yes, 6 - no, 1 - did not know

12. Q. Did the board's negotiator effect the length of the strike?
    A. 3 - yes, 5 - no

13. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator bring any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome to the strike?
    A. 5 - yes, 2 - no, 1 - did not know

14. Q. Does an outside negotiator representing the teachers handle emotional issues better than an inside person would?
    A. 1 - yes, 3 - no, 4 - did not know
15. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties involved?
   A. 6 - yes, 2 - no

16. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
   A. 1 - yes, 5 - no, 2 - did not know

17. Q. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the length of the strike?
   A. 3 - yes, 4 - no, 1 - did not know

18. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff?
   A. 3 - yes, 4 - no, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

19. Q. Would you support legislation prohibiting teachers the right to strike?
   A. 3 - yes, 3 - no, 1 - did not know, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

20. Q. Would you support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step?
   A. 3 - yes, 3 - no, 1 - did not know, 1 - depends on the specifics of the legislation

21. Q. Would you support binding arbitration as an alternative to strikes?
   A. 2 - yes, 3 - no, 1 - did not know, 2 - depends on the legislation

22. Q. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining be open to the public?
   A. 2 - yes, 6 - no

23. Q. Was the Ferguson Act invoked?
   A. 1 - yes, 7 - no
24. Q. Did the board of education seek any type of injunction against the teachers?
   A. 3 - yes, 3 - no, 2 - did not know

25. Q. Did your group encourage the public to get involved?
   A. 4 - yes, 4 - no

26. Q. Was the strike worth it?
   A. 2 - yes, 6 - no

27. Q. Did the administration keep schools open during the strike?
   A. 8 - yes

28. Q. Were substitute teachers used during the strike?
   A. 7 - yes, 1 - no

29. Q. What part did the PTA play in the strike?
   A. 2 - played a part, 6 - played no part
CHAPTER IV
Presentation of Findings and
Qualitative Analysis of Individual Schools

School One

School number one is found in the NW quadrant of Ohio and is part of the A enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

Representing the superintendent - superintendent
Representing the board of education - board president
Representing the teachers - teachers' president
Representing the PTA - band boosters president

In this school system there was no PTA. The superintendent suggested I speak with the president of the band boosters club since that was one of the most active groups in the school.

I. Are the superintendent, board president, teachers' association president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All four interviewees agreed that bargaining at the table should be closed to the general public. The superintendent perceived an open bargaining situation to be a show in which both sides "played" to the audience with dramatic speeches and accusations designed to win public sympathy. Little, if any, attempt would be made to actually bargain under these conditions, but rather each side would attempt to sway the public sympathy and pressure support to their side. The school board president perceived the bargaining sessions to be too complex for the average layman, "bargaining has become too sophisticated for anyone but experts." The teachers' representative saw public involvement as a very time consuming way of negotiating. "To spend time listening to everyone's input to each issue
would force days of negotiation into weeks and months." The
booster president echoed the teachers' opinion citing the
larger the body of people involved, the longer the time to
hear and debate every opinion and issue.

The amount of advance notice of an impending strike each
party had was fairly similar; however, their individual means
of discovering the eminence of a strike were quite diverse.
The superintendent found out about the strike from his high
school principal, the board member from the board's refusal
to call a special meeting to hear the teachers' concerns,
the teachers' president held out hope for a settlement up
until the strike vote was actually made, while the booster
president received his information from some of the teachers.

Initial reactions to the strike were also quite varied.
The superintendent expressed disbelief and shock that his
teachers would strike. The board president confidently per-
ceived the board and administration's position as right. The
teachers' president expressed a great deal of personal concern
and "fear and uncertainty." "Strikes were very rare in this
part of the state and I was concerned about local reactions
and possible violence." The booster president "had never
thought strikes were right." But in this particular case,
he felt a strike was the only course of action the teachers
had.

The key issues causing this strike were perceived the
same by all four parties. A music teachers' contract had not
been renewed and the teachers wanted his reinstatement, reasons
for his non-renewal, and a fair dismissal policy.

Since such short notice was given for the strike, the
superintendent and board members were not able to make any
strike plans until the strike had already begun. Arrange-
ments for substitutes and keeping schools open were the only
plans made during the strike by the administration. The teach-
ers' association had begun planning picket lines, finding a
strike headquarters, arranging for "phone trees," and had called in OEA for help prior to the strike. The booster president became a leader in an Ad Hoc Citizens committee and relied on OEA for directions.

The percentage of teachers each group perceived as supporting the strike was fairly consistent until the school board member perceived 50 per cent of the teachers as non-strikers, compared to perceptions of 88 per cent, 94 per cent, and 90 per cent of the superintendent, teachers' and booster president respectively.

Pressures for and against each side were quick to build despite the brevity of the strike. The administration kept schools open one of the two days of the strike. The superintendent felt the "education process was not as good as having the regular teachers working," but he discerned a need to try. The school board member agreed with keeping schools open, citing the need for education to have "continuity and flow." Although the teachers' president made no comment on the schools being open, the booster president was quite adamant; "You can't bring in mothers and run a school...no supervision."

The superintendent and board president both considered the strike was too short to choose sides, while the teachers' and booster presidents strongly disagreed. The teachers and booster presidents claimed support from the non-certified workers, letters of support from county labor organizations, other teachers' associations across the state, and the community as a whole. A parade through town was led by the community ending in front of the school with parents honking car horns and encouraging students to leave school and support them. (Approximately 80 students did leave.) The teachers and community saw this march as a great success. The administration and board of education claimed that only half of the students who left were band students supporting their director and that the other half were junior high students
looking for excitement in an otherwise quite rural farming town.

The superintendent's perceptions of anxieties, threats, and violence were limited to threats. The superintendent was told his house would be burned down if he did not rehire the music teacher, while several striking and non-striking teachers received the same threat if they did not work or refuse to work. The superintendent's wife received several obscene telephone calls both during and after the strike.

The board president also perceived harassment against the superintendent and his wife, with a few harassing telephone calls to board members. The teachers' president also commented on the harassment of the superintendent's wife, but was unaware of any other harassment or violence. The band booster president also referred to harassment of the superintendent and also remembered some property damage to the superintendent's home. The teacher, board president, and booster president felt harassment and verbal abuse on the one day picket line was minimal. The superintendent disagreed, claiming substitutes were harassed for crossing the picket lines.

In none of the above mentioned incidents did anyone express a viable way of coping with or avoiding the harassment that accompanies a strike.

A great deal of difference surfaced concerning the perceived role of the local police. The superintendent called the county sheriff and asked for additional protection during the strike. The sheriff agreed to help if the local town marshal gave them his permission to enter his jurisdiction; the marshal refused. During the impromptu parade, the marshal simply sat in his car and observed. The superintendent believed the marshal's perception of the strike was that "if this many people were angry, the board and superintendent
must be wrong."

The board president's only comment concerning the police was, "I feel they did what they are supposed to do."

When asked about the involvement of the local law enforcement agencies, the teachers' president responded "pleased...very neutral,...non-biased... . I feel they protected both sides."

The booster president perceived the local police supervising the parade and doing "nothing out of line."

On the question of outside negotiators, the four parties were in agreement. The administration used an outside negotiator who had been an administrator in another school district and was now retired. After the strike began, the board also hired an attorney. All four parties agreed that the teachers used an OEA Uniserve representative to head their negotiations after the strike began. (A OEA Uniserve representative is a field representative of the OEA assigned to a specific school)

After the strike was over, the booster president and board president observed no recrimination toward non-strikers. The teachers' president and superintendent disagreed citing hard feelings, bad remarks, and shunning of teachers who did not support the strike. All four parties agreed that the post strike atmosphere in general is improving with few grudges now remaining. The booster president reported a quick return to normal conditions was facilitated because almost everyone was on one side; against the board and administration.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

All four parties agreed that the board's negotiator performed well in his role as negotiator, or at least did what he was asked to do. The teachers' general reaction was "they
did their job."

Although the booster president reported the actual bar-
gaining sessions to be too secretive for him to comment on
any perceived goals the board's negotiator might have had,
the other three parties did not recall the board's negotia-
tor arriving with any personal goals or ideas.

The question concerning emotional issues was very import-
ant in this strike because the non-renewal of a teacher,
especially one as popular as the music teacher, is a highly
emotional issue. The superintendent believed that an outside
negotiator "...can go right to the point of what you are
there to solve." The board president noticed the outside
negotiator to be "more objective and controlled." The teachers'
president favored outside negotiators because "inside people
become too emotional and irrational." The booster president
had no comment.

Only the superintendent and teachers' president saw any
change in the board of education's attitude toward bargaining.
Both credited the board's use then and currently of full time
outside negotiators as a realization that the board of educa-
tion and superintendent could not or should not attempt to
deal with the OEA Uniserve representative alone. Neither the
board or booster president had any comment on this issue.

The superintendent, board president, and teachers' presi-
dent believed the board's negotiator assisted in the final
settlement and shortened the length of the strike. The board
president perceived the board's outside negotiator as helpful
in keeping the board within their boundaries of responsibility.
The teachers' president perceived the board's outside negotia-
tor as more rational than the board or superintendent and,
therefore, contributed to shortening the strike. The booster
president had no comment, again citing the closed bargaining
sessions as preventing his access to the information to comment
on these questions.
III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

Just as the four parties' comments were positive on the role of the board of education's outside negotiator, so were they on the teachers' outside negotiator:

Superintendent: "He did the job he was trained for."
Board President: "They were trying to do their job."
Teacher: "He followed our instructions."
Booster: "Excellent job."

On the question concerning preconceived goals of the teachers' outside negotiator, the superintendent, board president, and booster president disagreed with the teachers' response that the Uniserve man came in without his own ideas. The superintendent perceived that OEA wanted only to prove they could pull off a strike in this part of the state and then settle quickly. The board president perceived that the OEA brought in state issues, while the booster president saw the OEA attempting to build membership.

The four parties responded to the teachers' outside negotiator's handling of emotional issues exactly as they did for the board's negotiator; outsiders handle emotional issues better.

The superintendent perceived the teachers' negotiator as changing the teachers' attitude toward needing a full time negotiator, while the board president and teachers' president saw no attitude changes. The booster president perceived the OEA negotiator as a morale booster for the teachers and the community members who supported them.

Only the superintendent thought the teachers' negotiator shortened the strike; the other three interviewees saw no connection between the length of the strike and the OEA Uniserve man. However, the superintendent and booster president agreed that the OEA man had no effect on the settlement itself, while
the teachers' and board president perceived his contract writing expertise as fundamental to a fair settlement.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same in the future?

Planning for a strike received varied responses from the participants. The superintendent thought the short notice and short duration of the strike made planning for this time or a next time impossible. The board president thought the strike was something that was destined to happen and could not be planned for in advance. The teacher president would like to see better delegation of responsibilities next time, while the booster president kept a list of those attending all meetings, a scrapbook of news clippings, signed and passed petitions, and backed OEA suggestions and ideas.

The anxieties, threats, harassment, and strain of a strike were a major source of concern for everyone even remotely involved in the strike. However, none of the four persons interviewed in this district had any suggestions on how to deal, avoid, minimize, or plan for strike anxieties.

The extremely small number of substitutes used during the strike limited the problems and issues that might have been created by their presence. All respondents believed that the small and isolated nature of the community accounted for the small number of substitute teachers.

Opinions were varied on the quality of coverage of the strike by the media. The superintendent expressed a concern that 98 per cent of what was written was a "sensationalization of the truth. The newspapers printed "...whatever would keep it alive and used it in a manner that perpetuated the news. Some people whose lives have been meaningless up to this time were now being interviewed by reporters. They were very pro-teacher; ... they printed out of context. ...I'll never trust the media again." The board president thought the media favored
the teachers because the board's attorney advised against any release of the reasons why the teachers' contract was non-renewed. The teachers' president was very pleased with coverage and stated, "A lot of coverage raised questions the board of education would not answer. We allowed the press to come to all of our meetings. We had nothing to hide." The booster president took a different position. His comments focused more on his embarrassment because the rest of the world was viewing his community's troubles. He stated, "I would just as soon the media had never come."

The issues that began the strike and those that ended it were the same according to all four of the participants. The teacher and booster presidents maintained that the superintendent had no reason for not renewing the teacher's contract other than he did not like him. The board president backed the superintendent's actions 100 per cent, although the board president also believed that the superintendent and teacher in question had a personality conflict in addition to the teacher's other problems.

To facilitate a settlement, the board and superintendent agreed to a special open meeting to hear the teachers' and community's defense of the reasons for not renewing the contract. These reasons had been provided in writing to the teacher in question the day before. The superintendent agreed to the public meeting even though he knew "there would be a blood letting." After all sides had been heard during a fairly orderly meeting, the board voted not to change their first non-renewal decision, but they would negotiate a fair-dismissal policy during the next year.

The fair-dismissal policy was seen very differently by the four interviewees. The superintendent and board president read the board's decision as a willingness to negotiate a policy. The teachers' and booster presidents thought they had been granted a policy.
The board president and superintendent agreed that the final settlement was facilitated by both sides working together, whereas the teachers gave the two outside negotiators the final credit and the booster president gave the credit to OEA.

As was stated earlier, the community did hold a parade the day before the strike in support of the teacher whose contract was not renewed. The superintendent perceived the community's role as one of "bringing on the strike," and therefore, he did not encourage the public to become involved. The board president perceived himself as an elected representative of the people and therefore did not need to encourage the people to become involved. The teachers and community group worked together to support the issues and the teacher whose contract was not renewed.

The brief nature of the strike made invoking the Ferguson Act or any type of injunction unnecessary, in the eyes of the superintendent. The board's attorney advised against the Ferguson Act because of its time factor, while the board president was against the hard feelings he believed it would cause.

From a political perspective, the superintendent was very upset at the mayor and marshal's concept of their role in controlling the community. The teachers' president and board's president perceived no political involvement, while the booster president cited a wife of a teacher as an outspoken politician for the teachers.

The teachers' president was the only person who took action to combat post-strike recrimination. He met with teachers after the strike and called for a peaceful reopening of schools. However, even the teachers' president admitted it is "difficult to change people's minds and feelings."

Given the opportunity to change one thing or do one thing differently the next time, the superintendent saw himself giving problem or weak teachers less time to "straighten up." The teacher in question had worked for the school for
five years, and the superintendent believed he had let problems build too long. The board president saw a need for the board and superintendent to work more closely together as the board's biggest area for improvement. The teachers' president would perceive his role as delegating more of the responsibilities next time rather than doing so much himself. The booster president called for a change in state law moving the teacher renewal notification date to January rather than April.

To avoid future strikes of this type, the superintendent perceived his role would include making contract non-renewals on problem teachers before they had established four or five years of service in the school system. The board president saw a handling of teacher evaluation by line administrators rather than top level management as the proper way to avoid similar strikes. The teachers' president thought the fair dismissal policy that the board "gave" them would avoid a repeat of this strike while the booster president restated his desire for an earlier decision on contract renewal.

When asked if the strike was worth it, the superintendent responded with a definite "no." As the superintendent stated, "the teachers struck for a reinstatement and a fair-dismissal policy, and all they received was the promise to negotiate a policy." The board president reported the strike was worth it because the board supported each other and the administration in something they believed was right. The teachers' president saw the strike as worthwhile because he received his fair-dismissal policy. The booster president saw the strike as worth it because two board members were replaced during the next election and the superintendent resigned.

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

The data in Table 17 provides the responses made by the representatives to the legislative questions. The issue of
mandated bargaining with teachers was uncertain for the superintendent, who wanted to see the specific legislation before he commented. The teacher president really had not yet decided on his position on this issue. The booster president did not respond to the question while the board president favored this type of legislation because he believed it would eliminate the need for teachers' unions.

The superintendent and board president were in agreement on new legislation banning teachers from striking. The superintendent perceived strikes as using students as pawns while the board president noted that work should continue during negotiations. The teacher and booster president declined commitment on this issue until they saw what alternatives the legislation would provide for a strike.

The question of legislation requiring binding arbitration as a final grievance step received a negative vote from the superintendent because of the loss of local control. The other three parties agreed "a point is often reached in a grievance where an outsider must make a final judgment to be fair to both parties."

The superintendent voted against binding arbitration as an alternative to strikes because of the loss of local control just as he was against binding arbitration as a final grievance step. The board president favored binding arbitration because of his intense desire to see that schools never close. The teachers' president favored this type of alternative to strikes because of his faith in the fairness of arbitrators. The booster president wished to hold his vote until he reads the specifics of such a law.

Only the booster president voted for legislation mandating open bargaining. He believed the public's money was being used; therefore, they had a right to be there. The superintendent, teachers, and board presidents were of the opinion the public would create a show, would slow things down, and
would not have the expertise. It should be pointed out that the booster president's decision to support open bargaining is in conflict with his statement at the beginning of the interview against open bargaining.

**Summary**

All of the interviewees were involved in the strike activities and had opinions as to what the issues were. It would appear the board president was totally uninformed concerning the number of teachers striking, for he reported 38 per cent fewer teachers striking than the next closest opinion. The booster and board presidents also seemed to be unaware of post-strike recrimination and anxieties.

All respondents except the booster president credited the board's outside negotiator with having a positive affect on the outcome of the strike settlement and with shortening the length of the strike. The booster president was unable to attend the bargaining sessions and, therefore, did not believe he could accurately comment.

Comments concerning the teachers' negotiator were also positive. Although no one recalled any great influence on the outcome, the superintendent and board presidents did report that the teachers' negotiator had convinced the teachers to strike in the first place.

Many of the issues involved in this strike which were studied in this dissertation were not dealt with or planned for by the respondents. The teacher president did attempt to avoid post-strike recrimination this time, and the superintendent swore never to trust the media again. No other plans for this strike or future strikes were made.

None of the legislative issues received unanimous votes. No voting patterns developed between any of the respondents; however, arbitration received a majority of positive votes and open bargaining received a majority of negative votes.
The strike in school one was a brief confrontation between administration and teachers over a non-renewal of a music teachers' contract. The board held fast to their recommendation, and the teachers received only a promise to negotiate a fair-dismissal policy.

To provide a more detailed rendering of the data and information available about school one, a table of the frequency responses for this school is provided in Table 17. This table will provide a comparison of the four respondents and their similar and conflicting opinions. The twenty-nine questions listed here are the same questions provided for all the schools in frequency analysis and model tendency summaries found in Chapter III (pages 67-82). For the purposes of this table, and those for each school, the questions have been listed along the left hand margin in abbreviated form. (For the entire question refer to the corresponding numbered question in any of the summaries on pages 76-82)
### TABLE 17

Consistency of Responses for School One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK - Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP - Depends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers out</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>local +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School number two is found in the Northeastern quadrant of Ohio and is part of the A enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent - superintendent
- Representing the board of education - board president
- Representing the teachers' association - local teacher
- Representing the PTA - PTA president

The teachers' association president declined to be interviewed and suggested the teacher that handled the bargaining replace him as a respondent.

1. Are the superintendent school board president, teachers' association representative, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

The superintendent and board president were against negotiations being open to the public. The superintendent recalled a time when negotiations were open in this district and the only people who came to the bargaining sessions were teachers. The board president was against open bargaining because he believed the board "could not compete with the teachers' professional negotiator and the public at the same time."

The teachers' representative did not think that involving the public at the table made any difference, while the PTA president perceived a need for the negotiations to be open so that the general public could become better informed.

The superintendent first became aware that a strike was eminent three weeks before the strike actually began. A change in the amount of State Foundation money to be received was lowered, thus requiring the previously negotiated teachers'
raise in salary to be recinded. The board president first
realized the strike was eminent four days before the strike,
citing uncertainty of state money as the determining factor.
The teachers' representative also perceived the state money
issue was the factor which alerted him to a strike, but he
perceived this problem one week before the strike. The PTA
president perceived a definite strike was coming three days
before the strike began, citing the teachers' strike vote as
her source of information.

Reactions to the strike were mixed: the superintendent
was very disappointed, noting that he took the strike too
personally; the board president had been through a teachers' strike before and perceived this one as "no sweat"; the teach­
ers' representative was "ambivalent and justified in striking";
while the PTA president expressed "concern."

All four respondents agreed that the key issue causing the strike was the recinding of the originally negotiated agreement with the teachers association.

Although all four respondents claimed to have advance notice about the strike, only the board and teacher representatives claimed to have made any advance plans. The superin­
tendent said that no comprehensive plan was made before the strike; however, the board president thought plans for staying open during the strike were made prior to the strike. The teachers' representative made contact with the non-certified employees before the strike and attempted to solicit their support in the pending strike. The PTA president reported plans made only after the strike began and said, "We did not function as a PTA as such, but myself and another PTA official worked to try to get both sides together."

All four respondents were in total agreement concerning the percentage of teachers supporting the strike; four respondents reported 95 per cent.

The superintendent, board president, and PTA president were in favor of keeping schools open during the strike.
Although keeping schools open creates a financial pressure against the teachers, the superintendent noted, "The longer a strike lasts, the more public sympathy swings to the teachers." Although the board's president favored keeping schools open as a pressure tactic against teachers, he now believes this decision as unwise because "The education process came to a stop." While teachers were unable to close the schools, the teachers' representative perceived the board as "inefficient in keeping education going." The PTA president expressed a firm belief in "never closing schools."

All respondents reported limited anxiety, few threats, and no actual violence. The harassment of substitutes as they crossed the picket lines was observed by the four interviewees as the only form of anxiety. The superintendent received no harassing telephone calls and reported "the teachers conducted themselves in a very nice manner." The board president noted only three calls pressuring board members and some minor verbal abuse to those crossing picket lines. The teachers' and PTA's representatives also mentioned the minor incidents at the picket lines.

Since no one perceived any serious anxieties, few suggestions were made concerning coping with strike related anxieties. The superintendent, however, did express a great deal of hostility toward OEA and the advice they gave the local association. "OEA bugs me quite a bit because of the direction they have assumed in the last several years. They have gotten away from professional teacher upgrading, such as inservice, and gone strictly to an organization for teacher benefits."

The four representatives were in complete agreement that the role of local law enforcement agencies was strictly to patrol the area. No one expressed any negative attitudes or perceptions toward police involvement, and the superintendent commented, "It was never a dangerous situation."

The superintendent, teacher representative, and PTA representative all agreed that the board of educations' vice
president served as the head negotiator for the board. However, it was the board's president's perception that the superintendent served as the head negotiator.

The superintendent reported the teachers' association president as the teachers' head negotiator; the board president was not sure who was head negotiator, but he did know they were advised by OEA. The teachers' representative said he was the head negotiator with OEA's advice. The PTA president knew that one of the teachers and OEA negotiated for the teachers.

Only the PTA president reported any post-strike recrimination. The superintendent and board president discerned no recrimination and reported that everything returned to normal. The teachers' representative observed no recrimination and "everything was normal the next day." The PTA president perceived anyone who worked or tried to help run the schools "were shunned by those teachers who were on strike."

III. How did the board of education's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The four respondents expressed positive reactions to the role played by the board of education's negotiator; in this case an inside person. The teachers' representative mentioned that "he tried to be fair and sincere."

None of the respondents observed that the board's negotiator brought any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions about the outcome of the strike into the bargaining sessions.

The superintendent and teachers' representative perceived an outsider to be more removed and thus more capable of handling the emotional issues of a strike, while the board president expressed that "he did not know." The PTA president perceived an inside person better informed of the local situation and therefore better prepared to deal with any issue.

None of the interviewees observed any attitude changes toward the bargaining brought about by the efforts of the
board's negotiator, and also agreed that the negotiator did not affect the size or type of settlement.

The superintendent and board presidents did not perceive the board's negotiator as having any effect on the length of the strike, while the teachers' representative reported the board's negotiator as stalling the procedures so that the schools could save enough money on lost daily salaries to reinstate the original salary agreement.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

All respondents perceived the teachers' negotiator, in this case a local person, to be "fair and reasonable." However, the board and PTA presidents reported attempts by the OEA advisors to "keep things agitated," while the teachers' representative related that the OEA had given him misinformation about the correct way to handle an injunction.

Only the board president observed any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions brought to the bargaining sessions by the teachers' negotiator. The board president detected "OEA goals" in many of the demands the teachers made.

Although the superintendent generally favored outside negotiators to handle emotional issues, he perceived the OEA advisors as trying "to keep things riled up."

Opinions varied concerning the changes in attitude brought about by the teachers' negotiator. All respondents observed no changes effected by the negotiator but were quick to add comments about OEA advice. The superintendent and PTA president noted that OEA tried to keep attitudes "stirred up." While the teachers' representative appreciated the expertise provided by the OEA representative, the board president would only comment that the OEA "influenced our local teachers."

Only the superintendent perceived the teachers' negotiator as having any affect on the final settlement. "He attempted to regain what he had lost in June and settled for that
agreement contingent upon the passage of a levy."

The superintendent, board president, and PTA president noted that the teachers' negotiator and OEA lengthened the strike, while the teachers' representative disagreed, pointing to the board's negotiator as the one lengthening the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same in the future?

Despite prior knowledge of the strike, the superintendent chose to wait until after the strike had started to develop a specific plan. Included in that plan was an attempt to obtain as many substitute teachers as possible, to maintain as much of the regular academic program as possible, to keep the non-certified employees working, and to meet with the board and administrators daily. The board president disagreed with the superintendent's observations as to when planning began but confirmed the high priority for obtaining substitute teachers. The teachers' main plan centered around a public meeting. The teachers' representative did confide that, given the opportunity to plan again, he would have avoided the strike; he said, "It was rougher than I thought." The PTA president emphasized that she did not function as an officer of the PTA but as a parent attempting to get both sides back together.

Given an opportunity to deal with the anxieties of this strike again, none of the respondents had any suggestions for avoiding or dealing with this issue any differently than they did this time.

Although the superintendent and PTA president reported that the substitute teachers received harassment crossing picket lines and in some cases were followed home and harassed, neither had any suggestions for dealing with the situation any differently.
The superintendent perceived the media coverage to be "by and large fair, but slightly favoring teachers." The board president observed little coverage with "no sides blamed or taken." The teachers' representative had no comment about the media, while the PTA president reported a bias for the teachers' side.

Everyone except the teachers' representative perceived no effects on the strike as a result of media coverage, while the teachers' representative had no comment.

Given an opportunity to deal with the media again under the same conditions, the superintendent would attempt to try to "get more factual information to them so that they would more clearly understand our problems." The board president could think of nothing he would do differently, and the teachers' representative again had no comment. The PTA president stated a need for the board of education to communicate more information to the public.

All four respondents reported that the key issues creating the strike stayed the same throughout the entire strike, and all agreed that there were no changes in demands or issues made by either side.

The superintendent believed his willingness to negotiate anytime, his attempts to deal with as many non-money items as possible, and the picket limitation injunction were the key factors in settling the strike. The board president expressed frustration about his attempts to cope with strike problems by keeping in touch daily with the prosecutor's office and by receiving daily bad and untrue information from that office. Both the teacher and PTA representative mentioned the public meeting as their key contribution to facilitating an end to the strike. According to the superintendent, community involvement included: 1. a demand for a public forum to speak to the issues, 2. pressures to settle the strike no matter what it took, and 3. those community members who volunteered
to help out in the schools during the strike. Encouragement
to become involved was limited to accepting volunteers to
help keep schools open.

The board president did not perceive that the community
as a whole was involved in the strike. He also believed that
since the public did not and could not attend all of the meet­
ings they therefore were not "up on all of the issues" and
should not become involved. The teachers' representative also
did not perceive any involvement of the community as a group.
The PTA president disagreed, citing various informational
coffee and tea parties, public meetings, and campaign work for
the passage of a levy as examples of community involvement.

The superintendent and board and PTA presidents agreed
that the Ferguson Act was never invoked. However, the teachers'
representative reported to the public that the Ferguson Act
had been invoked and that all teachers would be fired. The
superintendent maintained that he had obtained a picket limita­
tion injunction and a back to work injunction which is not
the same as the Ferguson Act. The superintendent mentioned
that any court orders beyond the scope of a picket limitation
injunction tend to polarize the teachers and community and
create more hard feelings and, therefore, more damage than
good. The board president echoed the superintendent's observa­
tions but added that the back to work order was totally ignored
by the teachers'. Given the same situation again, the board
president insisted he would close schools until the strike was
settled. The teachers' representative insisted that there was
no difference in the back to work order issued by the judge
and the invoking of the Ferguson Act. The injunction "did
not settle the strike, but in fact heated it up." The PTA
president perceived the Ferguson Act was not used because of
the expenses involved, citing also the community polarity
caused by the back to work injunction.

All of the respondents reported that there was no involve­
ment by any political figures in the community. The board
president commented, "They should stay out of it; they don't have all the information."

Although the PTA president was the only person that observed any post-strike recrimination, she, and none of the others, had no suggestion for dealing with this issue.

If there were a next time, the superintendent believed that the most important thing he would do differently would be to avoid making any settlements with the teachers until the amount of money to be received from the State Foundation was assured. The board president insisted next time he would keep schools closed, while the teachers' representative would avoid the strike. The PTA president, given a next time, would become more involved.

In order to avoid a similar strike, the superintendent cited a need to establish a closer relationship with the staff and provide them with as much honest financial information as possible. The board president perceived long hours of hard negotiating as the only way to avoid future strikes, but the teacher perceived such a change in the staffs' respect for themselves and in the board's improved attitude as a result of this strike that a strike would not be as likely in the future. The PTA president had no ideas concerning avoiding a strike.

When asked if the strike was worth it, the superintendent's response was very negative. "It hurts the relationship between the administration and teachers. The teachers lost more than they gained." The board president considered the strike a direct cause of the passage of the operating levy and therefore "worth it." The teachers' representative agreed that the strike was "worth it" and cited greater respect for teachers, a better attitude of the board of education, and the community's commitment to no longer take their children's education for granted as the reasons. The PTA president reported a negative response to the value of the strike, noting many hard feelings and friendships lost as a result of the sides taken during the strike.
V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

Data included in Table 18 shows the responses of the participants to the legislative questions, along with a comparison of similar and conflicting responses to some of the more important questions.

Although the superintendent and PTA president agreed that mandating bargaining with teachers would be a good idea, only the PTA president expressed a reason; "we need guidelines." The board president was against mandating bargaining, while the teachers' representative had not made a decision on this issue yet.

The superintendent and PTA president also would support a new law prohibiting teacher strikes. The superintendent again gave no reason, while the PTA president was insistent that "children should be in school." Both the board's and teachers' representatives were against legislation prohibiting teacher strikes. The board president cited the right to strike as basic to everyone, while the teacher did not like strikes, but he believed that sometimes they were necessary.

Reactions to legislation requiring binding arbitration were mixed. The superintendent was against this type of legislation and cited the arbitrator's tendency to be pro-labor as his reason. The board president also was against this type of legislation and noted the arbitrator's complete lack of future responsibility for his findings and any problems which these findings may create. The teacher, who was in favor of binding arbitration, observed a "better case" can be developed for an arbitrator. The PTA president was non-supportive because of the loss of local control when arbitrators are used.

When considering the issue of binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike, the superintendent reserved his comment until he could see the specifics of the legislation, but
the board president repeated his concern over the arbitrator's lack of responsibility for the decisions he makes. The teacher favored this type of alternative and stated, "No one wins in a strike." The PTA president repeated her concern over loss of local control.

All respondents were against legislation requiring open bargaining. Both the superintendent and PTA president noted a "show" type atmosphere would result in open bargaining. The other respondents made no additional comments.

Summary

All respondents made comments regarding issues related to research question I. Only the board president seemed to be uninformed about who actually did the negotiating for each side. All parties were involved in the strike and provided knowledgeable answers to the questions.

In this school district, the negotiator for the board of education was not an outside person. No one expressed a perception that an outsider could have handled the bargaining any better than the person who did.

The teachers' head negotiator was also a local person in this school system. None of the respondents perceived that an outside negotiator would have accomplished or influenced the strike more than the negotiator they used. There were, however, negative comments from everyone, including the teacher, regarding the negative influence the OEA representative had on the strike.

In this particular strike, the respondents had made plans to deal with most of the special issues during the strike and/or have made plans to avoid these problems in the future. The issues of anxiety, harassment, and recrimination were given no plans or suggestions for avoidance or coping.

From a legislative standpoint, open bargaining was the only issue the respondents agreed upon unanimously. The superintendent and PTA president supported four out of five of the
same issues, but no other supportive patterns developed.

The strike of school number two resulted from an inability to definitely determine receipts from the State Foundation Fund. Only the PTA president expressed any perceptions of "hard feelings and friendships lost." The teachers decided they had to fight for a previously granted contract, even if they had to pay for it by the loss of several days pay.
TABLE 18
Consistency of Responses for School Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers out</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board' negotiator</td>
<td>board+</td>
<td>supt.</td>
<td>board</td>
<td>board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of Findings and
Qualitative Analysis of Individual Schools
School Three

School number three is located in the southeast quadrant of the State of Ohio and is in the A enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

Representing the superintendent - superintendent
Representing the board of education - board president
Representing the teachers' association - former president and head negotiator during strike
Representing the PTA - A community patron

When the superintendent in this district was contacted, he strongly urged that the PTA president not be interviewed. It was the superintendent's perception that the PTA president would not be able to answer any of the questions listed in the interview schedule. The superintendent suggested, instead, a patron of community who had lived his entire life there and had formed a concerned citizens group during the strike to provide a community platform for input and informational dissemination about the strike. The teacher holding the office of teachers' association president during the strike had just been elected to office and requested that the former president whom had been president for five years and acted as head negotiator during the strike be interviewed in her place.

I. Are the superintendent, board president, teachers' association representative, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All of the respondents stated that negotiations should have been and were closed in this situation. The superintendent reported that open bargaining would "slow progress and
create too much show." The board president perceived that the public was "not expert enough to understand the negotiation process." The teacher representative thought open bargaining should be determined by each situation. The community patron commented that bargaining could be open only if "you have rules which require the public to be observers and not participants. If the public were allowed to participate, "tempers would flair and things would get out of hand."

The superintendent was first aware of an impending strike four days before it actually began. The superintendent also reported that the Uniserve man called and informed him of the strike, and the board president did not learn of the strike until the night before it happened when the same Uniserve man called him. The teachers' representative first was alerted to the strike one week before it happened when the board "refused to meet again and move from their position." The community patron, who first learned of the strike two days before it happened, was alerted by the teachers' strike vote.

Reactions to the strike were varied. The superintendent's first reaction was to "get prepared." The board president's reaction was one of disbelief; "I thought teachers were too intelligent to do this." The teacher representative expressed "anger," while the community patron stated, "I felt it would not last more than three or four days. I had faith in the people of this community; but I was sadly wrong."

The key issues causing the strike, according to all four respondents, was the non-renewal of two teaching contracts and the refusal to give reasons for such action.

The superintendent had developed a file for dealing with strikes from previous experiences and as a result his basic plans were made before the teachers' strike began. The board president, teachers' representative, and community patron did no planning until after the strike actually began.
Perceptions of the percentage of teachers not working during the strike were mixed. The superintendent and patron observed 99 per cent of the teachers not working during the strike, while the teachers' representative and board president reported 90 per cent and 85 per cent respectively.

During this eight week strike, support and pressures changed. The superintendent reported that schools were kept open during the entire strike. The non-certified employees, including the bus drivers, refused to work also, but only for the first two weeks. "After the non-certified personnel returned, things went much smoother," reported the superintendent. The board president recalled a "great deal" of community support and stated that several parents met each morning to form two lines through the picketers so that busses and children could safely enter the schools. The teachers' representative noted two community groups; a group of vigilantes backing the board and an academic group attempting to resolve the issue. The community patron expressed concern about schools being open. "I felt schools should have been closed, ... (there was) no way they could have had any meaningful education going on."

The superintendent reported at least fifty acts of violence during the eight week strike. "Attempts were made to force busses off the road, shots were fired into board members' homes, board members' properties were damaged, phone calls were made to board members' and administrators' homes at all hours of the night, and tires were slashed." The board president reported "threats on my life, cars following closely behind me to work, cars driving slowly past my home late at night, another board members house shot at, my daughter called by phone at home and told I would be killed that day, teachers who taught had cars totally destroyed, homes painted, cars painted, picture windows broken out, bus tires slashed, radiators broken out of busses, and windows broken out of busses." The teachers'
representative mentioned "threats to burn down my house, nails in teachers' driveways, windows in teachers' homes broken out, and harassing phone call." The community patron reported "teachers being pushed around, oil poured on teachers' heads by students while they crossed picket lines in busses, busses running teachers down, rocks thrown through the superintendent's front window at home, and a board member's home shot at."

The four respondents agreed that local law enforcement agencies were called during the strike, but the quality of their support was perceived very differently. The superintendent called the police on several occasions when the teachers blocked access to the building; however, the police were "very non-responsive." Although teachers were arrested on three different occasions for various charges, the superintendent observed the police as "not providing the proper support; they were afraid to become involved." The board president reported also that the police "were afraid to get involved," although later the board president admitted that the police did arrest two "OEA people for beating on the side of a school bus." The teachers' representative observed the police as very "pro-board," while the community patron was more concerned about the "tremendous amount of money" spent to hire a private security firm to protect buildings.

All respondents agreed that the board of education used an outside attorney as their head negotiator and that the teachers' used one of their local people advised by several OEA representatives.

All respondents also agreed that various forms of post-strike anxieties and recrimination prevailed.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent viewed the role of the board's negotiator as one of strictly a "legal advisor." The board president
maintained that the negotiator did a "good job; he followed the board's directives." The teachers' representative maintained that the board's negotiator tried to be a "hardnose, or at least play the role." The community patron maintained that the negotiator did "nothing."

Both the superintendent and board president reported that their negotiator brought no preconceived goals or ideas of the outcome into this bargaining situation. The teachers' representative noted that the negotiator came in with the idea that the board members were personally liable for any evaluations released about the non-renewed contracts. The community patron related that the problems and issues raised by the board's negotiator in this strike were very similar to the same things which he had negotiated in other school districts.

The superintendent and board president agreed that outside negotiators handle the emotional issues of a strike better because of their experience. The teachers and community patron disagreed, with the teacher citing no reason and the patron maintaining that "outsiders don't care about the people within the district."

The teachers' representative noticed that the board's negotiator, when introducing the board's liability to the evaluation issue, created a change in attitude. The patron recalled the board's negotiator creating a "hardening of the board's attitudes toward the strike," but the superintendent and board president observed no attitude change.

The superintendent and board president did not perceive the outside negotiator as effecting the final settlement or length of the strike. The teacher and patron agreed that the final settlement was not effected but viewed that the board's negotiator was responsible for lengthening the strike.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?
The superintendent viewed the role of the teachers' negotiator as one of "doing what he was paid for." The board president was "not impressed with the teachers' negotiator or the OEA man. They [OEA] were using our teachers as tools to achieve strength and show their power." The teachers' representative did not comment on his own role or that of the OEA. The community patron had no comment about the teacher but perceived the OEA's role as "at times very loud and tactless and at other times very diplomatic."

Only the community patron noticed any preconceived goals or opinions brought into this strike by the teachers' negotiator or his advisors. "Similar situations occurred here as occurred in other districts that used these OEA advisors," reported the community patron.

The superintendent and board president perceived that outside negotiators handle emotional issues best, while the teachers' representative and patron favored inside negotiators.

Changes in attitude brought about by the teachers' negotiator were not reported by anyone; however, the superintendent related attitude changes which prolonged the strike and were generated by the OEA advisors. The patron also mentioned a more resistant attitude on the part of the teachers once the OEA arrived.

None of the respondents reported an effect on the final settlement caused by the teachers' negotiator or his advisors. But the superintendent and board president thought that OEA contributed to the length of the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

The superintendent reported that his planning for the strike was effective. As a result of some of his experiences in other strikes, the superintendent hired an attorney and
held several special meetings with the board of education to 
brief and prepare them. In the future the superintendent 
noted nothing he would change. The board president relied on 
the superintendent and Ohio School Boards Association lit-
erature for planning guidelines. The board president had 
no comments on making any changes in future strike plans. The 
teachers' representative reported the strike was fairly un-
organized until OEA came into the situation. Given a next 
time, the teachers would change nothing in their plans. The 
community patron held several informational meetings and spent 
a great deal of time developing a proposal for a settlement. 
The patron had no suggestions for any changes in his planning 
if he had to do it again. Despite the tremendous amount of 
anxiety, violence, and threats of violence in this strike, only 
one step was taken to prevent violence; a security service was 
hired to watch buildings and busses. No one had made any plans 
or had any suggestions for avoiding this same situation in the 
future.

No special arrangements were made to assist substitutes 
in crossing the picket lines, despite the threats and damage 
to their personal property. Only the teachers' representative 
had a suggestion on how to deal with substitutes, "fear."

The media was observed by the superintendent as favoring 
the teachers' side of the issues. "The media tended to feed 
the teachers' will to stay out until they received what they 
wanted," the superintendent related. The board president 
agreed the media was "very biased for teachers... they kept 
things stirred up." However, neither the superintendent or 
board president made any suggestions on how they might have 
or will handle the media differently. The teachers' repres-
entative viewed the media coverage "totally pro-board of 
education." Given a next time, the teachers planned to "seek 
out a neutral reporter and refuse to talk with all others." 
The patron viewed the newspapers as "for the board's side,"
while the radio coverage "took no sides." The community patron had no suggestions on how he might deal with the media any differently in the future.

All respondents agreed that the key issue causing the strike remained the same throughout the strike.

The superintendent was conscious of a great deal of community support for the schools as a whole. "Early on there were meetings at the homes of community members; as time went on more people became involved by helping in the buildings, bringing children to school, working as teacher aids, and watching and guarding busses," stated the superintendent. The superintendent believed the community support shifted to the administration's favor as the strike was prolonged. The board president recalled attempts by community people to keep picket lines open and escort busses on their rounds. The teachers' representative viewed the board of education's community support to be "blue collar types," while the teachers' community support came from the "academic, people with good head" part of the community. The patron referred to a very radical group of community members who agitated and lengthened the strike. The patron recalled, "I feel everyone in this school district, regardless of side, had the same goal, to settle the strike. Maybe each one had a different method, but still the same goal. There were friendships lost and enemies made: if they had all sat down and talked about it, things could have been settled sooner. If they had, there would not still be so much animosity today."

All respondents agreed that the Ferguson Act had been threatened, but never used. The superintendent viewed the act as "unwieldy, cumbersome, and not workable." The board president would have "invoked the act had the strike lasted much longer." The teachers' representative perceived the Ferguson Act as a joke, while the patron perceived that the teachers would have ignored the act even if it had been invoked.
The superintendent recalled seeking no other types of injunctions against the teachers because "courts usually favor teachers." The board president recalled seeking and receiving picket limitation order against the teachers which was ignored. The teachers representative recalled no injunction, but the patron recalled an effective picket limitation injunction which was sought and received. None of the respondents commented on plans to deal with an injunction if another strike should occur in the future.

The board president and teacher representative recalled no political figures becoming involved in this strike. The board president commented that political figures should not become involved, and the teacher perceived that they were afraid to become involved. The superintendent recalled attempts by a state representative, probate judge, and the local prosecuting attorney to influence the strike. The patron recalled a state figure was involved but mentioned that he would have liked to see more local political figures involved. None of the respondents ascertained that the limited political involvement influenced the strike in any way.

To combat post-strike anxieties and recrimination, the superintendent provided a "buffer day." When the strike was settled, the teachers were given one day with pay, to work in the schools without the students there to organize themselves and begin to restart schools. If there is another strike situation, the superintendent suggested a "two day buffer" might be more effective. The other three respondents reported post-strike recrimination but had no suggestions for avoiding or coping with it.

The superintendent could think of nothing he would do differently if he had this entire situation to do again. The board president wanted to see a "more responsible strike vote taken by the teachers. They voted three times before the OEA could intimidate enough teachers to vote for a strike."
The teachers' representative would try to be more organized from the beginning, while the patron would like the community to take more of a "wait and see attitude" toward the strike.

Both the superintendent and board president mentioned nothing they could have done or could do in the future to avoid a strike. The teachers' representative and patron said the teachers have formed a standing committee to elect new board members in the future.

The superintendent and board president observed that the strike was worth it. The superintendent reported he had "no choice" in the decision; the board president had a strong commitment to "fight for what you believe is right." The teacher did not think the strike was worth it because of the way it was handled but would "do it again under the same circumstances." The patron viewed "no strike is ever worth it."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

Table 19 presents the responses made by the four respondents to the legislative questions and a comparison of similar and conflicting responses to several of the more important questions.

The superintendent would not commit himself to legislation mandating bargaining with teachers until he saw the specifics of the law. The board president saw no need for such legislation because "any board that is honest should be able to sit down with their teachers and review the budget and intelligently reach a decision." The teachers' representative was very much for mandated bargaining because "some boards refuse to negotiate." The patron reported a need for "some guidelines." Both the superintendent and board president would support new legislation prohibiting the right for teachers to strike. The superintendent mentioned that "education is a vital service, and children are being hurt." The board president commented
that "when you sign a contract, I expect you to honor that contract." The teachers' representative was against a new no strike law but gave no reasons. The community patron stated that "teachers are the most under paid, highly educated people there are. They have been kicked around for years. They should have the opportunity to stand up for their rights."

The superintendent and board president would not support legislation requiring binding arbitration as a final grievance step. The superintendent related that "having gone through three binding arbitration cases, we always gave more than we really could afford; the teachers always received something." The board president perceived that "80 per cent of all arbitration cases are awarded to labor, because without labor disputes, there would be no need for arbitrators." The teachers' representative favored binding arbitration of grievances because "it is the fastest and most effective way." The patron declined commitment until he could read the specifics of such a law.

Both the superintendent and board president were against binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike for the same reasons they were against binding arbitration for grievances. The teachers' representative was also for this type of binding arbitration for the same reasons as he was for binding arbitration for grievances. The patron again wanted to see the specifics of the law before commenting.

Only the teachers' representative would support open bargaining legislation for teacher negotiations.

Summary

In this particular school system, all four respondents expressed an awareness and knowledge of the basic strike issues. The first two weeks of the strike, everyone became involved in as much of the strike as possible. After the community patron submitted his proposal for a settlement to
the board and it was rejected, the patron resigned from his citizens committee and worked "on the sidelines as an individual."

The influence of the board's outside negotiator was perceived very differently by the four respondents. The superintendent and board president reported that his negotiator influenced only the legal aspects of the strike. The teachers' representative reported that the board's negotiator really did nothing but scare the board into not releasing reasons for the contract renewals. The community patron discerned that the board's negotiator dragged the strike out as long as he could to receive as much fee as possible. None of the respondents perceived that the outside negotiator had any major influence on the outcome of the strike. Only the community patron mentioned that someone else should have been used, but his reasoning was not another person would have done a better job, but a cheaper job.

Although the respondents acknowledged the teachers' representative as the person designated as head negotiator, most all comments were directed at his OEA advisors. Except for the teachers' representative, all of the respondents reported negative opinions of the OEA's participation and would have liked to have seen the teachers negotiate without OEA's assistance.

Despite a long and violent strike, little planning was done to avoid the violence or to prepare for or avoid a strike in the future. The participants all blamed each other for the strike, and therefore, since a strike would never be their idea or fault, they could not plan for it. Only the teachers took positive action to avoid a reoccurrence; they developed a campaign to remove board members and to elect new members at the next election who would be sympathetic to the teachers.

None of the legislative issues received unanimous support or rejection. Both the superintendent and board president favored four of the five issues, but no other patterns
developed.

The strike in school district number three resulted because of the non-renewal of two teachers' contracts. After eight weeks of violence, the issue was sent to binding arbitration. The arbitrator's ruling was interpreted differently by the administration and teachers' association. Although the teachers received a new fair dismissal policy, the board still refused to reinstate the two teachers whose contracts were not renewed, so both sides claimed victory in the arbitrator's decision.
**TABLE 19**

Consistency of Responses for School Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers out</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>supt. +</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>local +</td>
<td>local +</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain.</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance ar.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School number four is found in the southeast quadrant of the State of Ohio and is part of the B enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent - superintendent
- Representing the board of education - board president
- Representing the teachers' association - teachers' president
- Representing the PTA - Local minister

When the superintendent of this school district was contacted, he indicated that the school had no PTA. The superintendent was able to provide the name of a local minister who had been in the community for eleven years and usually chaired any citizen's committee that was formed to discuss school issues. During this particular strike, the minister was part of a Citizens for Better Schools committee.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association president, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All four respondents agreed that bargaining in this situation was not and should not be open to the general public. The superintendent related that "it would not bother me personally, but I think there would be problems if either side started playing to the public." The board president perceived the bargaining process as "too complex for the general public to understand." The teachers' president viewed bargaining as "strictly business between labor and management." The minister
reported that "OEA had people too stirred up to meet rationally."

The superintendent reported a two day notice about the impending strike. The superintendent was first alerted when the teachers' president commented to the superintendent that teachers would not work Monday if the agreement was not ratified. The board president received only a one day strike notice the teachers' strike vote was taken. The teachers' president reported a one day notice but insisted that this was not a strike. "It was a lockout in union terms. We ratified the contract; they refused," recalled the teachers' president. The minister had heard rumors from the teachers of a possible strike several weeks in advance but never believed a strike would happen until the night before when the teachers contacted him and informed him of the strike which would begin the next day.

Initial reactions to the strike were mixed. The superintendent observed, "Ten years ago I might have been upset, not now." The board president's only comment was "let them [teachers] go out on strike." The teachers' president expressed "anger," while the minister perceived the situation as "illegal, unfortunate, and provoked by OEA."

According to the superintendent, the key issue causing the strike was the failure of the board to pass the final package. The board president recalled the key issue was money, but the teachers' president recalled two key issues: 1. failure of the board to ratify the contract, and 2. lack of communication between the board of education and their negotiator. The minister noted that the "failure of Ohio law to respond to the needs of teachers "was the key issue."

Only the superintendent reported that he made plans before the strike began. The other respondents made plans after the strike began. However, since the strike lasted only one day, few plans had time to be implemented.
Perceptions of the percentage of teachers that did not report for work on the day of the strike varied. The superintendent reported 85 per cent of the teachers out, while the board president, teachers' president, and minister reported 95 per cent, 97 per cent, and 87 per cent respectively.

Although schools were kept open, the respondents agreed that the strike was too short for pressures to develop or for sides to be chosen.

The length of the strike also limited anxieties, threats, and violence. The superintendent reported a few telephone calls to his home and those of the board members. Some of these calls were people who identified themselves and disagreed with the action taken. Other calls were anonymous and harassing. The superintendent also recalled that someone found keys to one of the busses and blocked one of the school entrances with the bus and hid the keys. The board president received a few telephone calls but the teachers' president stated that the strike was "too short for anything to happen." The minister recalled that a head light was broken out of a car crossing the picket line but insisted he knew for a fact that the person responsible was an outsider.

The superintendent called the local sheriff to keep school entrances open, and he was "very pleased with their [sheriff's] involvement." The other respondents also made positive comments about the sheriff, and the minister added that "the sheriff helped prevent violence. He was respected by the OEA."

All respondents agreed that the board of education used an outside negotiator and that the teachers used an OEA Unions representative.

The superintendent and board president were unaware of any post-strike anxieties or recrimination. The teachers and minister, however, disagreed. The teachers were conscious of an "animosity and quiet resentment toward the scabs." The minister was aware of "several teachers who resigned at the
end of the year because of the recrimination."

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The board's negotiator was apprised by the superintendent to have done "a tremendous job."...He [negotiator] listened to what the board wanted and got for the board what they wanted." The board president was impressed with the negotiator and mentioned the negotiator's "vast experiences in private sector labor relations." The teachers' president related that the board's negotiator "did his job," but the minister described him as "soft spoken, understanding of the union's position, well versed in the law, and able to communicate."

Only the teachers' president recalled any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinion of the strike that were brought in by the board's negotiator. "He [negotiator] had a personal prejudice against teachers," reported the teachers' president.

The superintendent related that an outsider handles the emotional issues of a strike better than an insider. "You can vent your feelings to an outsider, then he is gone, and with him alot of feelings...he shoulders much of the blame," said the superintendent. The board president preferred an insider for negotiation for any issues because "an insider was cheaper." The teachers' president said the ability to handle emotional issues "depends on the individual negotiator, and not the fact that he was an insider or an outsider." The minister reported that he really "did not know" which kind of negotiator handled emotional issues best.

Both the superintendent and board president noticed no change in attitude by anyone as a result of the presence of the board's negotiator. The teachers' president, however, reported that the board negotiator made the board itself prejudiced against the teachers. The minister observed the board's negotiator as providing the proper attitude for the
board "to deal with the OEA."

The superintendent and board president credited their negotiator with keeping the final settlement within the financial boundaries that were set. The teachers' president perceived the board's negotiator as keeping the final settlement lower than the teachers would have liked, but "within acceptable bounds." The minister reported the board's negotiator to have "no influence on the final settlement."

No one reported that any influence on the length of the strike was created by the board's negotiator.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent described the role of the teachers' negotiator as "arrogant, obstinate, a typical union negotiator." The board president reported the negotiator to be a "nice guy, one to one, but at the table, alot of mouth." The teachers' president commented that she was "satisfied" with the role her negotiator played. The minister recalled the teachers' negotiator "created polarization within the community."

Both the superintendent and board president reported the teachers' negotiator brought preconceived goals and ideas into this situation. The superintendent recalled "sixty items on the teachers' original package, that were exactly the same items requested by OEA in other area schools." The board president accused the OEA of "using our school as an example and show of force." The minister agreed that the OEA representative brought in "state issues," but the teachers' president was "not aware" of any preconceived ideas or goals on the part of her negotiator.

The superintendent noted a change in teacher attitudes toward the board of education and the administration and claimed that "OEA created animosity toward the board and administration." The board president reported that "the public
now has a bad opinion of teachers' associations as a result of the conduct of this OEA negotiator." The teachers did not think their negotiator changed any attitudes, but the minister observed the teachers' negotiator "convinc[ed] the local teachers they needed all the OEA state issues."

Only the minister did not perceive the teachers' negotiator had increased the final settlement which the teachers received. No one thought the teachers' negotiator had influenced the length of the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

Planning for the strike had been started before the strike by the superintendent. Having been through a strike in this same system before, the superintendent had made plans before the strike actually started. Plans had been made to: 1. keep schools open, 2. centralize all press releases, and 3. keep non-certified staff working. Since the superintendent perceived these plans to be effective, he reported "no changes would be made if the plan was needed again in the future."

The board president noted that some type of plan needs to be created which would include involving the public so that they would be informed before a future strike situation existed. The teachers' president admitted that no plans were made before the strike because of the short notice given and that few plans were made during the strike because of the shortness of the strike itself. The teachers' president did not report any plans or changes in plans for future strikes. The minister related that he had reorganized a committee of citizens that had worked together to pass an operating levy to plan for this strike. However, the "brevity of the strike made implementation of such plans impossible." In the future, the minister would like to "force the state board of education and some of
the legislators to come to the community and discuss the issues
causing the strike."

The brevity of the strike limited the amount of anxiety
manifested during this one day strike. No one reported any
attempt to deal with the problems that did arise or a plan for
any future problems.

The length of the strike was also mentioned by all of
the respondents as the reason substitute teachers were not used,
and as a result, no problems occurred or plans needed to be
made.

Although the superintendent expressed concern that the
media took "cheap shots," he was unaware of this fact influenc­
ing the strike in any way. The superintendent did not report
any plans to handle the media any differently in the future.
The board president viewed the media coverage as "pro-teacher"
but said it was not influential in the strike settlement. The
teachers' president viewed the media coverage as "fair and
objective," but she did not note any influence on the strike
as a result of the coverage. The minister recalled the media
coverage to be "bad press, a little better radio." The min­
ister also credited the newspapers with "polarizing the com­
munity." In the future the minister would write to the news­
paper editors requesting equal space for both sides.

No one reported a change in the key issues throughout
the strike.

The superintendent reported a "continuation of talks
with individual teachers and OEA" as his contribution to
settling the strike. The board president related no special
tactics used on his part to settle the strike, but the teachers'
president "worked with the federal mediator, to settle the
strike." The minister "collected facts, interviewed and talked
with the mediator, and provided counseling to those emotionally
injured by the process."
The community "supported both sides and made several phone calls to help reach a settlement and keep things calm," reported the superintendent. The board president also acknowledged support from community leaders. The teachers' president reported that the community "inundated the board with phone calls and forced a quick settlement." The minister credited the community with keeping the schools open for the one day of the strike.

All respondents agreed that the Ferguson Act was not used or even threatened in a strike this short. The superintendent would "never recommend the use of the Ferguson Act because of what happened at Southpoint." The board president repeated the superintendent's comments concerning the brevity of the strike and added, "Why force them to work when they don't want too." The teachers' president expressed concern about the amount of the costs of invoking the Ferguson Act. The minister did not perceive the Ferguson Act to be "workable."

The superintendent reported that "two state representatives called during the strike and asked if they could be of help and would the superintendent please keep them informed." The board and teachers' presidents recalled no political involvement, while the minister labeled the lack of political involvement as part of the problem. "They were too chicken to become involved," related the minister.

None of the respondents had made plans for dealing with or avoiding post-strike anxiety or recrimination now or in the future.

If there were another strike, the superintendent would do nothing differently. The board president would "make the maximum offer first and avoid long negotiations." The teachers' president listed "more information to the community," as the one best thing to change, while the minister listed "communication and awareness of OEA state issues" as the one thing he would change.
The superintendent believes that a strike "can not be avoided if the teachers feel they can gain by it." The board president was able to ascertain nothing that could be done to avoid a strike. The teachers' president "did not know" of anything that could be done to avoid a strike, and the minister suggested that strikes could be avoided if "better legislation were promoted."

When asked if the strike was worth all the problems that went with it, the superintendent replied that it was. "This was a special case. Only a one day strike has few problems," responded the superintendent. The board president who did not view the strike as worth it said, "We will never recover from the community feelings." The teachers' president reported the strike was worth it because they "received what they wanted." The minister did not observe the strike as worth it because "people were hurt."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

The superintendent would support legislation that mandated collective bargaining with teachers. "If done on a state level, we might be able to avoid the constant local problems of negotiations," responded the superintendent. The board president agreed to support this legislation but declined giving specific reasons for support. The teachers' president also would support mandated bargaining because "it [negotiations] would go easier and better if we had a workable law." The minister was against mandated bargaining but gave no reasons.

None of the respondents supported new legislation that would prohibit teachers from striking. Only the teacher provided a reason, "there comes a point when teachers have nothing left to do but strike."

The superintendent would not support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step because "we would
be loosing local budget contol." The board president also would not support this legislation because he "did not like binding arbitration." The teachers' president would support binding arbitration as a final grievance step. "How can you go to one of the parties of the dispute and expect them to settle it?" asked the teachers' president. The minister was against this legislation because of "loss of local power."

Legislation mandating binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike would not be supported by the superintendent because of the "loss of local control." The board president repeated his "dislike of arbitration" for any reason. The teachers' president would not comment on binding arbitration as an alternative to strikes until she had seen the specifics of the legislation. The minister was against the legislation because of "loss of local control."

None of the respondents would support legislation mandating open bargaining. The superintendent was against open bargaining because of the tendency to "play to the audience." The board president perceived the public as "unqualified to participate." The teachers' president perceived that the bargaining process was only between the two parties, while the minister cited "loss of control in the meetings" as his reasoning for disliking open bargaining.

Summary

All respondents in this school system preferred many of their responses with references to the very short duration of the strike. Considering that the strike lasted only one day, the respondents were active and organized. Each respondent was aware of, knowledgeable of, and involved in all aspects of this strike. A strike of longer duration had occurred in this district two years earlier. The respondents were much more interested in the first strike than the one currently being investigated.
All respondents credited the board's negotiator with doing his job well. The negotiator was given much credit for the quality of the package which was accepted by the teachers but which was later refused by the board. Issues creating the strike itself appeared to be more between the board and the teachers, with the negotiator providing little input during the one day strike itself.

The teachers' outside negotiator was perceived by all of the respondents, except the teachers' president, as a very disturbing force in the negotiations and strike. More comments were made concerning problems caused rather than solved by the teachers' negotiator. This negotiator was also credited with great control over the teachers, their attitudes, and the issues the teachers brought to the bargaining table.

Since all of the respondents had been a part of the first strike, many problems had been dealt with earlier. The brevity of the most recent strike prevented any reasonable opportunity to observe if any plans or problems were dealt with better or at least differently as a result of everyone's experience. Despite two strikes in this same system in such a short time, no one had any suggestions or plans for avoiding a next time.

On legislative issues, all respondents voted unanimously against open bargaining and new legislation prohibiting teachers from striking. The superintendent and board president voted exactly the same on all issues, while the minister, who had repeatedly blamed the legislature for school problems, voted against every legislative question given to him.

The strike in school number four resulted after the board's negotiator and teachers agreed on a negotiation package and then the board, feeling "left out" as the teachers' president put it, decided they would reject the package until they had time to study the final package. The almost instant and decisive decision for the teachers to strike and added
pressure from the superintendent and community encouraged the board to vote for the package at the end of the first strike day.

Data included in Table 20 shows a comparison of the responses of the interviewees for agreeing and conflicting answers.
### Table 20

Consistency of Responses for School Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers out</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance ar.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of Findings and Qualitative Analysis of Individual Schools

School Five

School number five is located in the southwest quadrant of Ohio and is in the B enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent - superintendent
- Representing the board of education - board president
- Representing the teachers' association - former president and head negotiator during the strike
- Representing the PTA - PTA president

The teachers' association president expressed concern regarding the interview and encouraged the use of the former president and head negotiator during the strike to replace her in the interview.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association representative, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

The superintendent reported a desire to see negotiations remain closed because "if they were open, parties would perform for the public rather than bargaining." The board president agreed that bargaining should remain closed, citing that "no bargaining is done while people are there." The teachers' representative also would not like open bargaining because most members of the general public "don't know all of the facts or background to judge what is going on." The PTA president suggested that "the public should be aware of both sides' issues and offers, but not be at the table.

The superintendent first realized the strike was eminent three days before the strike started when the teachers' negotiating team did not recommend the last package to the
membership. The board president reported a one week notice and cited that the determining factor was the board's refusal to accept binding arbitration as part of the package. The teachers' representative held out hope until one-half hour before the teachers' actual strike vote. The PTA president was on vacation when the strike began and was not aware of the strike's existence until she called home to a friend.

Initial reactions to the strike were mixed. The superintendent did not really believe the teachers would not work until he saw them on the picket lines. The board president was very "upset" and said, "We have always had a good relationship with our staff, and I felt the strike was largely influenced by outside sources." The teacher expressed concern about the superintendent's unmovable attitude, while the PTA president perceived a major influence from OEA and said, "I was sick."

The superintendent reported the following to be the key issues causing the strike: 1. binding arbitration of grievances, 2. salary, and 3. high level of distrust between teams. The board president reported only the binding arbitration and salary issues, while the teachers' representative perceived the key issues to be a power struggle. The PTA president listed binding arbitration and state level OEA issues as the key issues.

Despite the short notice of an impending strike received by each of the participants, everyone except the PTA president made plans to deal with the strike before it actually began. Perceptions of the percentage of teachers supporting the strike varied little. Both the superintendent and teachers' representative reported 75 per cent not working. The board president perceived slightly more, 80 per cent, of the staff out. The PTA president's perception of non-working teachers, however, was 95 per cent.

A 3 to 2 split vote by the board of education on most negotiation issues created many pressures for the superintendent
and board president. "The teachers were constantly working on individual board members for that final vote," reported the superintendent. The superintendent also reported a Citizens' Group was founded and supported by the teachers to attend board meetings in masses and pressure board members to contradict each other. Although schools were kept open by a few parent volunteers and 82 substitute teachers, the board president perceived the non-certified staff's support of the teachers' strike to be a very powerful force against the board and administration. The teachers' representative also referred to the Citizen's Group as a teacher formed group and commented that the community support for the administration "was so small it was ridiculous." The PTA president, who was very supportive of the administration, stated, "I do not feel my child's education was interrupted. I feel we had very qualified substitute teachers."

Anxieties, threats, and violence ran high. According to the superintendent, "Letters were sent to the superintendent implying physical threats. Substitute teachers practically had to run over picketers, and one teacher, after jumping on the hood of a car, attempted to fake an injury." The superintendent also stated threatening phone calls were made to board members, their mailboxes were damaged, things were thrown in their yards, and anonymous phone calls were made to children encouraging them not to go to school. The superintendent reported that he finally hired a professional security service to guard the school and had a personal body guard assigned to himself. The board president reported her house "egged" and several obscene telephone calls. She also reported that the teachers and substitutes that worked had to be brought in mass to the buildings by bus. A law suit between a picketer and a substitute teacher who both allege personal property damage is still pending. The teachers' representative also reported several incidents. "One board member and his wife, who is a
teacher, called striking teachers and told them how bad they were for striking. These same two people went to community meetings and harassed the teachers in attendance. A community member was hit by a board members' car as he tried to ram through the picket line." The teachers' representative also reported violence started by his teachers. "I have found there are some teachers you just cannot control. When they become loose, they are uncontrollable. I saw cars egged and scratched. I personally threatened a teacher because I would not tolerate that type of behavior." The PTA president was also aware of teachers calling their students at home and informing them that schools would be closed the next day. The PTA leader also reported teachers using "foul language" to people crossing picket lines, "cars pounded on, spit on, and one car windshield broken out by a teacher with a tire iron."

Involvement in strike activities by local law enforcement agencies varied in the minds of the participants. The superintendent reported several officers on duty at each location. One of the officers was accused of being sympathetic toward the teachers. According to the story told to the superintendent and board president, this officer stopped substitute teachers crossing the picket lines, checked their drivers license, and then held the license up high enough for strikers to copy down the address so that they could later harass them at home. The teachers' representative perceived that the local police were very fair to both sides and said, "We probably had a better relationship with the police and the security force hired by the administration than they did." The PTA president accused the police of standing by and allowing harassment and violence to be done to cars crossing picket lines.

The teachers' representative related a story regarding the administration's security force. According to the local teachers' representative, the second morning one of the building administrators jumped out of his car and yelled at
several of the security officers for not clearing the picket lines fast enough to let him through. That afternoon the chief of the security force telephoned the teachers' representa­ tive and suggested he have as many teachers at the high school at dismissal time as possible. When administrators began to leave for the day, the security force placed one officer in front, one in back, and several on each side of the administrators' car and slowly walked the car around the school drive and out onto the street. This protected the car, but took so long that each administrator was forced to listen to ten to fifteen minutes of verbal harassment and insults from the large number of teachers that assembled and walked along with the guards.

All of the respondents agreed that the assistant super­ intendent was the head negotiator for the board of education, and that the teacher who was interviewed negotiated for the teachers.

Recrimination was perceived by all respondents to be very strong. The superintendent noted "name calling and people not speaking to each other to this day." The board president reported that "every board member that was up for reelection was not reelected." The teachers' representative observed harassment of striking bus drivers by the administration, verbal exchanges between strikers and non-strikers, and one specific principal showing favoritism toward non-striking teach­ ers.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent viewed that the role of the head nego­ tiator for the board was slightly antagonistic. "He should have said no in a more appeasing manner, rather than the I don't give a damn attitude." The board president's impression
was one of "a job well done." The teachers' representative discerned that the board's negotiator "enjoyed playing roles," and as a result, "you never knew where he was coming from. However, I do think that if the strike had been left up to him, it would have ended sooner." The PTA president reported that the board's negotiator "did a very nice job."

The teachers', board, and PTA representatives were not aware of any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions about the outcome of the strike brought in by the board's negotiator. The superintendent commented that given a strike situation the board's negotiator would not "give an inch" on some of the issues.

The superintendent perceived that emotional issues are best handled by outsiders, while the board president commented that it "depends upon the individuals involved." The teacher and PTA representatives did not know if inside or outside negotiators handled emotional issues any differently.

Both the superintendent and board president discerned no attitude changes brought about by the board's negotiator. The PTA president reported she did not know if there were any changes. The teachers' representative reported, "Up until the strike, I was very much for inside negotiators only. Now due to the total rupture of relationships between the superintendent and teachers, I feel we will always need an outsider now."

The board, teacher, and PTA representatives were not conscious of any effect on the final settlement of length of the strike that was precipitated by the board's negotiator. However, the superintendent was conscious of a constant dueling between the two negotiators that lengthened the strike.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent and board president independently discerned the same opinion of the teachers' negotiator and his
role. Both reported an initial trust which quickly eroded when the teachers' negotiator could not deliver the support for various aspects of the package that he said he could. Although the teachers representative appraised himself as doing "a good job," the PTA president described him as "belligerent and not interested in settling."

Concerning preconceived goals, ideas, and opinions of the teachers' negotiator, the superintendent stated, "They came in with certain items which they refused to move on." The board president viewed the association's insistence on binding arbitration as a final grievance step as a state goal of the OEA. The teachers' and PTA representatives did not know of any preconceived issues which were brought in by the teachers' negotiator.

The superintendent and board president were not aware of any changes in attitudes brought about by the teachers' negotiator. Both the teacher and PTA representatives responded that they "did not know."

The superintendent was cognizant of a dueling role between the two negotiators which probably lengthened the strike. The board president was of the opinion that the teachers lengthened the strike, while the teacher was aware of no influence on the settlement or strike length brought about by himself. The PTA president stated that the teachers' negotiator prolonged the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

Everyone except the PTA president began making plans prior to the beginning of the strike. The superintendent defined the roles everyone would play and contacted a neighboring school district that had just settled a strike. The board president said that the extent of the planning was only to procure a professional security service. The teachers had
plans covering every aspect of the strike written out in advance of the first day. The PTA president related, "When a strike situation begins, I believe the PTA should disband and each individual should pursue the side he/she feels he/she should."

Only the teachers' representative attempted to cope with and/or avoid the anxieties and threats that accompany strikes. He made a plea to the teachers not to participate in any form of "unprofessional behavior." Even given the same situation again, the other respondents had no suggestions or plans to cope with this problem.

The superintendent was the only interviewee who conceived a way to deal with substitutes and the problems encountered with their use. He suggested a need to limit curriculum during a strike to non-volatile issues and have daily meetings with the administration and the substitute staff to air anxieties and deal with them before they became larger problems. In the future, the superintendent suggested that substitute teachers meet in a common location and be bussed in mass to the individual schools.

The superintendent commented that the media coverage was "intense with most of the space going to the under-dog, in this case, the teachers." After a public relations man was brought in from the county office, the superintendent observed approximately 40 per cent of the media coverage went to the board of education's side. "Overall I believe the press lengthened the strike," reported the superintendent. "Press releases from both sides were used to negotiate through the press rather than face to face." Given an opportunity to deal with this same situation again, the superintendent related that a newsletter sent home with the kids received "alot of backlash. Next time I would have parents distribute these flyers door-to-door." The board president thought the press coverage was extremely
pro-teacher until the county public relations man began to handle the board's press releases, for "when the information went through him, things balanced out." The teachers' representative related that the media coverage "could not have been better. The press tried to be fair to both sides but, by the end of the strike it became so obvious that the board had never met as a group that the press had to support us." The teachers' representative also noted that the media coverage probably boosted teacher morale by "showing them how much support they had." The PTA president related a tendency on the part of television to "glorify the process and only show the wild things that happened. The press favored the teachers."

The issues causing the strike and those settling the strike changed, according to the superintendent. "Money issues finally settled the strike; binding arbitration was only a strategy," said the superintendent. The other respondents did not perceive a change in the basic issues.

Attempts by each of the respondents to settle the strike varied. The superintendent cited "press conferences and information flyers" as key instruments in his plan, while the board president mentioned continued negotiations, compromises, and a federal mediator as part of her plan. The teachers' representative made "daily attempts to negotiate, brought in experts, tried compromises, asked for federal mediation or arbitration, and went to the public and asked them to pressure the board to meet as a group." The teachers' representative concluded, "Next time we will get aggressive sooner and make sure we close the schools." The PTA president planned an informational meeting for 25 key community members in her home. "When the meeting finally began, we had 57 people, including the media," reported the PTA leader.

The superintendent stated the community was extremely active throughout the strike and said, "They pressured the board members by telephone and eventually voted three of them
out of office." The board president recalled many community
meetings, and the teachers' representative was conscious of
the extremely union oriented town's support of the teachers'
and was aware of the pressure against the administration. The
PTA president agreed that the community sided with the teachers
and added also that "the community fought among themselves
constantly." Only the teachers' and PTA representatives
attempted to involve the community directly into their cause.

When discussing the use of the Ferguson Act, all res­
pondents agreed that it was not invoked in this situation.
The superintendent gave no reason for not using this act, and
the board president did not conceive the act as workable.
The teachers' representative viewed the Ferguson Act as a
"farce," and the PTA president labeled it "ineffective."

The board and PTA presidents recalled a picket injunction
was sought and received by the administration. The superin­
tendent commented that he started to obtain a picket limitation
injunction, but the strike ended before he had a chance to
file for it. The teachers' representative made no reference
to the picket limitation issue but reported that the teachers
sued the board of education and administration for bad faith
bargaining. Although the teachers did not win the case, "it
was worth trying anything," reported the teachers' represent­
ative. If another strike should occur in the future, all the
respondents would again react to injunctions in the same manner.

The superintendent and board president were not aware of
any political involvement during the strike. The teachers'
representative viewed the AF of L - CIO's support of the teach­
ers as a political involvement, but the PTA representative
remembered no political involvement.

Only the superintendent and PTA president made any effort
toward avoiding or at least minimizing post-strike recrimination.
The superintendent made a point to let people know that
everything that had been said and done during the strike was "past history." All building administrators were asked to be very visible the first week back to school and to tactfully discourage groups from forming and "rehashing the strike." The PTA president went in to talk with her daughter's teacher to encourage a "burying of wounds." The teachers' representative made no comment about dealing with this issue, and the board president said, "I don't know how you could handle it."

If given an opportunity to do one thing differently, the superintendent would have a community organization formed before the strike to communicate the board's views. The board president commented, "We did everything we possibly could." The teachers' representative perceived a need for a new board of education, but the PTA president would "do it all the same again."

According to the superintendent, the one most important thing that could be done to avoid another strike was "More communication with the faculty." The board president ascertained that "nothing can be done," while the teachers' representative related, "We did everything we could this time." The PTA president cited a need to "make rank and file teachers more aware of issues, and keep state OEA out of the situation."

When asked if the strike was "worth it," the superintendent's impression was "yes," but he added, "no one won." The board president did not know if the strike was worth it, but the conception of the teachers' representative was "no strike is ever worth it; both sides are losers." The PTA president ascertained that the strike must have been worth it because it "could not have been avoided."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

Only the teachers' representative would support mandated bargaining with teachers because "teachers have no rights
except through a strong union or new legislation." The superintendent expressed concern that open bargaining would result in a "show for the audience," while the board and PTA presidents responded that each school should be free to choose.

Although he gave no reasons, the superintendent would support new legislation prohibiting teacher strikes. The board president would also support a new bill of this kind because "education is lost and is not an appropriate place for a strike." The teachers' representative was against such a bill because teachers already have very "limited rights." The PTA president would support this legislation and cited the "harm" to kids and loss of respect of teachers.

Only the board president refused to support binding arbitration as a final grievance step and cited loss of local control as her reason. The superintendent viewed binding arbitration as workable, while the teachers' representative observed it as an "extension of the legal system." The PTA president noted that "you need a referee sometimes."

The superintendent was against binding arbitration as an alternative to strikes and stated that the arbitrator "would not be familiar with our local situation." The board president perceived binding arbitration as a "loss of local control," while the teachers' representative believed arbitration was an "extension of the legal system." The PTA president was against binding arbitration because a "third party does not have enough background to make a fair decision."

At the beginning of the interview, the superintendent expressed a desire to see negotiations closed to the public because of the tendency of both parties to "perform to the audience." However, when asked at the end of the interview if he would support legislation mandating open bargaining, he was very supportive, noting "there must be a time when the administration demonstrates that it is pursuing good fiscal management." The board and teacher representatives were
against open bargaining legislation but had no specific reasons. The PTA president favored this type of legislation and perceived a "quicker settlement" would result.

Summary

Except for a few minor disagreements, the four respondents reported involvement, knowledge of, and awareness of the strike issues. The PTA president insisted that her involvement through public meetings held within the community and in her home were personal actions and not those of her role as a PTA officer.

Prior to this strike, the respondents were very much in favor of the board using an insider negotiator. No one was cognizant of any great influences he made on the bargaining process or anything except emotional issues that an outsider could have done better. Now that the district has experienced a strike, some questions are being raised about using outside negotiators. In fact, the year after the strike, the board did use an outside negotiator.

The superintendent, board, and PTA representatives expressed a preference for inside negotiators for the teachers; however, in this case the inside teacher who was negotiating developed a personality conflict with the administration and board. A final settlement for this strike was not reached until the teachers' negotiator was replaced the last two days of the strike.

Despite a desire on both sides of the table to keep inside negotiators, both the board and teachers' association are trying outside negotiators to see if they can avoid another strike.

Planning and coping with the special issues that arise during a strike were handled best by the superintendent and teachers' representative. Both had made plans prior to the strike and had ideas about doing a better job the next time. The board and PTA presidents made few plans and had no ideas
for the future.

When considering the legislative issues, the superintendent and PTA president voted for and against the same issues, while the teachers' president voted against their pattern. The board president did support 3 of the 5 same issues that the superintendent and PTA president supported.

The strike in school district number five resulted in a violent and emotional experience for all concerned. Throughout the four interviews conducted in this district, references were made regarding a lack of communication, and as a result, most suggestions for future planning contained new communication ideas.
### TABLE 21

Consistency of Responses for School Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK - Don't know</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP - Depends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ - with outside advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>1/2 hour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers out</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School number six is found in the northeast quadrant of Ohio and is part of the B enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent - curriculum director
- Representing the board of education - board president
- Representing the teachers' association - teacher/strike captain
- Representing the PTA - patron of the community

After contacting school six, it was discovered that the superintendent during the strike had moved to another school district. The current superintendent had been on the board's negotiating team and had been curriculum director at the time of the strike. The president of the teachers' association requested I meet with one of the strike captains because this captain had been president or on the negotiating team for the last ten years and could speak about the strike better than the person actually holding the office of president. The superintendent expressed concern about my talking with PTA people regarding the strike because he thought the PTA would know so little about the strike that they probably could not answer any of my questions. The superintendent then provided me with the name of a member of the community who had lived there all of his life, knew most of the people, was very involved in schools, and worked as a local attorney.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association representative, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All of the respondents reported that the negotiations in their school system were not open to the public. The curriculum
director agreed with that procedure and stated, "You avoid
grandstanding by both parties." However, the board president,
who perceived a need for negotiations to be open to the public,
said, "If you have anything to say of validity, it should be
exposed to everyone who has anything to do with the situation.
Unless you are making ridiculous demands, there is no reason
why every taxpayer should not be there." The strike captain
was against opening the bargaining to the public in this school
because "the public was already involved emotionally; open
bargaining would have made it worse." The community patron
also wanted to see negotiations remain closed because "proceed­
ings go faster and smoother when negotiations are closed. When
negotiations are open, only the teachers usually show up any­
way."

The curriculum director, who reported a three day notice
of an impending strike, said, "Nothing could be done with the
negotiations instrument we had." The board president recalled
a one day notice to the strike and stated, "The superintendent
called me and told me the teachers would not be working tom­
morrow." The teachers' strike captain, who also recalled a
one day notice, said, "I knew we would be out when the super­
intendent refused to move on anything." The community patron
recalled having a two day notice about the strike and said,
"After conversations with teachers and hearing their frustra­
tions with the superintendent, I knew we had a strike."

Initial reactions to the strike were mixed. The curriculum
director reported a "concern for the opening of school." The
board president expressed "astonishment. The local union had
not gone through things such as arbitration; they [teachers]
went directly to a strike." The teachers' strike captain re­
ported "anger," but the community patron made no comment.

The curriculum director reported the key issues causing
the strike were: 1. lack of a master contract, 2. a grievance
procedure, 3. rights of teachers, and 4. staff evaluation.
The board president, who was conscious of two sets of issues, said, "I did not feel the true issues and those bargained for were the same. The bargained issues were money and a R.I.F. [Reduction in Force] policy. The true issues were that they [teachers] felt they were not treated with proper respect. Their egos were hurt; they felt they were treated in a childish way." The strike captain thought the key issues were "a personality conflict and power struggle... . The teachers were not treated professionally... we had to play by his [superintendent] rules alone." The patron perceived the issues to be a "personality conflict between the superintendent and the teachers' association."

The curriculum director and strike captain recalled their respective sides making plans for the strike prior to its actual happening. The board president reported he made plans after the strike began, but the community as a group made no plans.

Perceptions of the percentage of teachers not working were very close. The curriculum director reported 99 per cent of the staff not working, and the board president, strike captain, and community patron reported 95, 90, and 95 per cent respectively.

The curriculum director was aware of no formal groups supporting either side during the strike. He did, however, think that keeping the schools open during the strike was a "form of monetary pressure to force teachers back into the classrooms." The board president perceived that community pressure was more in his favor, "especially as the strike progressed." However, the board president also recalled that the non-certified personnel supported the teachers. The strike captain recalled the non-certified personnel's support made a big difference in their having an "effective strike." The patron perceived no organized support for either side other than the non-certified staff, who supported the teachers.
According to the curriculum director, the only anxiety experienced during the strike was verbal abuse crossing the picket lines. The board president, who was not aware of any anxieties during the strike, stated, "I met every picket line every day." The strike captain recalled that one particular board member made a habit of "cursing, threatening, and intimidating teachers on the picket lines every day." The captain, who also was aware of harassing telephone calls received by both sides, said, "The Uniserve people tended to be more arrogant, abnoxious, and nasty on the picket line than we were." The community patron was conscious of "harassing telephone calls to board members and the superintendent, verbal abuse of non-striking teachers crossing the picket lines, and people following the superintendent."

All respondents reported involvement by local law enforcement agencies. The curriculum director was aware of an attempt by local police to "avoid being involved." The board president recalled the local police "did a remarkably bad job. The non-certified workers brought in outsiders to keep picket lines going. We tried to pressure them [police]; we finally hired guards." The strike captain viewed the police as "keeping a very low profile and avoiding problems." The community patron was "pleased the police stayed out of the strike."

The respondents could not agree upon who played the role of head negotiator for the board of education. The curriculum director thought an elementary principal who had been advised by a legal firm was the head negotiator. The board president thought the legal firm's representative was the head negotiator. The teachers' strike captain perceived that the board president and the legal firm representative together handled the head negotiator role. The community patron observed that the elementary principal was the head negotiator before the strike and that the legal firm's representative was the head negotiator after the strike.
All respondents agreed that an OEA Uniserve person handled the head negotiator duties for the teachers.

The curriculum director and board president were unaware of any post-strike anxieties or recrimination. The strike captain reported "some recrimination against non-strikers and serious reassignment of duties for teachers in leadership roles. "The community patron recalled recrimination against non-striking teachers.

III. How did the board of education's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The curriculum director was cognizant of a lack of freedom on the part of the head negotiator to move or make any decisions without first leaving the negotiations table to consult with the superintendent. The curriculum director also perceived that the head negotiator had a "lack of understanding of what was happening throughout the state." The board president's only response to the head negotiator and the role he played was "pleased." The strike captain thought the board's head negotiator was "more trouble than he was worth...very obnoxious in his comments to the public." The patron thought the negotiator was "not that experienced."

The strike captain recognized that the board's negotiator brought in preconceived ideas and especially "preconceived answers to all the OEA questions." The patron thought the board's negotiator brought ideas of the law firm, while the curriculum director and board president were not aware of any preconceived goals or ideas brought in by their negotiator.

When considering emotional issues, the curriculum director ascertained that an insider was more emphatic, but an outsider can "do the best by disassociating themselves from emotional issues." The board president thought that "outside negotiators did not recognize emotional issues." The strike captain "did not know" which kind of negotiator handled emotional issues.
better, and the patron saw "no difference."

The curriculum director credited the board's head negotiator with changing the board's attitude toward "its role to take a more active part in the negotiations." The board president was aware of an attempt to change the board's attitude about jailing the teachers rather than being patient. The strike captain was not impressed with the negotiator and stated, "He made the board's attitude more unreasonable." The patron was not aware of any attitude changes as a result of the influence of the board's negotiator.

The size and type of final settlement "was higher monetarily and the issues less refined because of the board's outside negotiator," reported the curriculum director. The board president, however, viewed the final settlement to be "smaller" because of the outside negotiator. The strike captain was not aware of any influence on the final settlement by the board's negotiator, but the patron observed that the negotiator kept the settlement "about the same as they [teachers] would have received had they not gone on strike."

The curriculum director perceived that the strike was lengthened because of the board's negotiator; however, the board president noted no influence on the length of the strike by his negotiator. The strike captain reported the negotiator lengthened the strike by "refusing to negotiate." The patron noted the board's negotiator attempted to "wait the teachers out."

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The curriculum director thought that the teachers' negotiator had done "a good union job." The board president perceived the negotiator as "a very smart guy on a one-to-one basis, but in meetings he did alot of screaming and shouting for show." The strike captain observed his head negotiator to be "very hard lined." The patron reported him to be a "real harassing
Neither the curriculum director or board president noted any preconceived goals or ideas brought in by the teachers' negotiator. The strike captain observed "pre-made answers to all questions. He and the board's attorney made a good pair." The community patron related that the teachers' negotiator "attempted to keep the community as riled up as possible."

The curriculum director and board president reported no attitude changes as a result of the teachers' negotiator. The strike captain was aware of an attitude change on the part of the teachers; "he [negotiator] convinced us the process is too complicated for us ... . Uniserve will always be in there from the start." The patron, who also credited the teachers' negotiator with changing the teachers' attitudes, said, "OEA helped the teachers understand they could be in a position of power."

The influence of the teachers' negotiator on the final settlement was viewed by the curriculum director as "a refinement of the language of the contract." The board president reported the negotiator's influence would be "hard to determine." The strike captain was cognizant of the teachers' lack of expertise, and therefore their negotiators' help "gave us more than we would have received on our own." The community patron gave no credit to the negotiator for any part of the final settlement. And no one reported that the teachers' negotiator had any influence on the length of the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

Prior to the strike, the administration had begun to formulate viable plans to deal with the strike. The curriculum director reported that substitute lists were compiled, the Ohio School Board's Association strike manual was studied, and
alot of time was spent deciding which law firm to choose. But the board president thought the administration was not prepared for the strike and stated, "When the superintendent called me, he was absolutely panicked; he was panicked throughout the strike and totally ineffectual." Neither of these respondents made any comments concerning new plans for future situations. However, although the strike captain had little to say about the planning this time, he wanted "better communication, a better headquarters, and better organized picket lines next time." The patron recalled that the community "made no plans as such,... we were new to strikes, not really sure of what to do."

Anxieties, threats, and threats of violence were minimal during this situation. None of the respondents suggested a method of coping with these stresses or a method of avoiding them in the future.

The curriculum director confirmed that substitutes, who were used to keep schools open, were harassed when crossing picket lines; however, he made no mention of how to deal with this problem now or in the future. The board president did not recall using substitutes because "they were not needed." The strike captain reported substitutes were used but "not enough to make an impression." The captain also reported substitutes were verbally harassed when crossing picket lines but offered no solutions on how to deal with the verbal abuse. The community patron was aware of substitute use but had no comments concerning their problems or how to deal with those problems now or in the future.

Media coverage was viewed by the curriculum director to be non-supportive of either side. If given an opportunity to deal with the media again or in the future, the curriculum director would handle the media in the "same way." The board president rated the coverage as "average to poor " with most information "factual." In the future the board president
would like to "see that the board's point of view was properly reported." The teachers' strike captain viewed the coverage to be "lousy...never really got the stories straight...reported on hearsay or out of context." Although the captain did not perceive that the coverage affected the strike, he would like "more direct written statements to the press" in the future. The community patron was aware of favoritism toward the teachers because of lack of board efforts." In the future the patron would like to see the board have a "media representative."

None of the respondents recalled a change in the key issues causing the strike and in those issues settling the strike.

The only special steps the curriculum director could remember the administration took to reach a settlement was to hire the legal firm that represented them; however, next time the curriculum director would "try to settle without high powered attorneys." The board president, who was credited by the curriculum director and patron with settling the strike, made several special efforts on his own. "Football season was in and we turned our backs when the coaches met with the team off school property and practiced. By meeting with coaches at my home and answering their questions, the coaches felt they had been misled and were willing to accept the board's offer. These coaches went back and pressured the OEA and local to settle and get the facts." The teachers' strike captain agreed that most of the settlement was worked out at the board president's home but that a final settlement was not agreed upon until "40 hours later." The community patron mentioned that a meeting of women voters helped to "get issues out in public." Only the patron had suggestions for future settlements; "the public should force both sides to voice their opinions."

The curriculum director, who did not recall much community involvement in the strike, said, "I was disappointed they [community] were not more involved." The board president, who did not think the community wanted to be involved, said, "The
public wanted someone else to settle it. They did not want
to be bothered with it." The strike captain reported that
the public "brought food to picket lines, made signs for us,
and the students had a demonstration asking both sides to
negotiate." The community patron recalled "no organized
community effort; however, interested people met at the sug­
gestion of women voters to discuss issues." No one reported
plans for dealing with the community any differently in the
future.

The curriculum director, board president, and teachers' strike captain related that the Ferguson Act was not invoked.
These three also mentioned a back to work injunction was
sought, but teachers returned to work before the judge had
time to act on the request. The community patron, an attorney,
responded, "Yes, we invoked the Ferguson Act, and it scared
the hell out of the teachers. It was a very effective tool." The curriculum director percieved the Ferguson Act would "take
too long." The board president was against the act because
of legal advice. The strike captain labeled the Ferguson Act
"antiquated."

In the future the curriculum director would "ask for a
picket limitation injunction the first day of the strike." The board president was concerned that "if we had gone through
with it [back to work injunction], they [teachers] would have
been even more militant." The strike captain and patron had
no opinions about future injunction actions.

The curriculum director was not aware of any political
influences or involvement in the strike; "next time I would
contact them and ask for support." The board president was
angry and frustrated because "no one helped us. The Ohio
School Boards Association only made a token phone call, the
state department offered no help even though they were contacted
and the county sent a man who just sat around and drank coffee." The teachers' strike captain mentioned that the mayor was
supportive and "provided us with a strike headquarters." The patron was not aware of any political involvement and believed "they should stay out." No one reported that political involvement or the lack of it influenced the strike in any way, and only the curriculum director made plans to deal with political figures in the future.

"Post-strike anxieties were expressed by the teachers to the board of education," according to the curriculum director. The teachers had "considerable feelings that the superintendent did not do all he could have done to avoid a strike," related the curriculum director. The only post-strike reactions the board president was aware of were "for sale signs in the yards of the board members the day we settled." The strike captain related stories of recrimination against the teachers' association officers by the administration, and the patron reported teachers who worked were "shunned." No one expressed a means of dealing with these problems now or in the future.

If there is another strike, the one most important thing the curriculum director would like to see done differently would be "better communications between the teachers' association and the administration." The board president, who would like to see better media coverage, said, "We need to get the board's position out even if we have to buy space." The strike captain would have "better organization rather than flying by the seat of our pants and better communications with the public." The patron reported, "Nothing could be done differently."

The curriculum director suggested that the one thing he could do to avoid a future strike, especially now that he is superintendent, would be to "meet with teachers often and make an attempt at a more humanistic approach." The board president perceived a need for the board of education to "keep in touch as to what is going on in the negotiations from the beginning. We need to make use of mediation and impasse procedures to attempt settlement before a strike." The strike captain
suggested avoiding future strikes by using professional help from the beginning of the negotiations procedure. However, the patron related that "nothing could be done" to avoid a future strike.

When asked if the strike was worth it, the curriculum director stated that "prior administrative authority was lost through the new R.I.F. (Reduction in Force) policy, and as a result, the strike was not worth it to the administration." The board president, who could not decide if the strike was worth it, stated, "The teachers got what they wanted, but the board saved money on all the pay teachers lost during the strike." The strike captain observed the strike was "definitely worth it. We got rid of the man who caused it." The patron agreed the strike was worth it, citing "the teachers got rid of the superintendent and the community learned a lot about their schools."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

Legislation mandating collective bargaining would, in the curriculum director's opinion, "provide guidelines which would help achieve satisfactory settlement on both sides." The board president, who also supported this type of legislation, stated, "I think it's time we should." The strike captain would support this legislation because "of a need for guidelines." The patron, who was against the legislation, said, "Every community should be allowed to develop its own system."

The curriculum director would not support new legislation prohibiting teachers from striking because such legislation would not be "workable or enforceable." The board president and strike captain agreed, while the community patron favored this type of legislation because "kids should be in school."

Binding arbitration as a final grievance step would be supported by the curriculum director and strike captain. The
curriculum director gave no reason, but the teacher viewed it as protecting both sides. The board president was against arbitration legislation because "if there is not enough money to do what is decided the school goes under." The patron, who was against this legislation, said, "Arbitrators don't have enough background to make a good decision."

Binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike was supported only by the strike captain who would "prefer anything over a strike." The curriculum director, board president, and patron were against this type of legislation because of "loss of local control."

Only the board president would support legislation mandating open bargaining. "The public has a right to know," related the board president. The other respondents feared both sides would play to an audience rather than negotiate.

**Summary**

Participants disagreed on several of the issues in this strike. A wide variety of issues were listed as causing the strike and much disagreement was voiced concerning who negotiated for the board of education. The community patron was not involved in any planning before or during the strike, and the board president was unaware of anxieties experienced on the picket lines. The curriculum director and board president were also unaware of post-strike anxieties.

Perceptions of the board's negotiator and his influence on the strike varied. In general, the negotiator was credited with changing the board's attitude toward becoming more involved in the strike. He was also given credit for lengthening the strike and influencing the size of the final settlement. No one reported that a different negotiator might have done a better job.

The head negotiator for the teachers was reported to have stirred up feelings and placed the board constantly on the defensive. He was also credited with convincing the teachers
that they had to have outside help during all negotiations procedures. The teachers perceived that they received more in their final settlement than they would have without the negotiator's help and that they were now capable of working from a position of power. The curriculum director credited the teachers' negotiator with helping refine the language of the final agreement.

Ideas and plans to deal with strike related issues were sparse. The board president reported the superintendent to be "panicked and totally ineffectual during the strike, with planning done primarily by the board president and the law firm hired." Despite this problem, only the teachers reported any plans being made now for the future. No one reported any attempts to deal with the anxieties of the strike now or in the future, although all respondents had opinions on how they would deal with the media differently in the future. Plans were not formulated for arranging for or assisting substitutes; the board president was not aware substitutes were used. Everyone had proposals for future dealings with injunctions, and the curriculum director had plans to involve political figures, but no one expressed concern or suggested viable plans for post-strike anxieties.

None of the legislative questions received a unanimous vote from the respondents; however, the curriculum director and strike captain did vote together on four of the five issues. The majority of the respondents supported mandating bargaining with teachers and were against a new law prohibiting teachers from striking.

The strike in school number six resulted from a perception by the teachers that they were treated in a very autocratic manner by the superintendent. The final settlement gave the teachers the monetary items they sought and the eventual removal of the superintendent.
Data included in Table 22 shows a breakdown of the opinions of the four respondents in school number six regarding many of the key questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers out</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>principal+</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>board+</td>
<td>principal+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School number seven is located in the northeast quadrant of Ohio and is in the C enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent - superintendent
- Representing the board of education - board president
- Representing the teachers' association - teachers' president
- Representing the PTA - municipal service director

Upon contacting the superintendent, who is now retired, it was found that this district had no PTA. The superintendent suggested that someone in the mayor's office might be willing to give me a "non-school" or layman's point of view. The mayor's office suggested I speak with the municipal service director who had lived in the area all of his life, had two children in school, and was actively involved in the school's athletic program.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association representative, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All respondents reported that negotiations in this school system should not be and were not open to the public. The superintendent viewed negotiations as a "private matter." "Statements can not be made freely, and incidents and persons can not be discussed in public that could be in private," reported the superintendent. The board president expressed that "things are discussed that the public is not directly involved with or knowledgeable about." The teachers' president reported "no personal opinion in the matter," while the service director perceived that "people can't be open with the press or other..."
people listening."

The superintendent, who reported a two month notice about the impending strike, said, "I felt that the teachers knew a strike would force the community to vote for an operating levy we desperately needed." The board president could not recall how much notice he had, but the teachers' president reported a two week notice. "After advisory arbitration failed to settle our impasse, I knew it was the right time for a strike. It had to be," recalled the teachers' president. The service director, who also reported a two week notice said, "When the football coach asked me to help him find an alternative place to practice, I knew they were serious."

Initial reactions to the strike were "apprehensive" for the superintendent, "not too upset" for the board president, "it had to be" for the teachers' president, and "upset" for the service director.

The superintendent, board president, and teachers' president perceived the key issues causing the strike were salary and binding arbitration of grievances; the service director reported only salary was an issue.

All respondents, except the service director, said the groups that they represented made plans to deal with the strike before it actually began. According to the service director, no plan was made by the community in general.

Estimates of the percentage of teachers not working were close. The superintendent, board president, and service director reported 90 per cent of the teachers did not work during the strike; the teachers president recalled 95 per cent did not work.

All respondents agreed that the schools were kept open during the strike. No one was aware of any outside group support for the teachers, but the board president thought the athletic boosters and community as a whole were supportive of the administration.
Anxieties during the strike included the "blocking of driveways, abusive language to anyone crossing the picket lines, and the picketing of board members' places of business. The board president recalled "no violence" but said feelings were hurt, friendships were strained, and pickets were established at his place of business. The teachers' president claimed that "the association officers actively opposed harassment; however, there were some harassing phone calls made and verbal abuse given to people crossing the picket lines." The service director was only aware of a "threat to the wife of the football coach."

The superintendent said the local law enforcement agency was "fair and took no sides. I was pleased with their involvement." The board president observed that the local police "did not force picket lines open but used common sense and reasoning." The teachers' president reported that the police "loosely monitored picket lines," but the service director perceived the police involvement to be "fair."

All respondents agreed that the board of education used an outside negotiator and that the teachers used their local association president as head negotiator, with advise from OEA.

All respondents were aware of post-strike anxieties between working and non-working teachers.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

According to the superintendent, "He [the board's negotiator] did what I wanted him to do; he was able to stall from March 15th until seniors graduated." The board president observed that the negotiator did "a good job." The teachers' president also was conscious of the negotiator's ability to "stall," while the service director related that the role of the board's negotiator was "adequate. He did what the board
told him to do."

When questioned about any preconceived goals or ideas which may have been brought in by the board's negotiator, the superintendent discerned that the negotiator assumed the part of a "bad guy" who would save the superintendent." The board president and service director were not aware of any preconceived ideas brought in by the board's negotiator. The teachers' president was sure that everyone had some preconceived ideas of the strike, but he was unable to detail any specific ideas the board's negotiator might have had.

All respondents agreed that outside negotiators handle the emotional issues of a strike better than an inside negotiator does. The superintendent was of the opinion that "outside negotiators become less emotionally involved because they are not negotiating things that will benefit them personally." The board president was aware of "more pressure on an inside person." The teachers' president viewed outside negotiators as "removed from the situation," while the service director commented that "outsiders do a better job."

None of the respondents perceived a change in anyone's attitudes toward the bargaining because of the influence of the board's negotiator.

All of the respondents agreed that the board's negotiator had no direct influence on the type or size of the final settlement. Only the board president was aware of any influence made by the board's negotiator on the length of the strike. He said, "Both negotiators played games and used a lot of unnecessary rhetoric."

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent stated that the teachers' head negotiator had done "a good job. We had good rapport." The board president stated that the teachers' negotiator was "adequate,
but could have been better if he used more common sense when he decided to strike." The teacher president was "pleased," with his role as head negotiator, while the service director viewed him as "doing his job."

According to the superintendent, the teachers' negotiator had the preconceived idea the "boards of education have more money than they did and boards and administrators have no compassions - these attitudes changed." The board president and service director were not aware of any preconceived ideas; however, the teachers' president was of the opinion that "grievance arbitration could be had."

Only the teachers' president thought that he had changed attitudes himself as head negotiator. "I feel I influenced the teachers views toward the strike issues," he said.

The superintendent, teachers' president, and service director were not aware of any influence on the final settlement brought about by the teachers' negotiator; however, the board president reported that the final settlement was "higher than the board intended" because of the teachers' negotiator.

The length of the strike was "not influenced by the teachers' negotiator" according to the superintendent. The board president repeated his comment that "both negotiators played games and used a lot of unnecessary rhetoric."

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

Because of a large amount of advance notice, the superintendent was able to plan for the strike. "I feel it is most important to be sure all of the administration is totally supportive of keeping schools open," commented the superintendent. The superintendent also reported that his plans were effective and that he would make no changes or additional plans for the future. The board president emphasized a need to have a "unified board of education while preparing them for a rough
Let the public and children know that schools will be open." The plans made by the teachers' president included: "phone trees, picket site selection, and strike teams. You must prepare strikers ahead of time. Make sure they know why they are striking. Members must realize you are negotiat­ing forcefully, but reasonably." The service director report­ed that the community, in general, made no plans to deal with the strike. None of the respondents expressed a need to make any changes or additional plans for future use.

Only the teachers' president dealt with the problems re­lated to the anxieties of a strike, possible violence, actual violence, or harassment crossing the picket lines. He said, "The association officers actively opposed harassment." No plans were made by anyone to deal with these problems in the future.

The superintendent and board president reported that sub­stitutes who crossed the picket lines were verbally abused and threatened; however, the teachers' president and service director "did not know" if the substitutes encountered any other special problems." No one had any suggestions about how to deal with this problem or had made any plans to avoid or deal with these problems in the future.

The media, according to the superintendent and board presi­dent, "reported as accurately as they could." Because the superintendent observed that the coverage did not have any effect on the strike and that coverage was accurate, he had made no plans to deal with the media any differently in the future. The teachers' president considered the media coverage "exceptional. We have not had that good of coverage before or since." The teachers' president also agreed that the media did not effect the strike and that the procedures for handling the press in the future would not be changed. In the opinion of the service director, the media coverage was "blown out of proportion and heated up the emotions of the people." However, the service director had made plans to work with the media
then or in the future.

All respondents agreed that the strike issues remained the same throughout the strike.

The superintendent and service director reported no special steps taken by them to reach a final settlement. The board president related that he tried to end the strike by continuing negotiations and by requesting the use of a federal mediator. The teachers' president attempted to end the strike by presenting the teachers' offer "to delay a pay raise until January" if the board would agree now to raise salaries if an operating levy was passed and the teachers' offer to provide concentrated "help to pass the levy."

According to the superintendent, the community at large was supportive of the teachers and was obviously instrumental in passing the levy. The superintendent also noted that when the teachers did not go back to work the first day after the levy passed the support of the community shifted to the administration and pressured the teachers to go back to work. The board president also observed that the community at large played a major part in the strike, but the teachers' president and service director observed that the community played "no part" in the strike.

The superintendent, who did not encourage the public to become involved, said, "We did not feel we needed to request help; they [the community members] were for us and [were] doing a good job for us without our encouragement." The board president and service director recalled no attempts to encourage the public to become involved in the strike. However, the teachers' president stated, "We tried to get local businessmen and attorneys to come in and argue with the board for us. Instead, they ended up arguing against us."

All respondents agreed that the Ferguson Act was not used in this situation. The superintendent perceived the Ferguson Act to be "totally unresolvable, with all the pressures on the board." "I would rather pay the teachers the money it would
cost to invoke the Ferguson Act than give it to the attorneys," commented the superintendent. The board president made no comment about the Ferguson Act, but the teachers' president observed the Act to be "not workable; it would have made the strike very bitter." The service director was of the opinion that the Act "should have been invoked; public servants have an obligation."

The superintendent reported that he sought and received a picket limitation injunction which was quite effective. However, a back to work order was also twice sought and twice refused. "I would not try the back to work order again. Courts are not willing to take action to resolve a strike issue," reported the superintendent. The board president mentioned the same injunctions, but he would be willing to try them again if the situation arises. The teachers' president also knew that the two injunctions were sought; however, the service director had no knowledge of either.

All of the respondents reported that no political figures became involved during the strike. The board president observed that "political figures might be helpful if they would assist the community as a group, help keep the peace, and provide community unity." The teachers' president and service director stated that political figures should stay out of the strike situations. The superintendent had no comment.

The superintendent, who cited a segregation between striking and non-striking teachers after the strike, said, "I made sure I was in the building, made myself visible, and tried to show a lack of animosity toward teachers." The board president noted that teachers who worked during the strike were "shunned and given the cold shoulder." It was the board president's opinion that "nothing could be done to prevent hard feelings." The teachers' president reported "minimal recrimination against non-striking teachers" and reported that the association leadership stressed that "recrimination is not
acceptable behavior." The service director recalled "non-
striking teachers were given cold shoulder treatments," but
he had no suggestions or plans to deal with the problem now
or in the future.

If there was another strike and only one thing could be
changed, the superintendent would "try to avoid large bargain-
ing teams with separate tables for teacher and administrative
observers." The board of education president would "not com-
promise on as many issues . . . and take a harder stand." The
teachers' president would "make a bigger effort to involve
parents in pressuring the board," and the service director
stated that he "would do nothing" if his children were still
in school and that he "might try to form a citizens' group" if
his children were out of school.

When asked what he could do to avoid a future strike, the
superintendent responded, "Pass levies." The board president,
who ascertained that the board of education is unable to avoid
strikes, said, "It's the teachers' decision to strike." The
teachers' president stated, "This strike experience has impro-
ved the negotiations procedure so much that I don't foresee
another strike being necessary." Since there was no citizens'
group as such, the service director could see no way they could
work to avoid a strike.

The superintendent and teachers' president perceived the
strike as being "worth it." The superintendent gave no specific
reason, but the teachers' president cited the binding arbitra-
tion of grievances as "reason enough." The board president did
not think the strike was worth it because "both sides lost." The
service director commented that "no strike is worth it."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legis-
lation supporting the various aspects of collective
bargaining?

All respondents would support legislation mandating bargain-
ing with teachers. The superintendent and teachers' president
gave no specific reasons for their support, while the board
The president saw a need for a "uniform way of bargaining." The service director would support this type of legislation if it were "enforceable."

The superintendent favored new legislation prohibiting teachers the right to strike and said, "We need a way to prevent a strike; the board is powerless and has no recourse." The board president commented that he "didn't feel that children should be deprived of an education." The teachers' president reported that he might support this type of legislation "if viable alternatives were presented, such as binding arbitration." The service director would definitely support this type of legislation because "public employees should not strike."

Everyone except the board president would support legislation requiring binding arbitration as a final grievance step. The superintendent said, "If there is a difference of opinion concerning an act which does not involve finances, we can support binding arbitration." The board president, who was against this type of legislation, said, "We would loose local control and open it up for someone who does not know the situation to make the decision." The teachers' president was for binding arbitration but gave no reason; however, the service director noted that "at some point you must settle."

Binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike would not be supported by the superintendent because "arbitrators have to be biased one way or another." The board president was against this type of legislation and the teachers president was for it, but neither had any specific reasons for their decisions. The service director would favor binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike because "at some point you must settle."

All respondents except the teachers' president voted against legislation mandating that collective bargaining be open to the public. The teachers' president wanted to reserve
comment until he had seen the specifics of such legislation.

Summary

The superintendent, board president, and teachers' president appeared to be involved in, knowledgeable of, and aware of the strike issues. The service director was definitely not involved in the strike and was aware of very little.

The board of education's outside negotiator was observed by most to have done his job to stall teachers off until the seniors had graduated and the voters had a chance to vote on the operating levy. No one perceived that the board's negotiator made any influences on the strike or its outcome.

The teachers' association chose to use an inside negotiator with outside assistance. Only the president of the board of education observed any influence on the strike created by the teachers' negotiator himself. No one reported that another inside or outside negotiator would have done a better job.

The handling of the special issues and planning for the future was limited to the superintendent, board and teachers' presidents. The superintendent had made plans prior to the strike for organizational purposes but made no plans for any future changes. The board and teachers' president also had organizational type plans for this time but were not planning for the future. Only the teachers' president had made any plans to cope with strike anxieties, and no one had any ideas on how to assist the substitutes in handling or preventing harassment. The three respondents were clear on their actions concerning injunctions and how they would be handled in the future. Only the superintendent and teachers' president made any attempts to cope with post-strike anxieties.

Mandating bargaining with teachers was the only legislative issue to receive a unanimous vote from the four respondents. The superintendent, board president, and service director voted together on four of the five issues, but
the teachers' president did not fit into any pattern of voting because he reserved comment on two of the issues until he could see the specifics of the legislation.

The strike in school number seven resulted from a financial crisis in the local district. With few incidents of threats and no violence, the school was able to pass an operating levy while the strike was in progress and give the teachers the items they had demanded.

Data included in Table 23 shows a summary of the responses of the four participants to several of the key questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of teacher out</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board' negotiator</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>local+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School number eight is located in the southeast quadrant of Ohio and is part of the C enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent – superintendent
- Representing the board of education – board’s vice president
- Representing the teachers’ association – teachers’ president
- Representing the PTA – community patron

After contacting the superintendent of school number eight, it was learned that the board of education president during the strike was recovering from a heart attack which had occurred just prior to the strike. The board’s vice-president during the strike, agreed to speak with me in place of the president, since he had been acting president.

The superintendent expressed a great deal of concern that the presidents of each building’s PTA would be unable to answer any of my questions and was unable to decide which, if any of the presidents, would be the best representative. At the suggestion of the superintendent, I interviewed a patron member of the community who had lived his entire life in the district and had been active in school activities, but not as a school employee.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers’ association president, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All of the respondents agreed that the bargaining sessions in this district were and should be closed to the general
public. The superintendent noted that "the true process would not be finished as quickly if negotiations were open." The board's vice president reported that "important facts need to be exchanged which the general public does not understand, such things as trade-offs." The teachers' president was conscious of an ability to "accomplish more if people deal with the parties involved rather than playing to a third party." The community patron perceived that open bargaining would become a "show."

Both the superintendent and board vice-president reported a three week notice about the impending strike. The superintendent first recognized this fact when "the state association leadership moved in in force and began to take over." The board vice-president recognized the strike potential by the "low morale of the teachers." The teachers' president and community patron each reported a one week notice about the strike. The teachers' president first recognized the coming of the strike when "the board of education rejected the minority and majority report of the impasse panel and offered no raise at all." The patron was first alerted to the strike at a public meeting which had been called to discuss the impasse panel's decision.

Initial reactions to the strike were varied. The superintendent reported that "it is a time to keep cool;" the board vice-president said that "it is time to get organized." The teachers' president expressed that she was "quite torn up personally," and the patron recalled he felt "it was the worst thing that could have happened."

The superintendent, board vice-president, and patron perceived the key issues causing the strike was "money;" the teacher's president perceived "money and the right to bargain."

Only the community patron did not make plans to organize and deal with the strike before it happened.

Perceptions of the percentage of teachers that did not work during the strike were very close. The patron was not
aware of the percentage, but the superintendent, board vice-

president, and teachers' president reported 99, 99.5, and 99

per cent respectively.

All respondents agreed that the administration kept

schools open. The superintendent, who was not aware of any

organized group supporting either side, said, "The public
does not know how to react to a strike." Although schools

were open, the board vice-president "would not close them if

there is a next time. The general public was behind the

board 100 per cent, while no one supported the teachers."

The teachers' president reported that "some of the non-certif-

ied observed the picket lines," but the community patron was

of the opinion that the "community in general supported the

board and administration."

According to the superintendent, who was aware of much

anxiety, threats of violence, and violence during the strike

said, "the life of the board vice-president was threatened,
picketers were arrested, cars were scratched and tires were

damaged." The board' vice-president recalled that "a threat

on my life scared my wife, substitutes were harassed crossing

picket lines and at home by phone, and one picketer was

arrested." The teachers' president reported that "people

crossing picket lines were harassed, parent volunteers were

verbally harassed when they crossed picket lines, their places

of business were threatened with boycotts, two board members

lives were threatened, and four picketers were arrested because

local police did not know how to deal with pickets." The

community patron was conscious of "harassing phone calls to

those who crossed the picket lines and cars being scratched."

All respondents reported that they were "pleased" with

the involvement of the local law enforcement agencies. The

superintendent recalled that "in a small community, the police

are not trained to handle strikes; you, therefore, must have

good rapport with them. Don't put them on the spot, but expect

them to do their job. Keep them informed and don't embarass

them in front of the public." The board vice-president viewed
the local police as "helpful on the picket lines." The teachers' president observed the local police to be inexperienced. "One of our schools, related the teachers' president, "is outside the city limits and, therefore, under county jurisdiction. One morning a sheriff's deputy was sent out to investigate a principal harassing teachers." The patron recalled that "nothing serious happened while the police were there."

A great deal of contradiction resulted when the question was asked, "Who was the head negotiator for the board of education?" The superintendent replied "the assistant superintendent during the negotiations, with an attorney added when the strike began." The board vice-president viewed two of the board members to be the head negotiators, while the teachers' president reported the superintendent was the head negotiator. The community patron recalled that the assistant superintendent and two board members shared the responsibilities.

All respondents agreed that the teachers' president served as head negotiator for the teachers and was constantly advised by OEA Uniserve representatives.

Everyone except the patron was aware of post-strike anxieties and recriminations among the staff and administration.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent expressed that he was "pleased" with the role of the board's negotiator. The board vice-president was glad to see the negotiator "was not willing to compromise with teachers." The teachers' president did not wish to comment on the board of education's negotiator or his role, but the patron perceived him to be "outstanding and knowledgeable of all procedures."

Only the teachers' president reported any preconceived goals or ideas brought into the strike by the board's negotiator. According to the teachers' president, "He believed that
the less money the better...he looked on this strike as a way out of their financial problems."

When considering the emotional issues of a strike, the superintendent stated that an outside negotiator "handled it better." The board vice-president reported that "outsiders seem to be more flexible." The teachers' president was of the opinion that "outsiders can get down to the issues." The community patron perceived that insiders "know the situation better."

The board vice-president and patron did not recall any changes in anyone's attitudes toward the bargaining as a result of the influence of the board's negotiator. The superintendent was aware of "changes in attitudes in every situation," but nothing specific. The teachers' president viewed the board's negotiator "hardened their attitude toward giving money."

Everyone except the superintendent did not believe that the board's negotiator had any influence on the size or type of the final settlement. The superintendent believed that both head negotiators moved the final settlement a little closer to their respective sides than it would have been without them.

Although the board's vice-president and community patron did not observe that the board's negotiator affected the length of the strike, both the superintendent and teachers' president reported that the negotiator lengthened the strike. The teachers' president reported that when the "board did not even talk to us the first week, we both knew it would be at least a two week strike."

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotia­tor (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

Everyone described the role of the teachers' negotiator as adequate, except the patron, who "did not know" what role the teachers' negotiator played.
Preconceived goals or ideas brought in by the teachers' negotiator were observed by the superintendent to be "state OEA issues." The board vice-president related that "OEA made the bullets and the local was expected to fire them." The teachers' president perceived that her ideas were concerned about how her "issues affected other districts throughout the state." The community patron observed no preconceived goals or ideas.

The superintendent perceived that attitudes are always changed during a process like negotiations, but he could not credit any specific changes in attitude to the teachers' negotiator. The board vice-president saw a change in the teachers' attitudes as a result of "orders from OEA." The teachers' president and patron were not aware of any changes in attitudes that could be credited to the teachers' negotiator.

Influence on the size and type of final settlement was observed by the superintendent as a kind of "meeting in the middle by both negotiators." The board vice-president and patron observed no influence on the final settlement by the teachers' negotiator; however, the teachers' president stated, "We would not have gone back for less than we went out for."

Only the superintendent and board vice-president thought the teachers' negotiator affected the length of the strike. Both men said that the teachers' negotiator was responsible for lengthening the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

Before the strike began, the superintendent had made plans with his "administrative team." "We had inservice training for our administrators and made decisions together; we were prepared," he said. The board vice president's concept of planning was "protecting the people's property [the school]. We made sure all administrators were in their buildings." The teachers' president, who had made plans to pressure the
board even before the strike began, said, "We felt we needed to pressure the board to accept the impasse finding, so we started a crisis center and opened a strike center. We did this so that the board would know a strike would be the result of a total rejection of the impasse findings. We had almost gone to a strike last year, so we had been through a lot of these planning issues before." The patron made no plans because "nothing could be done."

In the future, only the superintendent and teachers' president would make additional plans or changes in existing plans. The superintendent would "work more to get ideas past the teachers' leadership down to the classroom teachers." The teachers' president stated, "I would not freely allow principals to enter the buildings but encourage them to support our strike. Our decision to allow principals to enter the buildings unmolested was taken advantage of - principals hauled subs and volunteers into buildings."

None of the respondents reported making any plans to avoid or deal with strike-related anxieties during this strike or for any in the future.

All respondents reported that substitute teachers were harassed during the strike. No one reported any attempts to avoid harassment now or in the future. The teachers' president did, however, report principals transported substitutes. None of the other respondents mentioned this.

The superintendent reported that media coverage was "extensive," and it "favored the board of education because the issues were so simple." The board vice-president noted that media coverage was "very poor and sensationalized; they [the media] did not take the time to get the facts from either side. They [the media] supported neither side." The teachers' president, who thought the media coverage was "very good," said, "The Columbus people [OEA] could not believe the coverage we got. It was very favorable, reporting for both sides, although the
radio station favored the board." The patron related that coverage was "as fair as they could have been; they had no favorites."

The superintendent reported that media coverage shortened the strike. "When the media did not play up the teachers claim that no education was going on during the strike, the strike seemed to settle more quickly," stated the superintendent. The board vice-president and teachers' president reported no effect on the strike by the media, but the patron observed that the coverage "strengthened the board and administration's position."

Only the board vice-president had any suggestions for dealing with the press differently in the future. He maintained that "both sides should bring their whole package to the paper and show them what has been offered."

All respondents reported that key issues remained the same throughout the strike.

The superintendent and teachers' president were the only respondents who reported taking any special steps to facilitate an end to the strike. The superintendent credited the "back to work injunction," while the teachers' president reported "the crisis center, strike headquarters, and OEA survey of board members background" as her contributions to settle the strike.

The community at large was not observed or encouraged by the superintendent or community patron to play any part in the strike. The board vice-president reported that "public feelings were 100 per cent behind the board and against the teachers. In this part of Ohio, people believe teachers are over paid now." The teachers' president was aware of "more community communication than the board; but community support was fairly evenly split." The board vice-president was conscious of an effort to encourage the public to become involved by "using community volunteers to keep schools open." He said the teachers encouraged the public to become involved by having
"informational coffees, and teas at various homes, and they invited the public in." No one credited the community at large with influencing the strike in any way, nor did anyone express plans to deal with the community any differently in the future.

The superintendent reported that he did not use the Ferguson Act during this strike because "1. cost, 2. past practices, 3. in our strike it would have done more harm than good, and 4. we were advised by our attorney not too." The board vice-president considered the Ferguson Act to take "too long to put into effect." The teachers' president was made aware by OEA researchers that the board's attorney had never used the Ferguson in the past. The community patron noted that the Ferguson was not used and "should only be used as a last resort."

The superintendent reported that the other legal action taken was an injunction to force teachers back to work. Although he did not receive the injunction, he stated that he would "try the same thing again in the future." The board vice-president was not aware of any injunctions sought by the board but would support similar strategies in the future. The teachers' president reported that when the back to work order was sought by the board of education "the judge said, 'no, sit down and negotiate.' Three days later the judge refused the order again." "The teachers' association and its officers were sued for one-half million dollars," reported the teachers' president, "but I can't remember for what." The patron "did not know" if any injunctions were sought and had no opinion for or against using injunctions.

Political involvement was reported by the superintendent to be limited to a letter from the local steel workers union in support of the teachers. "When the teachers went to the steel mill to pass out literature to the workers, they were verbally abused," recalled the superintendent. The board vice-president was aware of support for the board from the
local "CIO at the end of the strike." The teachers' president was conscious of an offer to help from "a local state senator;" however, the patron did not remember any political involvement. No one reported that the political involvement or lack of it influenced the strike, but the community patron expressed concern that local figures were "not supportive."

The superintendent reported post-strike anxieties between working and non-working teachers. "Some teachers are not speaking. There was some pushing and shoving and supermarket talk calling people scabs," commented the superintendent. However, the superintendent mentioned no plans to deal with this anxiety now or to avoid it in the future. The board vice-president was aware of "morale broken down and verbal harassment between workers and non-workers." The board vice-president also stated that "the superintendent should call all teachers together after the strike, welcome them back, and ask them to pull together and build our morale." If there is another strike, the board vice-president would like to "have both parties go to a common pleas judge and have him provide guidelines for behavior." The teachers' president reported "changes in procedure by principals for no reason. Principals who had supported team teaching were now against it. Non-certified people who crossed picket lines were harassed by the administration." The teachers' president presented no plans or ideas to deal with this problem now or to avoid it in the future. The community patron reported "no post-strike recrimination."

If there was another strike, the most important thing the superintendent would do differently is to "bypass association leadership and go straight to classroom teachers." The board vice-president and patron had nothing they would like to change, but the teachers' president would "make sure principals know they do not have to go in [to school]."

The most important thing the superintendent would do to avoid a future strike would be to "encourage principals to work
more closely with teachers and be aware that normal operations after a strike may look like retaliation." The board vice-president would "plan ahead and not give away money you don't have." The teachers' president would "make sure the community keeps a close watch on the schools." The patron saw "no way to avoid a strike." Only the teachers made plans to avoid another strike and then implemented that plan.

When the respondents were asked if the strike "was worth it," the superintendent responded, "Yes," but gave no reasons. The board vice-president related that the strike was not worth it because "the teachers and students lost so much." The teachers' president related that "it was the best two weeks of my life to see our people work together." The patron related that "no strike is ever worth it."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

The superintendent reported that he would support mandated bargaining with teachers if the new legislation included: " 1. regionalized bargaining, 2. guidelines and limitations, 3. Ferguson Act revised, (if we are not willing to revoke teaching certificates, then forget the Ferguson), and 4. What is negotiable?" The board vice-president also supported mandated bargaining but gave no reasons. The teachers' president was in favor of this type of legislation because "we need guidelines." The patron reserved comment until he could see the specifics of the bill.

New legislation prohibiting teachers' the right to strike was supported only by the community patron, for "when teachers sign a contract, they should not be permitted to strike." The superintendent and teachers' president reserved comment until they read the specifics of such a law. The board vice-president was against this type of legislation and stated, "Up to a certain point, teachers should be allowed to strike. In some instances, boards are not fair to teachers."
Binding arbitration as a final grievance step was not supported by the superintendent or board vice-president. The superintendent observed that "we are not sophisticated enough to handle this." The board vice-president feared "loss of local control." The teachers' president favored binding arbitration of grievances because "a board is bound to support the superintendent, and therefore, we have no appeal." The community patron "did not know" at this time how he felt about this issue.

The issue of binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike received the same support from each of the respondents. The superintendent noted, "Arbitrators are generally not versed in school finance or local tax issues." The board vice-president again feared "loss of local control," but the teachers' president perceived this type of legislation as a "means of settling things." The patron had no opinion.

The board vice-president had no comment on open bargaining legislation; however, the other three respondents were against it. The superintendent thought "the true process would not be finished as quickly," the teachers' president thought "more would be accomplished if bargaining was closed," and the community patron perceived that open bargaining would turn the bargaining process into a "show."

Summary

In this particular district, the superintendent, board vice-president, and teacher were equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable about all strike issues except who was the board's head negotiator. The patron was unaware of several issues, and he organized little if any community involvement.

The board of education's outside negotiator was perceived to have little influence on the final settlement of the strike, but the superintendent and teachers' president did report that the strike might have been lengthened by the board's negotiator. No one expressed a concern or opinion that a different negotiator would have handled the situation any differently.
or any better. This may have been because everyone could not agree on who was the head negotiator.

In this district, the teachers' head negotiator was an inside person. No one reported any influence on the strike as a result of the role she played; however, several opinions were expressed that the OEA Uniserve representative's advice and influence on the negotiator and local union may have lengthened the strike and established the issues for the teachers.

Pre-strike planning by the superintendent and teachers avoided problems for both sides; however, planning appears to have stopped at this point. Few, if any, plans were made by the respondents for handling or avoiding future strikes. Community support was claimed by both sides, while little evidence of any involvement by the community at large was presented. No plans were made to cope with or avoid anxieties or harassment before, during, or after the strike. Only the superintendent and teachers' president made plans to avoid another strike.

The legislative issues addressed by this group of respondents received no unanimous support or opposition. Because of a lack of commitment on all respondents parts until they had a chance to read specific legislation, no patterns of voting could be determined.

The strike in school eight resulted from a financial crisis in the school district. Candid comments from both sides admitted that the teachers received the raise they sought because the board saved enough money on salaries during the strike to be able to afford the raises.

Data included in Table 24 shows a detailed reporting of responses to key questions by the four respondents.
Table 24

Consistency of Responses for School Eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of teachers out</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>Ast. supt+</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Ast. supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>local+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of Findings and 
Qualitative Analysis of Individual Schools 
School Nine

School number nine is found in the southwest quadrant of 
Ohio and is part of the C enrollment grouping. The inter­ 
viewees for this school were: 
Representing the superintendent - superintendent 
Representing the board of education - board president 
Representing the teachers' association - teacher president 
Representing the PTA - President of PTA Council

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association repres­ 
entative, school board president, and PTA president 
equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of 
strike related issues?

Three of the four interviewees were against allowing the 
public into the bargaining sessions. Only the PTA president 
thought the public should be allowed to sit at the table. The 
PTA president believed the public was not hearing all of the 
facts, while the teacher president perceived the bargaining 
sessions as ..."not any of the public's business. They don't 
understand what goes on in schools,...they should only be 
concerned about how the children are educated for the dollar 
spent." The board president discerned a need for periodic 
reports to the public but was not in favor of their presence 
at the bargaining table. The superintendent's perception of 
the public's involvement was that their presence created... 
"too much acting" by the parties involved.

The teachers' and PTA presidents were not aware of an 
eminent strike until the weekend before the walkout; however, 
the board president and superintendent both claimed to have 
had much more advance notice of the impending strike. Three 
years before the strike occurred, the superintendent realized
that a strike was unavoidable sometime in the future, and the board president perceived an eminent problem two months in advance.

The superintendent and board president were alerted to this specific strike when the impasse panel finding was rejected. The teachers' president was alerted to the strike's eminence by the board of education's refusal to make any moves on the package currently on the table. But the PTA president could not remember what alerted her to the impending strike. Personal reactions to the strike were mixed. The superintendent said, "I felt a great weight on my shoulders because I perceived it was within my power to avoid the strike by giving in to the teachers demands." The superintendent concluded, however, that "to give in to the teachers would be worse than a strike." The board president was very concerned about what types of things might happen, while the teacher president expressed a great deal of anger. The PTA president expressed concern, anger, and confusion in trying to decide whether to send her children to school or keep them at home.

The superintendent and board president drastically disagreed with each other, with the teacher, and with the PTA president's concept of money and a dental package as the key issues of the strike. The superintendent cited: 1. the teachers' leadership needed to show their power and expertise, 2. everyone knew the board of education had more money than they were willing to give, and 3. the teachers had a history of being hurt before in negotiations sessions. The board president disagreed blaming: 1. the ineffectiveness of the board of education to maintain credibility between the board and the teachers, 2. split decisions made on most decisions by the board of education, and 3. misrepresentation of the facts and misleading statements by the superintendent.

Despite the large amount of advance notice of the strike, the superintendent and board president made no official plans
to handle the strike until after the strike began. The teachers' association had laid their plan of action out prior to the strike and perceived their planning as producing a "very strong strike." The PTA made plans after the strike began; their only plan was to "stay out of it. We were afraid the teachers would hold grudges against our children."

Estimates as to the percentage of teachers supporting the strike were fairly close. The superintendent perceived a very strongly organized effort by the teachers with 95 per cent participation. The board president observed a 98 per cent participation, while the teachers' president reported 93 per cent. The PTA president did not know what percentage of teachers did not work during the strike.

The superintendent and board president agreed to keep schools open as a means of pressuring the teachers back to work by loss of pay. The teachers realized their strength was manifested by a simultaneous strike by the non-certified workers, by support from community members, and by pressure on the board from a local women's organization. The PTA president observed the women's organization as a pressure tactic for the teachers but was not aware of any other tactics.

Perceptions of violence, threats of violence, and anxieties were greatly polarized. The superintendent and board president discerned that the teachers "went through hell." The superintendent was aware of very traumatic experiences by substitute teachers who were followed home and threatened by phone; he did, however, admit there was no actual violence. The board president perceived the teachers who worked to be very fearful for their own safety and cited rocking of cars and verbal abuse while crossing picket lines. Board members were harassed by phone and in person, while the superintendent recalled only three calls. The teachers' president insisted that he cautioned teachers not to be involved in phone calling and violence but did admit to harassing "scabs" who crossed picket lines. The teachers' president expressed concern that the potential for
extreme violence was building as the strike progressed and would have surfaced had the strike continued any longer than it did. The PTA president was not aware of harassing phone calls but cited destruction to trees on school property, and verbal abuse of children and parents who attempted to go to school, and damage to the desks and personal items of teachers who worked.

Only the teachers' president expressed any attempt at coping with or avoiding strike related anxieties. He warned his teachers, "If you get caught committing acts of violence or making obscene phone calls, you'll get burned. I do not condone any of that. You're professionals." However, the teachers' president admitted, "If I would have had my way, I would have told my people to stand at the door, and if anyone tries to go in, bust their head. But that's not the way teachers are."

All four respondents agreed that one police officer was stationed at each picket site; however, both the superintendent and board president reported the police refused to enforce the judicial picket limitation order. The teachers' president reported that the police met them on the picket line each morning and had breakfast with them. The teachers' chief officer also reported that he met with the mayor prior to the picketing to learn exactly what the police would allow on the picket lines.

The superintendent, board president, and teachers' president agreed that the head negotiator for the board of education was a representative from the Ohio School Boards Association (OSBA). The PTA president was also aware that the head negotiator was an outsider but was not sure of the organization that provided his service.

The superintendent, board president, and teachers' president agreed that the OEA provided a Uniserve person to serve as head negotiator for the teachers; the PTA thought the job
was performed by a local teacher.

All respondents, except the teachers' president were
cognizant of recrimination against non-striking teachers. The
board president claimed a one year silent treatment against
working teachers was ordered by the teachers' president, while
the superintendent claimed that many of the hard feelings were
there before the strike and that the strike only served to
intensify these feelings. The teachers' president insisted
that there was little recrimination because those teachers who
did work quickly joined the association after the strike.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator,
(if one was used) influence the bargaining and
strike situation?

Opinions differed greatly concerning the board's negotia-
tor and his role. The superintendent perceived that the OSBA
negotiator did a "very fine job," while the board president
agreed, he also felt that the negotiator was unable to "shake
the board's image as created by the superintendent." So the
teachers' president had "no respect" for the board's negotiator
and insisted"...if he [negotiator] had advised the board pro-
perly, they would not have had a problem." The PTA president
had no opinion concerning the role of the board's negotiator.

The superintendent and board president agreed that their
negotiator brought no preconceived goals or ideas into the
strike, while the teachers' president observed that "OSBA
believes OEA has a master plan to break the state. OEA does
what we tell them to - they let me run my own show." The PTA
president had no comment.

The superintendent, board president, and teachers' presi-
dent all agreed that outside negotiators handle emotional issues
more objectively. The PTA president had no comment.

When asked to comment on any attitude changes the board's
negotiator might have made, the superintendent observed no
basic attitude changes by anyone, while the board president
perceived the outside negotiator was very influential in maintaining the attitudes of the board in a positive direction during the all night bargaining session. Both the teachers' president and PTA president were not aware of any influence in attitude adjustment by the board's negotiator.

Both the superintendent and board president admitted they did not see their negotiator affecting the size or type of final settlement, while the teacher and PTA president expressed that they did not know. The superintendent, however, thought the outside negotiator facilitated a quicker settlement. The board and PTA presidents did not know if the negotiator affected the strike length, while the teachers' president perceived the board's negotiator lengthening the strike with his poor advice.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent observed the teachers' outside negotiator to be "easier to deal with than the teachers," while the board president felt she could not control her teachers. The teachers' president perceived the role of his negotiator as extremely supportive and helpful to the morale of the local association. The PTA president realized that the teachers' negotiator's role included encouraging the public to become involved.

When addressing preconceived goals or ideas of the teachers' negotiator, the board president noticed many hidden agenda and accused the teachers' president of seeking personal vendettas. The superintendent noticed no preconceived goals brought in by the teachers' negotiator, while the teachers' president had no comment and the PTA president did not know.

The superintendent and board president did not believe the teachers' negotiator changed the attitudes of any of the parties involved, while the presidents of the teachers and
PTA did not know if attitudes were changed.

The superintendent had no idea if the teachers' negotiator affected the size or type of the settlement, whereas the board president perceived that the negotiator's inability to control the teachers resulted in a larger final settlement. The teachers' president credited his negotiator's ability to help everyone "keep their cool" as positively influencing the final settlement. None of the respondents perceived that the teachers' negotiator altered the length of the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same in the future?

The superintendent was pleased with the plans he made for the strike. He was able to keep schools open, to keep line administrators well informed, and to quickly return the school to its normal operation after the strike was settled. The superintendent, however, warned against counting on local city officials to fulfill promises made concerning the handling of the strike.

Despite the numerous comments and concerns expressed about violence, anxieties, and threats, only the teachers' president had any ideas or made any attempts to cope with and avoid these problems. The teachers' leader warned his teachers against threats and violence; however, as stated earlier, the teachers' president personally was for violence.

The use of substitute teachers during the strike was supported by the superintendent and board president. By increasing substitute pay to equal the salary of a first year teacher, the superintendent claimed to have more substitutes than he needed. The teachers' president had no comment about dealing with the substitute issue, while the PTA president believed substitute teachers were effective only at the elementary level.

Only the PTA president and superintendent viewed media coverage as fair. The superintendent added that he perceived
the media's coverage as facilitating a quicker settlement. The board president perceived the media, who used board releases out of context, was pro-teacher. The board's leader also has begun a blueprint to deal with media personnel in the event of another strike. The teachers' president was very adamant about his view of a major newspaper in an adjacent city. "Butchers, liars - take what you say and use it out of context, printed material they promised would be off the record. We cut them off."

The teacher and PTA presidents believed the key issue was money and remained so throughout the strike. But the superintendent discerned that the strike began as a teacher power struggle but ended as a demand for a dental plan; the superintendent noted that the teachers accepted the same salary as offered before the strike, with an earlier implementation date and the dental plan as the final settlement. The board's president felt the key issue changed from salary to insistence on the dental package.

Only the superintendent and teacher president perceived any special steps taken by either side to facilitate a settlement. The superintendent noted a change in the teachers' leadership, a willingness on the administration's part to meet anytime, and the work of the federal mediator as key points to moving forward to a settlement. The teacher mentioned only the work of the federal mediator.

The community as a whole was perceived in many different ways. Although the superintendent was approached by 200 women the third day of the strike, he did not see the community influencing the strike. He did, however, warn that every superintendent should expect the teachers to convince the community that a public meeting is needed by the third day. The superintendent suggested a second day news conference to let the people know what is happening and avoid a public meeting. The school's chief executive was "surprised how gullible the people
were to believe everything the teachers told them. The board president did not notice the community playing any role in the strike, while the teachers' president cited rallies, donated food, baby-sitting service, bathroom facilities, and a free strike headquarters as just a few of the community's supportive gestures. This support, the teachers believed, pressured the board. The PTA president cited an ad hoc group called "Moms for Teachers" as one type of community support.

Although their reasons differed, all four participants agreed the Ferguson Act was not used. The superintendent was advised by legal counsel not to use the Ferguson Act because it was not practical. The board president's conceptions of the Ferguson Act was that it could create bad feelings and prolong the strike, while the teacher president noted that the fairly quick settlement made the Ferguson unnecessary. The PTA president had no opinion as to why the Ferguson Act was not invoked.

The superintendent did request a picket limitation injunction, which was granted, but failed to be effective. Had the strike been extended another week, the superintendent was prepared to seek a back to work injunction as a possible "out" for the teachers. The board and teacher presidents agreed that the picket limitation injunction did not work, and the teacher commented that injunctions only serve to make people mad. The PTA president had no comment about injunctions.

The superintendent and board president were quite upset about the mayor's refusal to pressure police to enforce the picket limitation or support the school system as they had promised before the strike. The teachers' president indicated support from the local electrical union as their only political participation, while the PTA president did not know of any political involvement.

The superintendent instructed line administrators to deal with recrimination within their buildings on an individual
basis. The board president, however, felt that nothing could be done to avoid recrimination. The teachers' president warned that there was a no reprisal clause and that he would help no one caught engaging in any type of recrimination. The PTA president had no opinion or ideas about dealing with recrimination issues.

If given an opportunity to do something differently, the superintendent would call a public meeting before the teachers tried to influence the public; the board president indicated he would have liked to have seen progress reports given to the public earlier in the strike, while the teachers' president would plan to handle impasse procedures more carefully. The PTA president did not know what she would do differently.

In retrospect, the superintendent felt nothing could have avoided this strike; "it was inevitable." The board president outlined a plan to organize the board of education as a whole and fire the superintendent as the best way to avoid future strikes. The teachers' president placed the blame on the administration and board; "it's not the teachers' fault they are on strike. Therefore, if it is not their fault, they can not avoid it." The PTA president had no ideas on avoiding a strike.

Both the superintendent and teachers' president ascertained that the strike was worth the problems involved. While the superintendent perceived the strike as a means of releasing pent up frustrations, the teachers' president claimed a victory for the teachers. The board president refused to comment on this issue, and the PTA president did not think the strike was worth it but did not know why.

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

The superintendent was against legislation mandating bargaining with teachers, although he would like to see some
guidelines for public sector bargaining. The board president wished to reserve comment until he could read the specifics of such legislation. Both the teachers' and PTA presidents were in favor of mandated bargaining. Although the teacher gave no reasons, the PTA president saw a need for guidelines.

No one supported the idea of new legislation prohibiting teacher strikes. The superintendent could not conceive of another way for teachers to obtain equal footing, while the teacher president insisted everyone who works has the right to withhold their services. The PTA president was basically against teachers' strikes but agreed strikes should be permitted only as a last resort. The board president did not know how to vote at this time.

The superintendent and board and teachers' presidents were in favor of legislated binding arbitration as a final grievance step. The superintendent observed, "If two people have set down and established a written document to live by, then any violation, by either side, should be dealt with." The board president expressed confidence that "the board and administration should have the facts and evidence that would make an arbitrator's finding in our favor obvious." The PTA president would not make a commitment until she had read the specifics of such legislation. The teachers' president was not concerned about legislated binding arbitration for grievances because he had already negotiated it locally.

When considering legislated arbitration as an alternative to strikes, the superintendent was very much against it. "I don't want a third party deciding on something when the parameters are so wide open." The board president repeated his confidence in an arbitrator's decision in favor of board views, while the teachers' president approved it without comment, and the PTA president again wanted to see the specifics of the legislation.

Concerning legislation mandating open bargaining, the PTA president did not know how she would vote at this time, and
the other respondents were against open bargaining. The superintendent viewed the public as too emotional to become involved in bargaining, while the board president noted a need to keep the public out but informed as to the progress being made. The teachers' president observed that open bargaining would exist and stated, "If you mandate it, people will meet in secret and have hidden agendas."

Summary

In school district nine, the superintendent, board president, and teachers president all appeared to be knowledgeable or at least have their own perceptions of all of the issues mentioned. The PTA president expressed a lack of knowledge of several items and expressed a desire to "stay out of the strike."

The superintendent and board president gave their negotiator credit for doing a professional job, but both doubted that he made any major influence on the decisions or outcome of the strike. The teachers' president very strongly believed the use of this outside negotiator by the board increased the division between the two parties and distracted from a quick settlement. The PTA president was non-committed about any of the questions raised in this area.

The superintendent and PTA presidents made few responses regarding the influence of the teachers' outside negotiator. The board president observed that the teachers negotiator had a damaging and lengthening effect on the strike, while the teachers' president observed just the opposite.

The special issues that arise during a strike were handled in most instances without plans. Suggestions for the future were limited and unorganized, while little agreement could be reached about what had happened this time. The differences in opinion and the board president's displeasure with the superintendent may hold the key as to the lack of future planning by the administration and board. The teachers'
association was so pleased with their efforts that they perceived no need for different plans. The teachers' president stated, "This strike has made me a god. ...these teachers would do anything for me."

The perceptions of legislative aids to collective bargaining were never unanimous. A pattern of voting in pairs as a block, such as superintendent and board president, or teachers and PTA, never really happened. However, the majority of opinions were for mandated bargaining, against prohibition of striking, for arbitration of grievances, and as an alternative to strikes, and against open bargaining.

The data in Table 25 shows a comparison of responses to some of the key questions of this strike by the respondents of school nine.
Table 25
Consistency of Responses for School Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>PTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of teachers out</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>local+</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitude</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of Findings and
Qualitative Analysis of Individual Schools

School Ten

School ten is found in the northeast quadrant of Ohio and is part of the D enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent - superintendent
- Representing the board of education - board president
- Representing the teachers' association - teachers' president
- Representing the PTA - Citizens for Better Schools Chairperson

This school district has no PTA; however, the Citizens for Better Schools had been a permanent committee in this community for over twenty years, providing the services normally associated with the PTA.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association representative, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All respondents reported that negotiations in this district should be and were closed to the general public.

The superintendent recalled a one week notice of the impending strike; it was not until the actual strike vote that he recognized the strike possibility. The board president could not recall how much notice of the impending strike he received. The teachers' president reported a four week notice of the eminent strike. The board's response to the impasse panel was his first recognition of the certainty of the strike. The chairperson reported a three day notice of the strike, with the teachers' strike vote alerting her to the strike.

The initial reaction of the board president to the strike was: "I knew it would not be a good experience." The
chairperson expressed "extreme concern." The superintendent and teachers' president could not recall their initial reactions.

Opinions of the key issues causing the strike varied. The superintendent reported money; the board president reported fringes, salaries, and evaluation procedures; the teachers' president reported language evaluation procedures, fair dismissal language, and money. However, the chairperson reported two sets of issues, "the ones publicized and the real ones." "The publicized issues were money and language. The real issue was a personality conflict between the administration and the teachers."

All respondents reported that they made plans to deal with the strike before it began.

Perceptions of the number of teachers not working the strike varied little. The board president was not sure of the percentage, but the superintendent, teachers' president, and chairperson reported 95, 99, and 95 per cent respectively.

All respondents agreed that the administration kept schools open during the strike; however, opinions varied as to who supported this stand. The superintendent reported that only individuals supported the administration, while a newly formed citizen's group supported the teachers. The board president was unaware of any organized support for either side. The teachers' president observed that groups were forming behind both sides; however, the chairperson recalled "no formal groups" supporting anyone.

Anxieties, threats, and violence were reported by each of the respondents. The superintendent recalled: "picketers pounded on cars, locks were jammed, substitutes were chased substitutes were followed home, their homes were egged, the superintendent's wife was harassed, and teachers were threatened on the picket lines." The board president recalled; "harassment to anyone crossing the picket lines, threatening
phone calls to board members and administrators, obscene phone
calls, and one picketer who claimed to have been hit by a car." The teachers' president was aware of: "parents having damage
to their cars while delivering students, radio antenna torn off cars, locks on school property damaged, school property
disappeared, pickets struck by cars, one teacher pinned be-
tween cars sustaining severe injury, teacher presidents' wife
harassed by phone, and board members and administrators har-
assed by phone." The chairperson observed: "harassment at
picket lines, told schools were closed, a group of male teach-
ers picketed my house and tried to keep me from leaving my
home, I saw many people on picket lines who were outsiders,
kids who went to school were threatened with failure by their
teachers if they attended any more, board members threatened,
board members were threatened that their homes would be blown
up, cars crossing picket lines were beaten on."

All respondents agreed that the local law enforcement
agencies were involved during the strike. The superintendent
said the police were "sympathic toward the teachers." The
board president recalled "a few incidents they could have
handled better." The teachers' president noted that the police
"tried to keep a low profile. I don't think they favored one
side or the other. They just tried to keep the peace." The
chairperson stated that the police tried to "stay out of it
as much as possible."

All respondents agreed that the board used the assistant
superintendent as head negotiator. Everyone except the board
president recalled that the local teachers' president was head
negotiator. The board president perceived the OEA Uniserve
representative to be the teachers' head negotiator.

Recrimination and anxieties between non-working and work-
ing personnel were reported by all respondents.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator,
(if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike
situation?
In this school district an insider was used as the board's negotiator. The superintendent reported that he was "pleased" with the role of the board's negotiator. The board president said the negotiator's performance was "commendable" because "he tried to see both sides of the picture." The teachers' president recalled, "Some of his tactics were possible non-productive. His style was vastly different than what we were used to. We looked into his background to see if he had prior bargaining experience; it was limited." The chairperson reported that she "didn't know what else he would have done."

The superintendent, board president, and citizens' committee chairperson "did not know" of any preconceived goals or ideas brought in by the board's negotiator. The teachers' president was aware of a preconceived attitude of the entire board's team toward the teachers' negotiator. She stated, "Anything he said was taken very negatively, and as a result, slowed down the process."

When considering emotional issues, the superintendent was of the opinion that "outsiders have an easier time obtaining objectivity;" however, the board president perceived insiders do a better job of handling emotional issues because "they stay and live with the decisions." The teachers' president "did not know" if insiders or outsiders handled emotional issues better. The chairperson related that "insiders do better. Outside people orchestrated this strike."

The superintendent and board president were not aware of any changes in anyone's attitude as a result of the influence of the board's negotiator. The teachers' president recalled that "at certain points, attitudes and emotions were on a constant roller coaster. At times I'm sure I was very hostile." The chairperson related that both negotiators changed attitudes, but she had no specific examples.

The size and type of the final settlement was not influenced by the board's negotiator, according to the superintendent. The board president stated that both negotiators influenced
the "extremes of both sides toward a compromise in the middle." The teachers' president perceived the board's negotiator "was really calling most of the shots for the superintendent." The chairperson "did not know" if the board's negotiator influenced the final settlement.

Only the teachers' president reported any influence by the board's negotiator on the length of the strike. "The board's negotiator had to lengthen the strike because of the superintendent's attitude," recalled the teachers' president.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

In this situation, the teachers used an inside negotiator with advice from outside. The superintendent described the role of the teachers' head negotiator as "a mouthpiece. He could not negotiate without a Uniserve counselor." The board president said that "if negotiations had been left to the local negotiator, things would have gone differently." The teachers' president perceived that as head negotiator he was "too patient. Had I not been so patient with the learning process the board's negotiator was going through, we would have gotten into things sooner. Our team was consistent in our approach. We knew where we were going," recalled the teachers' president. The chairperson was of the opinion that the teachers' negotiator was "greatly lead by OEA."

According to the superintendent, preconceived attitudes of the teachers' negotiator were observed to be "the usual state issues." The board president and citizens' chairperson "did not know" of any preconceived ideas that the teachers' head negotiator might have had. The teachers' president was not aware of any preconceived ideas on his part.

The superintendent was not aware of any changes in anyone's attitude as a result of the influence of the teachers' head negotiator. The board president was of the opinion that the Uniserve representative "often wishes to attain his goals,
which are not always the same as the local association's."

The teachers' president repeated his concern about attitudes
being on a "rollercoaster," but the chairperson could not list
any specific attitude changes.

In the opinion of the superintendent, the size and type
of final settlement was not influenced by the teachers' head
negotiator. The board president was aware of a "meeting in
the middle" brought about by both negotiators. The teachers'
president stated that the Uniserve representative was very
helpful in handling financial crises. But the chairperson did
not know if the final settlement was influenced by the teach­
ers' negotiator.

Only the board president reported that the teachers'
organizer was influential in definitely lengthening the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled and
would these same issues be handled the same way in
the future?

The superintendent's planning for this strike included
providing for transportation of substitutes and communications
between all working personnel. No changes in these plans for
the future were made. The board president perceived pre-strike
plans were effective and should always include keeping build­
ing principals involved and informed. If there would be an­
other strike, the board president had no changes in existing
plans. The teachers' president recalled listing the associa­
tion's options if the impasse panel finding was rejected. The
teachers' final plan included: "having responsible people in
each building, finding a strike headquarters, establishing a
communications system, picket line rotation, food, and public­
ity." The Citizens for Better Schools chairperson recalled
her plans "were dumb as I look back. Plans were made to try
to get the two sides back together. A community meeting chair­
ed by a local pastor made appeals to get together. A meeting
in one of the churches after the teachers were jailed ended
with a great deal of heckling."

Although the superintendent and board president reported several anxiety filled situations that occurred during the strike, they made no plans to deal with them this time or in the future. The teachers' president maintained that "teachers were instructed not to call board members or administrators unless it was cleared through officers. We explained to our people why we didn't want them to engage in these activities," reported the teachers' president. The teachers' president also made no reference to any plans being made to avoid anxieties in the future. The chairperson perceived the best way to deal with anxieties now and in the future is to "ignore it."

All respondents agreed that substitute teachers were used during the strike and that they were harassed. The superintendent made plans to transport substitutes to and from school but had no additional ideas for dealing with the harassment of substitutes away from school or after the strike was over. The board president was of the opinion that the problems of substitutes were handled the best way they could. When pressed for future ways to avoid these problems, the board president replied that there "was no way." The teachers' president commented that he personally "bore no grudges against substitutes, but the people who were out on the line seem to be bitter." The teachers' president had no suggestions to make regarding substitutes.

The superintendent reported media coverage to range "from poor to terrible. It favored teachers and was sensationalized." The superintendent also perceived that the media was responsible for "keeping the strike going." The board president observed the media coverage was "not in the best interest of the community. They [media] favored the teachers, embellished the truth, and one year later after the strike, the TV showed pictures of the teachers going to jail as a reminder that the strike was just a year ago." The board president also stated
that the media did not present a true picture of what happened. The teachers' president reported, "Before the jailings, I felt the news coverage was very fair and equal; after the jailings, they tended to favor teachers." The chairperson recalled that the media coverage was "very sensationalized. They [the media] reported 500 towns people met to discuss the jailing of the teachers; I was there, and only 15 per cent of the people there were from our town." The chairperson also perceived that the media influenced the strike by "keeping the public 'hyped up' about the jailing of the teachers. I went on television and supported the administration and board of education; I received a phone call the next day from a man who said if I were a man he would come over and beat the hell out of me." None of the respondents made any plans to deal with the media any differently in the future.

The chairperson "did not know" if the key issues remained the same throughout the strike; however, the other three respondents agreed the issues remained the same.

The superintendent reported "around the clock negotiations, mediation, and a cooling off period" were things he did to aid in the strike settlement. The board president listed nothing in particular that he himself had done to end the strike. The teachers' president recalled, "The judge called both sides into his chambers to negotiate. We felt we made major moves financially from our original requests; however, the board was unmoving. The last week of the strike, I called the superintendent personally and asked that we get together for some hard negotiations. We met, I presented a new package, they countered, and we settled." The chairperson reported a "community meeting" as the only special attempt by her group to settle the strike. No one reported plans for settling a future strike.

The superintendent perceived that the community at large influenced the strike by "offering themselves as mediators and pressuring the judge to mediate. This is a union town, which made the strike longer." The superintendent encouraged the
public to become involved by attending several community meet-
ings to present his side. The board president did not observe
that the community at large had any influence on the strike.
"We did," reported the board president, "encourage the public
to become involved by passing out information to the community
and running adds in the paper." The teachers' president re-
called "alot of rapidly organized groups pressuring both
sides. They [community] were vocally supportive of the teach-
ers position which kept up teachers' morale. We [the teachers]
encouraged the public to become involved by informational meet-
ings and passing out leaflets." The chairperson reported that
"it was difficult to tell if the community played a large part.
The community was very polarized and everyone was involved in
some small way. One-third of our entire population is school
age, and with the school being the largest employer in town,
everyone has some connection with the school. We did not en-
courage the public to become involved, but we did try to keep
them informed."

All respondents agreed that the Ferguson Act was never
invoked. The superintendent labelled the Ferguson Act "not
practical," and the board president observed the Ferguson Act
to be "very time consuming and expensive." The teachers' presi-
dent was aware that "the board did not think it would work,"
and the chairperson "did not think it was enforceable."

The superintendent did seek a back to work injunction
against the teachers. Although the injunction was granted,
it did not do what it was intended to do. "The teachers did
not obey the order and forty-two contempt charges were filed,"
recalled the superintendent. The superintendent would seek
the same injunction again if a similar situation occurred in
the future, and the board president, who also was aware of
contempt charges, expressed a willingness to "do it all again
if need be." The teachers' president listed three injunctions:
"1. back to work, 2. picket limitation, and 3. contempt charges and jailings." The chairperson mentioned only the back to work injunction and the jailing of the teachers.

The superintendent reported that two council members, who supported the teachers were "the only political figures involved in the strike." The board president was not aware of any political involvement, but the teachers' president and chairperson also mentioned the council members' presence. However, no one observed any influence on the strike as a result of this political involvement.

Post-strike anxieties were very limited and "back to work was not traumatic," recalled the superintendent. However, the superintendent believed there was "no time or way to avoid these anxieties." The board president, who also was aware of only minor anxieties, tried to deal with post-strike tension by stressing that "the past is past; let's give our kids the best education possible." But he did not offer any plans to avoid these problems in the future. The teachers' president stated, "We signed a no reprisal clause, so we were very much on the watch for recrimination toward non-striking teachers. We made statements to our people that there should be no reprisals. I was pleased with our teachers reactions and would handle post-strike anxieties the same in the future." The chairperson reported recrimination toward non-striking teachers but offered no plans for dealing with or avoiding this problem now or in the future.

The superintendent perceived that the one most important thing which should be done differently in the future is to "involve a professional negotiator." Although the board president had "no comment" about making changes, the teachers' president reported "things went well. I wouldn't change a thing." The chairperson wanted "more accurate and daily information."

The superintendent said the one most important thing to avoid a future strike is to "keep in close contact with the
teachers." The board president would "work with a Federal Mediator while teachers were still working." The teachers' president would "campaign for new board members," but the chairperson related that there is "nothing we can do."

The superintendent was of the opinion that the strike was not worth the effort it took because "no strike is worth it." The board president reported that "there is a point when local school districts must maintain management rights." The teachers' president perceived that the strike as worth it "but would have rather avoided it if possible." The chairperson said the strike was not worth it because "it accomplished nothing."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

The superintendent would not support legislation mandating collective bargaining with teachers because "the board of education should choose." The board president, who would not support this type of legislation, stated, "If we can bargain without a union, fine." The teachers' president commented that his support "depends on the specifics of the legislation." The chairperson, who was against mandated bargaining, replied, "We should not negotiate; each person should be reimbursed according to their job and value. People should be hired, fired, and rewarded on individual merit."

The superintendent would support new legislation prohibiting the right for teachers to strike because striking "deprives students of an education." The board's and teachers' presidents and chairperson reserved comment on this issue until they saw the specifics of the legislation.

The superintendent and board president would not support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step. The superintendent believed it would result in "loss of local control," and the board president believed "those
involved are not fully aware of school situations such as finances." The teachers' president was for this type of binding arbitration because "in grievance procedures it is necessary." The chairperson would not support binding arbitration of grievances because "an outsider cannot make a decision. Local people should make the decisions."

Binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike would again not be supported by the superintendent because of "loss of local control." The board president also would again not support this type of binding arbitration because "those involved are not fully aware of school situations such as finances." The teachers' president was also against binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike because "arbitrators are both good and bad and to saddle the teachers or board with an incompetent arbitrator's decision is unfair to everyone." The chairperson was "against binding arbitration for any reason or purpose."

None of the respondents supported legislation mandating open bargaining. The superintendent stated that open bargaining would become a "show." The board president was against it because "misunderstanding occurs." The teachers' president was against it because "neither side would be free to say all they wanted to say." The chairperson was against open bargaining because "it would polarize the community."

Summary

All respondents appeared to be equally aware and knowledgeable of strike issues. The board president and chairperson did not appear to be as involved as the superintendent and teachers' president.

The board of educations' inside negotiator was not perceived to have had a major influence on the strike. Although the teachers' president expressed an opinion that the strike may have been lengthened by the board's negotiator, the board's
The inside negotiator used by the teachers' association was perceived only by himself to be influential in the strike. All others reported that the teachers' negotiator was only a "mouthpiece" for OEA. The respondents indicated that the strike might have caused fewer problems if the teachers' negotiator had had more control and less pressure from OEA.

Few, if any plans were made to deal with the problems of another strike sometime in the future. Only the teachers' president made and put into motion plans to deal with anxieties before and after the strike. All the respondents had suggestions for avoiding future strikes, but only the teachers' president had made any plans to put his ideas to work.

When considering the legislative issues, only the binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike received a unanimous vote. The superintendent, board president, and chairperson supported four of the five legislative issues.

The strike in school number ten resulted in the jailing of several teachers after they defied a back to work order. Settlement was finally reached after the superintendent and teachers' president communicated to each other personally and discussed the problems.

The data in Table 26 show a more explicit rendering and conflict comparison of several of the key strike issues.
TABLE 26
Consistency of Responses for School Ten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of teachers out</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>Ast.supt.</td>
<td>Ast.supt.</td>
<td>Ast. supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of Findings and Qualitative Analysis of Individual Schools

School Eleven

School eleven is located in the southwest quadrant of Ohio and is part of the D enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent - superintendent
- Representing the board of education - board of education
- Representing the teachers' association - teachers' president
- Representing the PTA - a patron of the community

The superintendent of this district strongly discouraged talking with any of the PTA presidents in the district. The superintendent was of the opinion that none of the PTA presidents would be able to answer any of my interview questions. The superintendent suggested that a patron of the community who had been very active in the community and who was very involved in school work, but not as an employee, be interviewed.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association representative, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All respondents agreed that bargaining was closed to the public, but opinions about whether bargaining should be closed were mixed. The superintendent reported he was against open bargaining because "the public is not the instrumental party. To add the public would cause the parties to play to the audience." The board president had mixed feelings about open bargaining. "If bargaining were open," related the board's president, "the public would find out what is going on, including the teachers who don't really know what is going on. They would find out the tactics their own people are using. On the
other hand, open bargaining would inhibit the give and take between parties." The teachers' president was against open bargaining because "it would inhibit free exchange and become a public relations campaign." The community patron wanted open bargaining because "it is a public function."

The superintendent recalled that he had two days notice of the strike; however, two years before the strike the teachers' president had told him that there would be a strike soon. The board president never gave up hope that a settlement would be reached without a strike. The board president did admit, however, that "the board made many tactical errors in handling the impasse panel results in 1977. We made public statements we probably should not have made. We probably had not been fair to the teachers with salary, didn't go for a levy soon enough, and as a result the board was partly at fault." The teachers' president reported a seven month notice, citing the "board's unwillingness to bargain in good faith" as the key factor that alerted him to a coming strike. The patron could not recall how he first learned of the strike, but he did not know about it until after it began.

Initial reactions to the strike were mixed. The superintendent recalled that he had "expected it and had no feelings about it." The board president was "regretful," but the teachers' president had no response. The patron recalled that he was "sorry to hear about it and was saddened by the news."

Key issues causing the strike were several according to the superintendent: "1. the way the board dealt with the arbitrators' decision, 2. a power struggle between the association and the board, 3. what is negotiable, 4. rules for negotiations, and 5. the association was losing membership and needed a rally." The board president was of the opinion that "money and credibility between the teachers and board" were the key issues. The teachers' president reported "money and pride" as key issues, and the community patron listed "base salary."
Everyone except the community patron reported having a strike plan before the strike began. The patron made no plans at all.

Perceptions of the percentage of teachers not working during the strike varied drastically. The superintendent reported 90 per cent, the board president reported 85 per cent, and the teachers' president and patron reported 94 and 50 per cent respectively.

All respondents agreed that schools were kept open during the strike. The superintendent mentioned that the board made the decision to stay open against his recommendation. The superintendent also reported no formal groups organized for or against this issue. The board president was of the opinion that keeping schools open during the strike was "the most difficult decision to be made because kids were hurt." The board president also reported no organized groups formed to support the board, but some "OEA support citizen's groups wanted a settlement at all costs." The teachers' president observed the decision to keep schools open as a "good example of management working without education going on." The teachers' president was not aware of any organized groups for or against the board or teachers. The patron was conscious of a need to keep schools open but was concerned that "not much happens." The patron was also unaware of any organized groups.

Anxieties and harassment during the strike was limited to verbal harassment and telephone calls, according to the superintendent. "I received 300 calls in 9 days," he reported. Although the board president worked his regular job every day and was away from a lot of the problem, he stated, "My wife was ignored or avoided, shunned at church, and the pastor made comments about the strike. She has never forgiven the church until this day." Although the superintendent reported that there was no violence, the board president mentioned that "where parents tried to cross lines, teachers jumped on cars and pounded on cars. Coaches pushed down a small male teacher
attempting to cross the picket line, and there was a fight between a teacher and a parent." The teachers' president recalled harassment included "intimidation toward anyone crossing picket lines, nails found in the driveway of the bus garage, an attack by a citizen upon a teacher, harassing telephone calls to community members, and pickets at the superintendent's home." The patron responded that "there must have been anxieties, but I am not aware of any."

The role of the local police during the strike was perceived by the superintendent to be one of "controlling picket lines; I was pleased." In the future the superintendent planned to deal with the police in the same manner that he did this time. The board president was aware that the police provided protection for the bus drivers but "felt police could have done more." The teachers' president observed the police to be "very cooperative, with a neutral attitude." The patron labelled the police "adequate."

All respondents agreed that the board used an outside negotiator and that the teachers' association was jointly represented by the teachers' president and an OEA consultant.

Each of the respondents reported recrimination and post-strike anxieties. The superintendent was aware of "cold shoulders toward non-striking teachers after the strike." The board president reported "minimal recrimination;" however, the teachers' president reported "friendships were lost." The patron was conscious of "daily indirect recrimination."

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The superintendent recognized that the head negotiator "did not do that much alone. The entire Ohio School Boards Association staff worked with us and was very helpful, patient, and became part of our staff." The board president related that the head negotiator's role was "well done." The teachers'
The president perceived the negotiator to be strictly an "advisor, who got out of it easy and was never used as a scapegoat." The patron "did not know" what kind of role the board's negotiator played.

The superintendent and board president were not aware of any preconceived goals or ideas which were brought in by the board's negotiator. The teachers' president was certain that there must have been some preconceived goals and opinions, but he did not know what they were specifically. The patron believed any outsider would bring in preconceived ideas because "they make their living giving advice."

When dealing with the emotional issues of a strike, the superintendent was under the impression that "outside hired guns handle emotional issues better and avoid emotional issues." The board president commented that "it doesn't matter if the negotiator is an insider or an outsider." The teachers' president viewed outside negotiators as "less emotionally involved." The patron "did not know" who handled emotional issues better.

The superintendent was not aware of any changes in attitude by any of the parties involved as a result of the influence of the board's negotiator. The board president credited the board's head negotiator with "convincing us to do things that benefited both sides; plus he brought in experience of other boards that he had represented. Teachers don't realize how much he helped them." The teachers' president was not aware of any attitude changes, and the patron responded, "Attitudes were probably changed, but I'm not sure how."

According to the superintendent, the board's negotiator effected the size and type of the final settlement by "bringing in the institutional agenda of his organization versus the OEA agenda. The egos and reputation of each must surely effect the outcome of any situation." The board president did not think the board's negotiator had any effect on the size or type of settlement; however, the teachers' president credited the
board's negotiator with "helping design and expand the parameters of the settlement." The patron ascertained that the board's negotiator had influence on the final settlement, but he "did not know" exactly how that influence was manifested.

The superintendent, board president, and patron did not observe that the board's negotiator had any effect on the length of the strike. The teachers' president, however, believed that "both negotiators shortened the strike."

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The role of the teachers' negotiator was perceived by the superintendent to be "typical OEA contrived tactics. During a strike everyone plays a role." The board president viewed the teachers' negotiator as "weak. He had to go back to the local president every time a decision needed to be made." The teachers' president reported that his head negotiator was "effective as a consultant and very experienced." The patron was not aware of the role played by the teacher's negotiator.

The superintendent was conscious of preconceived goals, ideas, and opinions brought in by the teachers negotiator. "They brought in typical OEA state issues," reported the superintendent. The board president "did not know" of any preconceived ideas. The teachers' president was sure that there must have been some preconceived opinions, but he "did not know" what they were. The patron stated that all "outsiders bring in issues. They make their living giving advice."

Only the patron observed any changes in attitude as a result of the teachers' negotiator; however, he could not cite examples of those changes.

The superintendent perceived that the teachers' negotiator influenced the final settlement because of "the reputation and ego of the institution he represented." The board president did not credit the teachers' negotiator with any influence
on the final settlement. The teachers' president thought that both the board's and teachers' negotiators moved the final settlement "closer to the middle," while the patron was certain the teachers' negotiator must have had an influence, but he was not sure what that influence was.

The superintendent and board president were not aware of any influence on the length of the strike by the teachers' negotiator. However, the teachers' president credited the negotiator with "shortening the strike," but the patron accused the negotiator of "lengthening the strike."

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

According to the superintendent, the planning for the strike was "very effective in keeping communications open." The superintendent did not, however, have any plans made which might alter the way a future strike would be handled. The board president viewed his strike plans as effect because they were "able to keep schools open." In the future, the board president would not "underestimate the union's power" as he did this time. The teachers' president labeled his pre-strike plans effective because "we knew what to expect and had no surprises." The teachers' president would "change nothing in the future situations." The patron had made no plans to deal with this strike and would make none for the future.

Despite the anxieties experienced during the strike, none of the respondents had made any plans to deal with these anxieties now or to avoid them in the future.

All respondents reported that substitutes were used during the strike and were harassed crossing the picket lines. However, no one had any plans to deal with or avoid these problems now or in the future.

The superintendent observed that the media coverage "found what they were looking for. Each reporter has his own biased
opinions and that is reflected in his reporting. They favored no side." The board president stated that the media coverage ranged "from terrible to good but was not biased for one side." The teachers' president viewed media coverage "in general to be good and pro-teacher." The patron reported the coverage to be "adequate but not biased."

The superintendent did not credit the media coverage with influencing the strike. The board president reported that the coverage "hyped up the public." The teachers' president was aware that his "P.R. [Public Relations] campaign with the media pressured management." The patron believed the media "helped focus attention on both sides and helped push for a settlement."

Future dealings with the media would be handled the same by the superintendent, teachers president, and patron. The board president would work for "better and more precise communications" with the media in the future.

Everyone except the teachers' president stated that the issues causing the strike remained the same throughout the strike. The teachers' president stated that a "master contract" became an issue as the strike lingered.

The superintendent listed no special steps taken to settle the strike. The board president recalled that the "mediator, public meetings and improving the offer to the teachers" were special steps taken by the board to settle the strike. The teachers' president credited "informing the public, pressure on the board, and the work of the mediator" as being his special efforts to reach a settlement. The community patron listed a community meeting as the community's attempt to aid in reaching a settlement.

Some individual citizens did contact the board and administration during the strike, but the superintendent stated, "We encouraged the public to keep informed but did not encourage them to actively become involved." And the board president
believed that the public meetings held by the community at large had "little influence on this strike." The board sought no community support but used volunteers to keep schools open. The teachers' president credited the community at large with "pressuring the board for a settlement." The patron "did not know" if the community at large played any part in the strike or its settlement.

All respondents agreed that the Ferguson Act was not invoked during this strike. The superintendent viewed the Ferguson Act as "a joke." The board president did not believe the Ferguson Act had "any clout." The teachers' president believed the board could "not afford to invoke the Ferguson Act." The patron observed "the Ferguson Act would probably have been involved eventually."

The superintendent did seek and receive a picket limitation injunction against the teachers. Because the superintendent thought the injunction was "effective," he would seek "the same injunction in the future if the situation arose again." The board president, who thought that a back to work injunction had been sought and received, stated, "Although the teachers did not go back to work, at least the pickets were under control." If a future strike occurs, the board president would seek the picket limitation again; however, he stated, "If you get the wrong judge, you might not get it [injunction] the next time." The teachers' president acknowledged the picket limitation order but "did not believe it accomplished what it was intended to do." The patron acknowledged the picket limitation injunction and said that it was effective.

Only the teachers' president was aware of any political involvement in the strike. "A city councilman attempted to mediate between the two sides," reported the teachers' president.

In order to deal with post-strike anxieties, the superintendent suggested that next time "schools be kept closed,
and don't involve the kids. Sit down and talk and avoid the stupid games." The board president reported that "the board, teachers, and administration provided leadership to minimize hard feelings. The superintendent and board president tried very hard to avoid negativism during the strike. People got back together better than I ever thought was possible." In a future strike, the board president would attempt to deal with post-strike anxieties in the same way. The teachers' president, however, saw "no way" to handle these problems now or in the future. The patron stated, "I'm not sure you could do anything."

The superintendent and teachers' president could not think of one particular thing that they could have done differently if they had a chance to do things over again. The board president was not sure he would keep schools open again. The patron would try to "act faster and be better informed."

The superintendent cited nothing which he planned to do to avoid a future strike. The board president stated, "As pro-teacher as our board was, I don't see what else we could have done to avoid a strike now or in the future." The teachers' president was of the opinion that "it can't be avoided. Teachers are forced to it [strike]." The patron believed that being "more informed" might help to avoid a strike.

When asked if the strike "was worth it," the superintendent responded, "Yes. We popped a boil that needed to be popped. It gave us a rock bottom feeling that provided a new beginning. At first I thought we would never recover. Now I've changed my mind." The board president labeled the strike as a "needed bloodletting." The teachers' president, who believed the strike was worth it, said, "We won more money than the board intended, received a master contract, and built pride among the teachers." The patron did not believe the strike was worth it because of the "loss to students."
V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

The superintendent would not support legislation mandating collective bargaining with teachers because "the collective bargaining process does not lend itself to schools in any state." The board president reserved comment until he saw the specifics of such legislation. The teachers' president supported mandated bargaining but would not state his reasons. The patron, who supported this type of legislation, said, "We need guidelines."

New legislation banning the right for teachers to strike was not supported by the superintendent. "That would not be realistic," responded the superintendent. "It [striking] is part of the process." The board president reserved comment until he saw the specifics of the legislation. The teachers' president was against it but gave no reasons. The patron also refused to support such legislation because "teachers are not second class citizens."

Binding arbitration as a final grievance step was supported by the superintendent who said, "If you have a good contract, this works well." The board president would not support this legislation because "it is a cop out so the board will not have to make a decision." The teachers' president would support it because "it could avoid a strike." The patron supported it but "did not know why."

Binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike was not supported by the superintendent because "arbitrators look at each school as a client and are not concerned with the same things both sides are. It is cold and mindless, and people end up with something they do not want." The board president again reserved comment until he saw the specifics of the legislation. The teachers' president would support this legislation because he would "have no trouble accepting a third party decision." The patron supported binding arbitration as an
alternative to a strike but gave no reasons.

Only the community patron supported open bargaining legislation.

Summary

In this school district, the community patron was the only respondent not equally involved, knowledgeable, or aware of strike issues.

The board's negotiator was given credit for only minor influence on the strike settlement. However, no one suggested that an inside negotiator or another outside negotiator would have had a greater or better influence on the strike.

The teachers' negotiator was accused of bringing in OEA state issues. He was also credited by the teachers' president as being extremely helpful in the final settlement. No one suggested that another negotiator might have influenced the strike any differently or better.

Plans for dealing with this strike and a strike in the future were limited. Plans were made to deal with post-strike anxieties, but little else was planned for the future.

No single legislative issue received unanimous support from the respondents. But the teachers' president and community patron both voted for all the same legislative issues.

The strike in school eleven was a power struggle between management and staff. Some respondents thought it was a classic battle between OSBA and OEA, with the local issues ignored. A great deal of internal conflict was created by the decision to keep schools open, a decision which may well change in the event of a future strike.

Data included in Table 27 show a more explicit rendering and conflict comparison of the key strike issues.
### Table 27
Consistency of Responses for School Eleven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supe.</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK - Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP - Depends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ - outside help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open bargaining</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice of strike</strong></td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Made plans</strong></td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of teachers out</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police involved</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board's negotiator</strong></td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers' negot.</strong></td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>local +</td>
<td>local +</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. precon</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitudes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School number twelve is located in the northwest quadrant of the state of Ohio and is in the D enrollment grouping. The interviewees for this school were:

- Representing the superintendent — director or personnel
- Representing the board of education — board president
- Representing the teachers' association — teachers' president
- Representing the PTA — president of the PTA council

The superintendent declined to be interviewed, suggesting instead I speak with the personnel director (referred to hereafter as the administrator).

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association president, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

All respondents reported bargaining was not open to the general public in this district. The administrator reported, "I don't think much would get done if they were open." And the board president stated, "It would become a show." The teachers' president described the public as "not having the ability to understand the process. It is also not possible to compromise in front of an audience." The PTA president stressed that "give and take would be harder; there would be more people to face."

The administrator recalled a two day notice of the impending strike but could not recall what altered her to that fact. The board president, who had a one month notice of the strike, was alerted by the teachers' hostile reaction to a 7 per cent across the board raise. The teachers' president,
who reported six weeks notice, explained that the new board members' campaign promises to break the union was his alerting factor. The PTA president noted a three weeks notice with the size of the teachers' demands being the alerting factor.

The administrator and board president could not recall their initial reactions to the strike, but the teachers' president reported "a sick feeling that did not leave me until two weeks after the strike was over." The PTA president reported a feeling that "this all could have been avoided.'

The administrator had dealt with so many issues since the strike that she could not recall the key issues of the year of the strike. The board president listed money and "a test of the new board" as the key issues. The teachers' president, perceiving the key issue to be a power struggle, stated, "The teachers' union was approached with a settlement so that the board could concentrate on the AFCSME union. We did not have enough discussion before the strike to find out if there really were any differences between us." The PTA president was conscious of only salary and fringe benefit issues.

The administrator and board president related that plans for dealing with the strike were made before the strike began. The teachers and PTA also made plans before the strike, but the PTA basically wanted to "stay neutral."

The administrator could not recall the percentage of teachers that did not work during the strike, but the board, teacher, and PTA presidents reported 80, 96, and 90 per cent respectively.

The administrator reported that the only pressure tactic used was keeping the schools open with only the support of individual community members. The board president perceived that the general public supported keeping schools open, but the teachers' president cited a community march of 3,000 people in support of the teachers. The PTA president reported a committee, People Actively Supporting Schools (PASS) as very supportive
of the administration.

The administrator, who was aware of only minimal anxiety, violence, or threats during the strike, said that "tacks were placed under some car tires." But the board president reported: "slashed tires, rocks and eggs thrown, nails in tires, physical assaults, and an attempted break-in at his home. The teachers' president reported "a lot of tires and cars were damaged. Some teachers were charged with assault and battery by the administration and rent a cops. One principal poured hot coffee on a teachers' bare arm; that afternoon his car blew up." The PTA president was aware of tires being slashed, windows broken, and verbal abuse to anyone attempting to cross picket lines. "I felt outsiders initiated these kinds of things," related the PTA president.

The administrator observed that the local law enforcement authorities and the hired security force functioned adequately. The board president observed that they were "not very helpful or protective of those trying to cross picket lines." The teachers' president perceived that the police were "very fair and objective," but the PTA president observed that the local police attempted to minimize involvement because of their membership in the same AFCSME union as the striking non-certified school employees.

All respondents agreed that the board's head negotiator was an outsider and that the teachers' negotiator was the teachers' union president. It should be noted that the teachers' union president in this school system is a non-teaching, full-time paid position.

The four respondents all reported recrimination between striking and non-striking workers after the strike was over.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

The administrator described the role played by her head negotiator as "satisfactory," and the board president related
that the negotiator "did a fine job. I felt the teachers feared him." The teachers' president observed that the board's negotiator was "unhappy with his role to break the union - he used every classic tactic to do so." The PTA president reported, "I don't know anyone who could have done a better job."

The administrator did not know if the board's negotiator had any preconceived ideas or opinions of the strike; the board president reported that the negotiator definitely "did not." The teachers discerned a preconceived idea to break the union, but the PTA president reported "no preconceived notions."

Although the administrator did not know if an outsider or insider handles emotional issues better, the board president thought that an outsider's ability to leave after a settlement was an advantage in handling emotional issues. The teachers' president observed that outsiders handle emotional issues better because "insiders usually don't have the training." The PTA president stated that the outsiders are "less pressured."

None of the respondents reported a change in anyone's attitude toward the bargaining as a result of the board's negotiator.

Although the board president did not believe that the board's negotiator had any effect on the final settlement, the other respondents reported that the negotiator did keep the final settlement lower than the teachers' demands.

The administrator perceived that her negotiator shortened the strike; the board president reported that the negotiator had no effect on the strike; and the teachers' president observed that the board's negotiator lengthened the strike by trying "to break the union and refusing to bargain." The PTA president discerned that a breakdown in communications between the negotiators lengthened the strike.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator, (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?
In this district, the teachers' union president acted as head negotiator, a full time position.

The administrator thought that the teachers' negotiator was "doing what he felt he had to do." The board president believed that the role of the negotiator was "very important," and the teachers' president believed that he himself had done a "good job." The PTA president stated that the negotiator was "excellent. He got everything that was possible to get."

The administrator "did not know" if the teachers' negotiator had any preconceived goals or ideas, but the board, teacher, and PTA presidents all reported that "he did not."

The teacher, PTA, and administrative representatives agreed that the teachers' negotiator increased the size of the final settlement; however, the board president disagreed.

Only the administrator perceived that the teachers' negotiator shortened the strike. The board and teachers' presidents observed no influence, and the PTA president observed that a breakdown in communication between the negotiators lengthened the strike.

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled and would these issues be handled the same way in the future?

Planning for the strike by the administration and board was limited to plans to keep the schools open and a security plan to protect property. Although the administrator was pleased with the planning, the board president would have liked to have had a better public relations plan. According to the teachers' president, the teachers' plans consisted of "gathering all the propaganda the Ohio School Boards Association puts out and then doing the opposite." The PTA planned meetings to attempt to keep both sides negotiating.

None of the respondents reported a viable plan for dealing with strike related anxieties, threats, or violence.

The administrator reported that substitutes were harassed and their cars were damaged, but she had made no plans for
dealing with these problems now or in the future. The board president suggested that next time schools should be closed, thus eliminating the need for substitute teachers. The teachers' president reported that the substitutes were provided with transportation and were paid a salary three times the usual rate. "We harassed them every time we could find them. They tried to hide their cars, but we found them," admitted the teachers' president. The PTA president stated that "very few, if any, substitutes were used."

Although the administrator perceived that media coverage was "not prejudiced," the board president observed that the media coverage was pro-teacher "because of the board's terrible public relations campaign." The teachers' president reported the media to be "reasonable, factual, and fair," and the PTA president stated that "they favored neither side."

The administrator did not know if the key issues causing the strike were the same as those that settled the strike. The board president observed no change in the issues, whereas the teachers' president discerned the final issue became "finding a way for the board to give us what they should have without losing too much credibility with the public." The PTA president reported that "getting the two sides to talk together" was the most important issue in settling the strike.

Special steps taken by each group to reach a final settlement varied. The administrator did not know of anything "special" they did to reach a final settlement. The board president found that the administration had accidently given them the wrong financial figures; as a result, an accountant and a special panel of mediators and local businessmen were contacted to help straighten out the financial problems and negotiate a two year package. The teachers' president cited the mediator and the time the two teams spent locked in a hotel for around the clock negotiations as the external steps taken to reach a settlement. However, the
teachers' president also related that "much of the real negotiating was being done on the outside while the teams were locked in the hotel." The teachers' president also added, "We had a room adjacent to the board's room. The board's negotiators all talked and argued in very loud voices. We heard and knew every strategy and trick they were planning before they came to the table." The PTA president described attempts to sit in the schools "with children in a protective role, but not as subs," and "the press conferences and letters . . . [written] to keep communications open" as their contribution to the strike settlement.

The administration reported that some parents voluntarily came into the schools to help with discipline during the strike; however, the administration did not openly solicit public help and was not really sure why they had decided not to seek public assistance. The board president, who noted little community involvement, stated, "I expected to receive more complaints than we did." The board president, who did not observe any attempt on the part of the administration or board to involve the public, said, "We really had a bad public relations effort." The teachers president related that they did involve the public by providing informational meetings and press conferences. "Many parents picketed for teachers and for a settlement," reported the teachers' president. The PTA president reported many small area meetings were held across the city to help "keep people calm and still apply pressure at the right time. We met in mass daily at the hotel where negotiations were held so that each time a negotiator stepped out in the hall we were standing there demonstrating community concern for a quick settlement."

All respondents reported that the Ferguson Act was threatened but never used. The administrator did not know or remember the rationale for not using the Ferguson Act, but the board perceived the Act as "unworkable." Although the teachers' president did not know why the board did not invoke
the Ferguson Act, the PTA president was pleased that the Act was not used because "it would have only aggravated the situation."

There was considerable disagreement among the respondents concerning injunctions. The administrator recalled a back to work injunction which was received but was not effective because it was ignored by the teachers. The board president, however, recalled that only a picket limitation was sought and received, but was ineffective because the judge allowed too many picketers at each sight. The teacher and PTA presidents reported that a picket limitation injunction was requested and never received.

The administrator and board president were not aware of any political influence in this strike; however, the teachers' president reported "pressure to resolve" from outside political influences. And the PTA president reported political figures to be "influential in keeping schools open."

Post-strike recrimination toward non-striking teachers was observed by the administrator, who said, "Only time heals these kinds of wounds." The board president recalled "a horrible year with lots of recrimination. I was just thankful it was close to the end of the year, ... the summer helped to heal the wounds." The board president, when pressed for a possible solution or way to avoid post-strike recrimination, replied, "Nothing can be done." The teachers' president noted "Very strong recrimination against scabs, some of whom are not speaking yet today. Strikers are penalizing non-strikers any way they can be while on the job. Nothing but time will resolve these kinds of problems. These things are not encouraged by the union; they are just human nature. We have told our people that when scabs join the union it is an admission of wrong doing during the strike, and all hard feelings should be ignored. I can not afford, politically, to get up and ask members not to harass people who tried to take food off their table by crossing picket lines."
PTA president was not directly aware of recrimination but had heard many rumors concerning the problem. His only suggestion to avoid post-strike recrimination was "to continually work toward settling the issues through negotiations."

If a future strike occurs, the administrator discerned a need to be prepared earlier and the board president perceived a need for a better public relations program. But the teacher and PTA presidents would do nothing differently.

In order to avoid a future strike, the administrator suggested earlier preparation, and the board president noted a need for "better P.R." The teachers' president perceived a need for "better school management and better school board members" and a "need to build stronger relationships with other power blocs in the community." The PTA president stressed a need for "supporting the administration and becoming more involved in the school processes."

The administrator "did not know" if the strike was "worth it"; however, the board president did not perceive "any strike being worth it." The teachers' president said, "We were put upon for a long time past our contract deadline; whatever price we had to pay to avoid this abuse was worth it." The PTA president stated that the strike was not worth the "damage to children and the tense atmosphere still present."

V. Of the four groups interviewed, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

The administrator "did not know" if she would support legislation supporting mandated bargaining with teachers. However, the board president, who was very much in favor of mandated bargaining, stated, "We need guidelines." The teachers' president reported, "It is a disgrace not to have some type of law. Those who are most sophisticated tend to triumph over those who are not. We don't have leadership in the legislature or governor's office that realize this." The PTA president
supported mandated bargaining with teachers but gave no reasons for his support.

When considering the teachers' right to strike, the administrator "did not know" if she would support such legislation; however, the board president, who was against limiting teachers' rights to strike, questioned, "What can you do if they do strike?" The teachers' president was also against this type of legislation because "no kind of employee can bargain if he does not have the right to withhold his services." The PTA president reported that he would support new legislation limiting teachers' rights to strike but gave no reasons.

Mandated binding arbitration as a final grievance step would receive support from the administrator. She perceived a need to "have some place where it will cease." The board president was against this issue and stated, "We can not give away financial decisions." "Binding arbitration works well" was the teachers' reason for supporting this issue, but the PTA president, who was against the issue, gave no reasons for his decision.

The board and PTA presidents were against binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike. The board president reported, "We can not give up decision making power," but the PTA president gave no reasons for his opinions. Both the administrator and teachers' president favored binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike; the administrator could state no reason for her support, but the teacher ascertained that "it works."

All four respondents reported that they would not support mandated open bargaining. The administrator believed little progress could be made if negotiations were open, and the board president mentioned a "show like performance for the audience" if the public was involved. The teachers' president cited the public's "inability to understand the process" as enough reason to keep bargaining closed. The PTA president
perceived that the "give and take would be harder to handle in open bargaining."

Summary

In this particular school district, the administrator was less involved, less knowledgeable, and less aware of strike issues than the other respondents. Despite the central office personnel's insistence that this administrator was the one to talk with, she knew little about what had happened.

Little influence by the board's outside negotiator was preconceived by the respondents. Three of the four respondents did report that the board's negotiator prevented the teachers from getting everything they were demanding, but the respondents could not or did not agree on any other influencing factors. No one reported that a different negotiator would have handled the situation any better than the board's negotiator, and all respondents perceived that the administration and board controlled all of the negotiator's actions.

Three of the four respondents reported the teachers' negotiator, an insider, had increased the amount of the final settlement. Although there was a disagreement among the respondents regarding who shortened or lengthened the strike, no one perceived a different negotiator would have handled the strike any better. The votes of confidence from all the respondents may indicate that, in this case, a different negotiator, an outsider, would not have done as well.

Planning for the strike and dealing with the special issues that arise during the strike were all well planned for by the teachers. Since the PTA tried to maintain a neutral position, they were limited in the numbers of things they could do. The administration and school board were poorly prepared, were ineffective in communication, and were unable to make any offensive moves to settle the strike. No one reported a way of dealing with or avoiding post-strike recrimination.
From a legislative point of view, the respondents only agreed on voting against open bargaining. The board and PTA presidents were against arbitration issues, while the administration and teachers' president favored these issues. The only other pattern that developed in voting was that the board and PTA presidents voted the same on four of the five legislative issues.

School twelve is a large city school district that struck over a contract that had long ago expired. All respondents, except the administrator, expressed an opinion that communication was lacking between the parties and between the administration and the public throughout the state.

The data contained in Table 28 show a more explicit rendering and conflict comparison of several of the key issues.
TABLE 28
Consistency of Responses for School Twelve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>DK - Don't Know</th>
<th>DP - Depends</th>
<th>+ - plus outside help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of teachers out</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>DK outside</td>
<td>DK outsider</td>
<td>DK outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>local +</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>local+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>DK no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>DK yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>DK no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>DK no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>DK yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitud.</td>
<td>DK no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>DK yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>DK no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>DK no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter VI
Supplemental Findings

A research project which utilizes the case study approach and open ended research questions like those found in the interview guide for this dissertation prompts more answers than those which were originally sought. In this section of the dissertation, supplemental information which was collected will be presented.

Did the strike contribute to the superintendent's leaving his position?

In eight of the twelve schools contacted, the person serving as superintendent during the strike was no longer employed or was leaving at the end of this year. When explaining his reasoning for leaving, the superintendent from school number one said, "I did not want to be around those people anymore. When you work with people, you have to have trust - I no longer trusted them." The board president, who had also ascertained that the superintendent left the school system because of the strike, said, "Both the high school principal and superintendent left because of lack of respect for the community. They both financially improved themselves." The superintendent felt it was not fair to submit his family to "continued harassment; the community in effect forced him out." The teachers' president, also perceiving that the superintendent was leaving as a result of the strike, said, "He realized the bad feelings between teachers and himself." In this school, the fourth respondent, the band boosters' president, commented, "Yes, the superintendent left because of the strike."

The superintendent of school number two cited "the strike and other things connected with that office contributed to his
leaving." The board president of school two "did not" think the superintendent left because of the strike, but because of the "hours he spent away from his family." The teachers' president did not comment on the superintendent's leaving, whereas the PTA president expressed an opinion that the superintendent did leave because of the strike.

The superintendent of school three resigned the day before his interview with this researcher. As the superintendent related, "They non-renewed the high school principal's contract. This was a newly elected board which had been supported by the teachers after the strike. The teachers pushed the board for the principal's resignation, so I resigned too." The board and teachers' presidents had been interviewed before the resignation was announced, so they had no comments. The community patron that was interviewed did know about the resignation and commented that "it was the best thing that ever happened to the district."

The superintendent of school six was unavailable for interview so the curriculum director, who was a member of the board's negotiating team, was interviewed. He had no comments about the superintendent's resignation. The board president thought the superintendent's resignation was connected with the strike, but basically "he left because of weaknesses exposed during the strike; he was not rehired." The teachers' president agreed that the superintendent left because of the strike but declined to comment why. The community patron, who also agreed that the superintendent left because of the strike, said, "The strike was a personal vendetta against the superintendent."

The superintendent of school seven retired after the strike but insisted he had planned to retire anyway. He said, "I was glad I had this experience before I left education." The board president said, "The strike may have had an influence on the superintendent's retirement, but I doubt it." The
teacher also expressed an opinion that "the strike may have had a bearing on the superintendent's leaving." The community patron made no comment on the issue.

The superintendent of school nine related that the strike did "not force him out" but gave him "an excuse" to get out. The board president responded that the superintendent's resignation was "only partly because of the strike, but mostly because of other management problems." The teachers' president definitely perceived that the superintendent's resignation was directly related to the strike. The PTA president also discerned that the superintendent resigned because of the strike and "conflict between the teachers and himself."

The superintendent in school twelve was not available for an interview and provided a designee. The designee had no opinions about the reasons for the superintendent's departure. However, the board president stated that the superintendent's leaving was a direct result of the strike, and the teachers' president and PTA president both agreed that the superintendent left because of the strike but had no comment.

During the month of August of 1980, this researcher learned that the superintendent of school number four has resigned. No follow up interview with the respondents of this school is planned for the purpose of finding out why the superintendent left.

Things to expect during a strike: A superintendent's viewpoint

Several tactics used by teachers' associations were listed by the superintendents. The following list and comments are a summary of those tactics as perceived by the superintendents.

1. The only reason for the strike was that OEA membership was low in this area; any school with half of an excuse would be used as an example of OEA power.

2. Two days into the strike a well-meaning community member or group will provide a public meeting to allow
both sides to present their side to the public. This
is taken over by the OEA with people brought in act-
ing as community residents used to intimidate, shout,
harass, and embarass the board and administration.
It becomes a "roast."

3. The longer the strike goes, the more sympathy the
teachers receive.

4. Back to work injunctions are used by teachers as
sympathy getters, a rallying point, and a show of
martydom.

5. Each board members' background will be thoroughly
researched by OEA.

6. Board members will be charged with fictitious crimes.

7. Rumors will be started about board members and their
jobs away from school.

8. Board members' "girlfriends" names will be released.

9. Law enforcement agencies will be pressured to favor
teachers, since both are labor. The police and mayor
may promise to support the administration until OEA
reminds them that parents and teachers have more votes
on election day than the board members and the super-
tendent.

10. OEA may bring hecklers into front rows of board meet-
ings. These hecklers will try to provoke board memb-
ers into an angry response that will make the board
or administration member look bad in front of the
press or audience. These same hecklers may try to
block a board member's exit from a meeting, when the
board member tries to step around the heckler or move
him to the side, the heckler may fall to the ground
and claim assault.

11. OEA will dispute every financial figure the adminis-
tration quotes.

12. Teachers, expecially elementary teachers, will call
students at home and tell them school is closed.

13. Teachers will tell students work done for substitute
teachers will not be counted when the strike is over.

14. Students will be threatened with course failure if
they cross picket lines.
15. Students and parents will be sworn at when crossing picket lines.

16. School equipment will disappear during the strike.

17. Keys to rooms, file drawers, and desks will be taken and/or locks will be jammed.

18. Board members and administrators will be intimidated so that they will say or do something that will look bad.

19. The OEA will keep the board and administrators constantly on the defensive.

20. Someone on the picket line will fake being hit by a car.

**Things to expect during a strike: a board president's viewpoint**

1. Blame for the strike may be laid completely on one board member.

2. OEA Uniserve will scream and pound on the table during bargaining sessions.

3. Once a strike begins, a bubble is dropped over the whole community. No logic, former characteristics, or friendships exist. It will be an entirely different world until the strike is over; expect anything.

4. The Uniserve person will take as many strike votes as necessary to obtain a yes vote.

5. If a board member belongs to a labor union at work, OEA will contact his union to pressure him.

6. The teachers' leadership does not always pass information back to their rank and file.

7. The teachers' leadership does not always represent the rank and file.

8. The teachers may agree to something away from the table and later deny all prior knowledge when they actually get to the table.

9. OEA will send in a strike force to teach intimidation tactics on the picket lines and handle the violent parts of the strike.
10. OEA will threaten the board with comments like "we will bring in the heavy weight strike breakers."

Things to expect during a strike: a teachers' viewpoint

1. The administration will publicize a settlement and give teachers a day and time to return to work when there has been no settlement.

2. Every day that schools are open the board is saving money. The raise in pay that teachers may receive may have come from the salary which they lost while on strike.

3. The board may hire a photographer to take pictures of picketers.

4. The administration may tell different stories at each building to create confusion.

5. The administration may tactfully keep board members from meeting together to avoid decision making.

6. OSBA is constantly bombarding school board members with lies about teachers.

7. Administrators will lie about how much money is available.

8. The administration will install new and private phone lines during the strike.

9. Teachers may be given a good settlement so the board can concentrate on breaking the non-certified union.

10. Teachers may be taken to court every day.

Things to expect during a strike: a PTA and community members' viewpoint

Tactics listed and experienced by the PTA and community members were repeats of the kinds of things mentioned by the other three types of respondents.

Teachers not working during the strike

Several superintendents and board presidents when asked question number 10 on the Interview Schedule, "What percentage of teachers participated in the Strike?" replied, "Do you want
to know how many did not come to work, or how many were actively involved in the strike?" The superintendents indicated that as many as 95 per cent of the teachers did not show up for work, but only 20 per cent of the staff were actively involved in the strike activities. The attitudes, problems, and decisions of these two groups of teachers, (active and non-active strikers) may hold some of the answers of how individual teachers actually perceive strikes. Percentage figures quoted throughout this dissertation reflect the total number of teachers not working rather than those actively participating in the strike.

**Strike experience**

Thirty four of the respondents reported that this was the first experience that they had ever had with a strike. Fourteen respondents had previously experienced one or more strikes. The breakdown by respondent was as follows:

- 10 superintendents with no experience
- 2 superintendents with experience
- 6 board presidents with no experience
- 6 board presidents with experience
- 8 teachers' representatives with no experience
- 4 teachers' representatives with experience
- 4 PTA presidents with no experience
- 0 PTA presidents with experience
- 6 community members with no experience
- 2 community members with experience

Who benefited from the strike?

All respondents were asked to decide who, if anyone, benefited from the strike. The responses were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>8 no one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 board of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 the district as a whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be pointed out that no one listed students benefiting from a strike and less than 30 per cent listed the teachers as benefiting from the strike.

Who lost as a result of the strike?

All respondents made comments as to who, if anyone, lost the most from the strike. The responses were as follows.

board presidents: 7 no one
2 everyone
1 teachers
1 board of education
1 no comment

teachers: 7 teachers
1 no one
1 everyone
1 attorneys
1 teachers and community
1 scabs

PTA presidents: 2 no one
2 teachers

community members: 4 no one
2 attorneys
1 community
1 teachers

totals: 22 no one
13 teachers
3 everyone
3 attorneys
2 board of education
1 district
1 community
1 teachers and community
1 scabs
1 no comment
It should be noted that only 50 per cent of the total responses perceived that students lost as a result of the strike.

How would you rate post-strike atmosphere?

Each respondent commented about the atmosphere in their district after the strike. Responses were as follows.

superintendent: 2 scars will never heal
  2 now have good relationship with staff
  2 not bitter
  2 pockets of bitterness still exist
  1 almost back to normal
  1 bitter
  1 better
  1 settled down

board presidents: 3 bitterness not lingering
  2 never really bad
Has the post-strike atmosphere changed?

After the respondents rated the post-strike atmosphere, they were asked to determine any changes in the atmosphere between immediately after the strike and now. Responses were as follows.

**superintendents:**
- 10 improving
- 1 calm
- 1 no change

**board presidents:**
- 10 improving
- 1 no change
- 1 no comment

**teachers:**
- 10 improving
- 2 never really bad

**PTA presidents:**
- 3 improving
- 1 never be the same
community members:
5 improving
1 no changes
1 less vocal, more covert
1 teachers loosing respect

Words of wisdom
When all of the prepared questions were completed, each respondent was given the opportunity to make any general comments concerning their strike that they believed should be passed along to anyone who may become involved in a strike. The responses were as follows.

superintendents:
1. It is a tragedy.
2. You must accept strikes as a way of life today.
3. No matter what your climate, you can have a strike; never say your teachers will not strike.
4. Attend as many seminars on collective bargaining as you can.
5. Realize there are a lot of people around you who can help.
6. Read as many negotiated agreements as you can.
7. Read every agreement in your county before you go into the bargaining sessions.
8. Get definite directions from your board; how far is the team permitted to go; keep board informed at all times.
9. Amateurs will get burned.
10. Be aware of what's going on throughout the state.
11. Administrators need more collective bargaining courses at the university level.
12. Meet with your line administrators daily.
13. Be prepared for OEA to dispute every financial figure you quote.
14. Plan, plan, and plan; figure out who is most crucial. Get with the staff and board everyday. Reaffirm direction daily. Do not forget you are negotiating, not striking. Recognize things are going to happen that you can not control; take them as they come.

board presidents
1. Be reasonable, calm, understanding, and empathic. OEA was looking for us to blow our cool and then take advantage of it.
2. Work hard for no more than six weeks. Do not drag it out. Have meetings with teachers and OEA to show financial picture.
3. Before the strike, be sure of your plans. If you are going to change your mind, do it before the strike.
4. It is never fun; it is going to be tough. All sorts of unpleasant things will happen.
5. Be firm in your beliefs; be sure of what you are striking for.
6. Prepare for bad language from OEA and their goons: they will try to scare you. Leave your kids at home.
7. Keep teams talking. Keep teachers informed before the strike vote is taken.
8. Avoid personality tests of power.

**teacher representatives**

1. If both sides want the best, we should let outside people with expertise do it for us.
2. No one really wins.
3. The ideal can not be reached unless there is personal involvement.
4. Strikes are not made by issues, but by people.
5. Only the last five years have I felt people in my profession can hold their heads up with a sense of accomplishment, pride, and collective achievement.
6. I feel the day of the teacher strike is past because boards have learned to use it to their own advantage.
7. People do not teach to make money, but they do expect to be treated fairly.
8. Avoid a strike if you can.
9. Plan and organize everything you do; make sure all information is factual and truthful.
10. If you vote to strike, you are right because teachers put it off until it is obvious.
11. You must have absolutely no self doubts and know that you are better than the other side.

**PTA presidents**

1. Speak for children and their welfare, support keeping schools open, communicate, investigate, and look out for the children.

**community members**

1. I am usually against strikes. I rarely see the value in them, but in this case, it was the only way.
2. Expect horror. It is like having a child; you can read and talk about it for years. but you really don't know how you will be effected emotionally until it happens to you.
3. Support your administration; do almost anything to keep schools open.
4. The community should be well informed and be careful which side they take.
5. Be sure to get as much for kids as possible.
6. In the last three years, board of education members have become much more prepared.
7. Administrators should remember that if teachers did not need unions they would not have them.
CHAPTER VII
Summary, Conclusions, and Implications

With an ever increasing need for relevant information to facilitate decision making in collective bargaining, an in-depth case study was conducted to supplement the vast amount of hortative literature that has been written. The literature that pertains to strikes specifically is limited to describing one aspect of a strike situation, i.e., planning or communicating. Similarly other in-depth studies have been limited to one or two specific school systems and the unique experiences they had. In this dissertation, an attempt was made to contribute to this body of collective bargaining literature by presenting the perceptions and roles of those individuals involved in one phase of the collective bargaining process - the strike.

The problem investigated in this dissertation was how the specific collective bargaining experiences of individuals within twelve randomly selected schools, under strike conditions, compare with the experiences of others reported in more broad based general studies. More specifically, how do the perceptions, attitudes, and roles of the board of education president, PTA president, superintendent, and teachers' association representative compare before, during, and after a strike with the findings of other studies?

Twelve Ohio school districts that have experienced a teachers' strike during the 1977-78 or 1978-79 school year were randomly selected. For the purposes of this study, the 36 school districts (JVS and TMR districts not included) which experienced strikes were placed in ascending order by enrollment or average daily membership (ADM). This ascending order list was divided
into four equal groups of nine districts each.

For a geographic comparison, the eighty-eight counties in the state of Ohio were divided into geographic quadrants of twenty-two counties each.

The districts selected represented one-third of the total striking districts. Three districts were randomly selected from each group. Since twenty of the thirty-six striking districts are found in the northeast quadrant, one northeastern district was selected from each enrollment group.

With each district selected, the superintendent, board president, teacher representative, and PTA president (or their designee) in those positions at the time of the strike were interviewed. A brief questionnaire was also sent to each superintendent prior to the interview.

Comparison with the Ohio School Boards Study

Data contained in Table 29 provides a comparison of the data found by the 1977 Ohio School Boards survey and the results of this study. The OSBA study included all K-12 schools (with or without a strike), while this study explored only those schools which had experienced strikes.

The OSBA data differs from this study's results in several major areas.

Who negotiates for the board of education?

The OSBA study reported a noticeable shift to the use of outside negotiators by Ohio school boards. During the 1974-75 school year, OSBA reported 8.6 per cent of the school districts employed an outside negotiator. But during the 1976-77 school year, the outside negotiators were used by 19.4 per cent of the districts — double the number from two years before.

The OSBA study closed the topic by stating that "It would appear that this trend towards employing outside negotiators would continue as the negotiations process becomes more time
TABLE 29

OSBA Study compared to This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>OSBA</th>
<th>This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who negotiates for the board of education?</td>
<td>Principal  .8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.  53.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Adm. 14.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board 12.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outsiders 19.4%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of third party intervention is used most frequently?</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the estimated number of hours spent by the superintendent on the negotiations process?</td>
<td>93 hours</td>
<td>398.1 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the estimated number of hours spent by the board of education on the negotiations process?</td>
<td>82 hours</td>
<td>165.4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the estimated number of hours spent by other administrators on the negotiations process?</td>
<td>114 hours</td>
<td>477.1 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the estimated number of hours spent by clerical personnel on the negotiations process?</td>
<td>50 hours</td>
<td>130.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the final step of the grievance policy?</td>
<td>Supt. .3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board 57.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adv. Arb. 24.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bind. Arb. 18.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

consuming and complex within each district." This study would appear to support this OSBA speculation. The schools surveyed in this study revealed that 58.4 per cent of them were in fact in a very complicated part of the negotiations process, a strike, and did in fact use outside negotiators much more frequently.

Some of the respondents in this study reported that outside negotiators were used because they were more rational and less emotional during a strike than those who were directly affected by the strike. Others reported a need to use the outsider as a scapegoat to direct hostilities and other anxieties toward, while others reported a need for greater expertise during the complicated negotiating encountered during a strike. These perceptions also explain why this investigation found considerably less superintendents in the role of chief negotiator than the OSBA study did.

**What type of third party intervention is used most frequently?**

Both studies agreed that mediation is most frequently used as a first type of third party intervention. The respondents in this study listed no special reasons for using mediation other than it was the most effective means now available and the most frequently found impasse resolution in most existing contracts.

**What is the estimated number of hours spent on the negotiations process?**

Collective bargaining is a time consuming process. When considering all type of schools, the OSBA found an average of 339 hours of board and staff time devoted to the preparation and conduct of negotiations. While this study found the average Ohio school district spent 1,171.1 hours dealing with the preparation and conduct of negotiations under strike conditions.

Striking schools reported several reasons for the excess time spent on negotiations and strike settlement. Districts
experiencing strikes usually spend time preparing for and arguing in court for various injunctions, restraining orders and contempt charges. Eight of the twelve superintendents and nine of the board of education presidents interviewed in this study reported that they sought some type of injunction against the teachers. Respondents also perceived the negotiations process was lengthened by outside negotiators wishing to extend their fees and reputations. One citizen stated, "The board's attorney stayed until he got all the money he could." Other respondents reported an unwillingness to settle on both sides because of a fear of losing face with the groups they were representing. Boards of education who had claimed they would never give in at the beginning of the strike had trouble justifying any movement from their original offers, thus making compromises next to impossible. Teachers responding to this study accused the administration of refusing to negotiate until they had saved enough money on teacher salaries not paid during the strike to bail the district out of financial problems. Some respondents reported greater time spent on negotiations because of community and media pressures on one or both sides.

What is the final step of the grievance policy?

The OSBA study reported a heavy reliance by Ohio districts on the board of education (57.7 per cent) as the final grievance step. This study, however, found binding arbitration (54.5 per cent) as the most frequently used final grievance step. Administrators responding to this study reported that binding arbitration was the statewide goal of OEA and a sign of success for Uniserve representatives. Board of education presidents cited binding arbitration as better than a strike, while community members reported a third party decision as sometimes the only logical and unemotional alternative. However, despite the fact that over half of the schools in this
study reported having binding arbitration as a final grievance step, only two of the school board presidents expressed a willingness to support legislation mandating it.

Comparison with the Slaven Study

Data contained in Table 30 compares the data found by Slaven in 1978 with the data by this study to the same basic questions. Slaven collected questionnaire data from four of the same categories of school representatives that were interviewed in this study. (Superintendents, school board presidents, teacher association presidents, and PTA presidents)

Should negotiations be open to the public?

Both this study and the Slaven studies report a majority of the superintendents, teachers, and board of education presidents against open bargaining sessions. A majority of the PTA presidents in the Slaven study were for open bargaining, while only 50 per cent expressed a willingness to support open bargaining legislation in this study.

Respondents to this study cited several reasons for their position on the matter. (Thirty-eight of the forty-eight respondents were against open bargaining.) Most frequently mentioned by the responding superintendents was a concern that both parties at the negotiations table would play to the audience rather than deal directly with the participating parties. This lack of direct and sincere communication was perceived to prolong the process, alienate community members, and result in a less satisfactory settlement. Responding board of education presidents added a concern that only teachers and pro-teacher groups would attend open bargaining sessions. Teacher association representatives expressed concern for the lack of expertise or understanding of the negotiation process by the layman which might result in misunderstanding of the goals of both sides. The PTA presidents opposing open bargaining also reported a concern that both teachers and administrators would
**TABLE 30**

Comparison of the Slaven Study and This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Slaven Study</th>
<th>This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should negotiations be open to the public?</td>
<td>Teachers no</td>
<td>Teachers 83% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt. no</td>
<td>Supt. 92% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board no</td>
<td>Board 75% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA yes</td>
<td>PTA 50% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-PTA 75% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who supports community involvement in the negotiations process?</td>
<td>Teachers against</td>
<td>Teachers 100% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt. against</td>
<td>Supt. 100% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board against</td>
<td>Board 92% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA for</td>
<td>PTA 50% for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-PTA 75% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the answers to the first two questions differ according to the district's location or ADM?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who supports legislation mandating community involvement in negotiations?</td>
<td>Teachers against</td>
<td>Teachers 83% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt. for</td>
<td>Supt. 92% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board for</td>
<td>Board 75% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA for</td>
<td>PTA 50% for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-PTA 75% against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who supports legislation outlawing teachers the right to strike?</td>
<td>Teachers against</td>
<td>Teachers against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt. for</td>
<td>Supt. for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board for</td>
<td>Board for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA for</td>
<td>PTA for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-PTA for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who supports legislation mandating negotiations with teachers?</td>
<td>Teachers for</td>
<td>Teachers for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt. against</td>
<td>Supt. for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board against</td>
<td>Board for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA for</td>
<td>PTA for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-PTA against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resort to "show-boating."

This study also interviewed a group of community leaders that was not included in Slaven's questionnaire. Seventy-five per cent of these community leaders were against open bargaining. Their frequent concern was the impossible task of allowing everyone to be allowed input to the process. The time element of hearing from large groups of spectators, the lack of time most layman have to attend every negotiation sessions, and the emotional outbursts from the audience prompted most community leaders to support closed bargaining sessions. Many of these leaders expressed faith in their board members as the public representatives.

Who supports community involvement in the negotiation process?

Both studies reported that none of the responding categories supported community participation as a part of either team at the table or as observers at the table. The respondents involved in this study saw no difference between the questions 1. Should negotiations be open to the public; and 2. Who supports community involvement in the negotiations process? The answers they gave to both questions, therefore, were the same.

Do the answers to the first two questions differ according to the districts location or ADM?

Although the two studies did not use the same method to determine geographic location, neither found the location or ADM to be a factor. This study did find a higher rate of strikes in the northeastern quadrant of the state.

Who supports legislation mandating community involvement in negotiations?

Again, both studies found the superintendents, board of education presidents, and teachers against community involvement by any means, be it legislative or voluntary. The Slaven study did find a majority of PTA presidents for mandated
involvement by the community while the PTA presidents in this study were evenly split on the issue. Community leaders not associated with the PTA responded 75 per cent against community involvement in this study.

The respondents to this study found it hard to see a major difference between direct or indirect participation of the community in the negotiation process and voluntary or mandated involvement. As a result, they consistently responded the same to all these questions concerning public participation in negotiations.

Who supports legislation outlawing teachers' right to strike?

The Slaven study reported the superintendent, board of education presidents, and PTA presidents favored outlawing teacher strikes, while the teachers opposed such legislation. This study found teachers and board presidents against outlawing strikes, with the other respondents either for this type of legislation or undecided.

Respondents to this study were less than decisive on this question. Sixteen respondents voted for outlawing strikes, while twenty-one were against it and eleven were undecided. Four of the undecided votes came from teachers' representatives.

Superintendents who favored outlawing strikes cited a strike as harmful to children, with the board having no recourse without a law. Superintendents against outlawing teachers' strikes believed that no strike law is enforceable; teachers need to have a right to strike to achieve an equal footing with the board of education, and that a strike is a part of the negotiation process.

Board presidents for outlawing strikes perceived strikes as hurting children and being a contractual violation on the part of the teachers. Board presidents against outlawing strikes were aware of a need for teachers to have rights to protect themselves against unfair school boards.

Eight of the twelve teachers' representatives would not support new legislation prohibiting teacher strikes. Several
of these respondents expressed a dislike for strikes and a desire to avoid them when possible. However, a need for the right to strike was perceived to maintain a position of power.

PTA presidents believed teachers should not have the right to strike because: they have a contractual obligation, striking hurts kids, and people in a service function such as teaching should not strike. Non-PTA community leaders reported teachers are not second class citizens and should have the right to strike.

Who supports legislation mandating negotiations with teachers?

The Slaven study reported teachers and PTA presidents in favor of mandating bargaining and the superintendents and board presidents against it. This study found the non-PTA leaders opposed to mandated bargaining and all other respondents for it. The superintendents felt that mandated bargaining would provide much needed guidelines and possibilities of state or regionalized bargaining. Teachers and board presidents echoed this need for guidelines as a means of uncomplicating the current procedure. Those expressing disapproval in this type of legislation believed they would be losing local control with a new law.

This study uncovered information regarding PTA leaders that the Slaven study did not survey but is important to report. Several school district superintendents responding to this study strongly suggested that PTA presidents not be contacted or interviewed. These superintendents perceived the PTA leaders'knowledge of the strike was so limited that many, if not all, of the interview questions could not be answered. Two of the PTA presidents interviewed emphasized that they were representing themselves during the strike and were not representing the PTA. Two of the PTA presidents expressed fear of reprisals against their children by teachers.
because of their involvement in the strike. The input the PTA leaders wished to have into the negotiations process expressed in the Slaven study was not present in this study.

Several superintendents, board presidents, and community members believed that OEA was against the PTA as an organization. Many respondents credited OEA with the fact that they had no PTA, an inactive PTA, or a PTO instead of a PTA.

The Slaven study implies that the PTAs of Ohio desire a greater participation or input to the bargaining process. The study undertaken by this author indicated that when a strike situation occurs the media, parents, non-parent community members, and ad hoc committees become involved in the process either by invitation of the board or teachers, or by their own demands. The PTAs, however, when given this opportunity to add input to anyone of these groups, refuses to take any position. This study revealed that of the 48 people interviewed, only 4 believed that the PTA played any part during the strike; two of those 4 said the PTA took only a neutral position on the strike. It could be implied then that when bargaining becomes a strike situation the PTA is uninvolved in the bargaining process.

Comparison with the American Association of School Personnel Administrators (AASPA) Study

A comparison of the data from this study and a similar national study might also be helpful in understanding the negotiations of various school systems. The AASPA conducted a national study in March of 1978. Selected members of this association, the National Association of Educational Negotiators (NAEN) and members of various teachers' associations were surveyed. A comparison of the AASPA results and the data from this study is shown in Table 31.

The AASPA data were collected from schools regardless of the presence of a strike, while this study data come from
only those schools experiencing strikes. The AASPA study, like the OSBA study, shows a lower percentage of schools using outside negotiators than this study found. However, when considering the issues of open bargaining, third party intervention, and final grievance settlement, the findings in this study are within a very few percentage points of the AASPA study.

When the legislative issue of mandating collective bargaining is considered, the combined administrators respond to the AASPA study show 24 per cent in favor of such legislation, while this study found 42 per cent of the responding administrators favored bargaining legislation. When comparing the responding teachers, AASPA shows 86 per cent in favor compared to 75 per cent in favor in this study. It should be added, however, that 33 per cent of the administrators and 25 per cent of the teachers responding to this issue in this study wished to reserve a decision until specific legislation regarding mandated bargaining could be studied by them.

The comparison between AASPA and this study would imply that the schools interviewed for this agree with national studies when considering open bargaining, third party intervention, and final grievance settlement.
## TABLE 31
Comparison of AASPA Study and This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>AASPA Study</th>
<th>This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who negotiates for the board of education?</td>
<td>AASPA 35% outside</td>
<td>58.4% outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach. 36% outside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEN 42% outside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are negotiations open to the public?</td>
<td>16% yes</td>
<td>100% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79% no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% no response</td>
<td>5% no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should negotiations be open to the public?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type third party impasse resolution is</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most frequently used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the final grievance step?</td>
<td>Board 22%</td>
<td>Board 18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adv. Arb. 21%</td>
<td>Adv. Arb. 27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bind. Arb. 53%</td>
<td>Bind. Arb. 54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who favors legislation mandating negotiations with teachers?</td>
<td>AASPA 15% for</td>
<td>Supt. 42% for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAEN 9% for</td>
<td>Board 50% for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach 89% for</td>
<td>Teachers 75% for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adv. - Advisory  
Arb. - Arbitration  
Supt. - superintendent  
Teach. - teachers
Conclusions

Within the limitations of this study, the following conclusions are offered for the six key questions presented in the methodology.

I. Are the superintendent, teachers' association representative, school board president, and PTA president equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of strike related issues?

1. The four categories of respondents are not equally aware of, involved in, or knowledgeable of the strike related issues. Superintendents and teachers were able to answer more questions than the other two groups and were in most cases involved in every aspect of the strike.

Both superintendents and teachers not only gave more answers, but since they represented, in some way, the two primary sides in the negotiation process, they were logically involved in each step of the process before, during, and after the strike. Superintendents, as a group, seemed to be less informed about the teachers' negotiator, while the teachers, as a group, also seemed to be less informed about the board's negotiator. (See Table 32).

It was in the area of planning that teachers, as a group, exceeded the superintendents, as a group. More teacher groups appeared to have planned for, organized for, and coped with all of the problems before, during, and after the strike than the superintendents, as a group.

Of the 49 questions asked of each respondent, 29 of them can be given a frequency analysis of the types of responses made. These 1,392 responses included an answer of "Don't Know."
The "Don't Know" responses are summarized in Table 32. The data included in Table 32 shows that of the 1,392 responses, 96 were recorded as "Don't Know." Of these 96 responses, 40 were made by the PTA presidents or their designee. It is interesting to note that 31 of the "Don't Know" responses made by the PTA presidents or their designees were to questions which concerned the attitudes, preconceptions, and direct effects of the two negotiators. The answers to these types of questions might be better answered by someone who had access to the bargaining sessions. In this study, the PTA presidents and their designees did not have this access.

It may also be worth noting that several respondents in the PTA and community group expressed "fear" in talking with this investigator. Two respondents refused to be tape recorded, 2 forced me to meet in a place were a tape recorder could not be used, 1 refused to speak to me any place except in his car parked in an isolated parking lot where we would not be noticed, and 4 respondents demanded oaths of anonymity so that no retribution could be brought upon them, their children, or their places of business. It would appear that these "fears" about participating in this study, along with the limited access some respondents had to the bargaining sessions, may account for the high number of "Don't Know responses and limited knowledge and involvement in strike related issues by the PTA and community respondents.

Board presidents varied in their knowledge of the interview questions, and on occasion their responses to the questions did not agree with any of the other respondents. In one district, the board president was not aware that substitute teachers were used to keep schools open. In another district the board president did not know that the school had filed a court injunction against the teachers. Only 3 of the 12 responding board presidents agreed with his/her superintendent as to how many teachers were actually not working, and 1 board president had no idea of how many teachers worked during the strike.
TABLE 32
Summary of "Don't Know" Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>PTA</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open bargaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of strike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made plans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's negotiator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' negot.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. preconceived</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. emotional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. effect size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. length</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' precon.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' emotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' size</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' length</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated bargain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to strike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance arb.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb. alternative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open bargain leg.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson invoked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctions sought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs used</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA involved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would seem that superintendents and board presidents who would be considered in most cases to be operating on the same side of the table should communicate information to each other in a better way than they did in several situations investigated. This lack of communication may again be related to the general lack of planning by superintendents.

In two districts investigated, the board presidents literally took over control of the negotiations process while the superintendent did nothing but stand by and watch. However, in the other ten districts, board presidents allowed the superintendents to handle all aspects of the strike and limited their roles as much as possible to following the superintendent's instructions.

2. Eight of the 12 schools did not have a PTA or someone they could recommend from the PTA whom they thought would be willing or able to respond to the interview questions. Some respondents perceived this lack of knowledge by PTA leaders was a result:
   a. of the professional teachers' associations forcing the PTA out of the district,
   b. of the PTA leaders' fear of reprisals, or
   c. of an inability of PTA leadership to agree upon a position or side to support.

3. Of the groups interviewed, the teachers' representatives were the most aware, involved, and knowledgeable of the strike related issues. Teachers were able to answer more of the interview questions, knew a strike was eminent before others, made more plans before, during, and after the strike, and were more organized to deal with the issues.

II. How did the board of education's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

1. Most of the respondents (See Table 33) agreed that the board's negotiator did not bring any preconceived goals or ideas
about the strike into the bargaining sessions. Typical responses indicated that the board's negotiator followed the instructions, style, and strategies outlined by the board of education. The large "Don't Know" response from the PTA and community group (See Table 32) may be because these people were not permitted to observe the board's negotiator at the bargaining table.

2. Most respondents (11 superintendents, 7 school board presidents, 7 teachers' representatives, 1 PTA president, and 1 community leader believed an outside negotiator representing the board of education could handle the emotional issues of a strike better than an insider. Fifteen respondents reported that they "did not know" (See Table 32). Typical responses in favor of an outside negotiator mentioned the outsider's lack of personal involvement in any of the issues and his/her ability to leave the district after the strike and not be concerned about any feelings that may have been hurt during the negotiations process. Respondents perceiving an insider doing a better job of handling emotional issues related that an insider was more familiar with the local situation and therefore could handle the problems.

3. Most respondents (See Table 33) reported that the board's negotiator did not influence the attitudes of the parties involved toward the bargaining process. Typical responses suggested that the board of education was entrenched in their attitudes toward negotiations and only allowed their negotiator to advise them on the best way to achieve standards for a settlement.

4. Most of the respondents (See Table 33) reported that the board's negotiator did not influence the size or type of settlement. Typical responses suggested that the negotiator
acted only within the guidelines of the board of education; therefore, the size and type of settlement was influenced more by the board than the negotiator.

5. Most of the respondents (See Table 33) reported that the board's negotiator did not influence the length of the strike. Typical responses placed the credit for the length of the strike on the board, the teachers, or the media rather than the negotiator. Those crediting the media with influencing the length of the strike reported that the strike was lengthened as a result of media coverage.

6. In those districts where an inside negotiator was used by the teachers or the board of education, the respondents within that district expressed confidence in their negotiator and noted no need to switch to an outside negotiator. Typical responses indicated that in a situation as critical as a strike the respective sides would have removed their inside negotiator if they had not been pleased with his/her work.

7. A majority of the districts studied had outside negotiators representing the board of education. Typical among the responses was a perception of a need to have as much experience and expertise available as possible in a situation as serious and complicated as a strike. Superintendents typically expressed a concern about facing a professional outside negotiator from the teachers' association alone.

Negotiators for the board of education were acquired from and had very diverse backgrounds. Attorneys, former administrators, administrators from other districts, free lance negotiators, college professors, and representatives of professional organizations such as the Ohio School Boards Association were used to represent the various boards of education. The diffusion of types and sources of negotiators representing the boards of education would suggest that no one role is applicable
for a negotiator in all situations.

III. How did the teachers' association's outside negotiator (if one was used) influence the bargaining and strike situation?

1. Most respondents (See Table 33) related that the teachers' outside negotiator did bring in preconceived goals and ideas about the strike. Among the typical responses were reports that the teachers' professional organizations had established a list of demands from which each district in the state was encouraged to select. Other responses included perceived changes in demands of the local organization, and complete changes in strategy and behavior after the professional negotiator arrived.

2. A majority of the respondents (See Table 33) reported that the teachers' outside negotiator did change attitudes of the teachers they represented. Among the responses recorded were: changes in strategy, changes in behavior, changes in demands, and an unwillingness to compromise on the part of the teachers after their outside negotiator arrived. It is interesting to note that when teachers were asked about the board's outside negotiator, teachers typically responded about their problems dealing with the board or superintendent rather than the negotiator. When the board presidents and superintendents were asked about teachers' outside negotiators, typical responses were very negative about the influence of this outsider on the whole process. This lack of comment by teachers about the board's negotiator would again suggest the lack of influence he/she had on the strike. It is also interesting to note that when teachers did not use an outside negotiator, superintendents' and board presidents' comments tended to be less critical.

3. In considering the findings from all of the respondents, the effect of the teachers' outside negotiator on the
size and type of settlement was not clear. Respondents were divided fairly evenly on their perceptions of the negotiator's role. (See Table 33)

Teachers placed a large vote of confidence in their negotiator's ability to influence the strike settlement. It would appear from some of the typical responses of teachers that their lack of experience and expertise in bargaining made any gains over the existing agreement by their negotiator greater than the teachers would have received bargaining alone.

The community leaders were of the opinion that the teachers' outside negotiator did not influence the size or type of settlement. It would seem from some of the community leaders' responses that they perceived the teachers' outside negotiator to be "arrogant, hostile, less than tactful," and in fact "resented" the presence of the outsider in their community. The 5 community leaders and 2 PTA leaders who were certain the teachers' negotiators did not influence the size or type of settlement had no access to the bargaining sessions; one may, therefore, wonder how they arrived at their decision or obtained information about this question.

4. The teachers' outside negotiator did affect the length of the strike, according to most of the respondents (See Table 33). Among the responses were reports that the strike was lengthened by added demands by the teachers' negotiator, the hostile nature of the negotiator, and the desire of the negotiator to impress the teachers.

It is interesting to note that a large number of superintendents and board presidents credited the teachers' negotiator with lengthening the strike while the teachers tended to credit the board president or superintendent. It would seem that in the case of the teachers, their negotiator in many cases was acting as a "scapegoat" and taking with him/her many of the hostilities, while the board's negotiator is less efficient in the role of "scapegoat," leaving resentment and
hostilities directed toward the board president or superintendent.

5. In those cases where an insider negotiator was used by the teachers' association, a need for an outside negotiator was not expressed. Typical responses from the teachers indicated that the inside personnel used as negotiators did a good job and were supported by their fellow teachers. Since the typical responses from superintendents, board presidents, and teachers were favorable toward their respective negotiators, and considering that the negotiators used by both sides came from so many different sources and used such a diffusion of strategies and methods, it would seem that no one role or type of negotiator is appropriate for every situation.

6. In the schools investigated, the teachers' outside negotiators were perceived to be more influential than the school board's negotiators. Of the total respondents, 29 perceived the teachers' negotiators to influence strike length, 21 respondents perceived the teachers' negotiator influenced the strike settlement size and type, and 25 respondents perceived that the teachers' negotiator influenced the attitudes of the participants, while only 18 of the respondents reported that the board's negotiators had an influence in each of these three categories. (See Table 33)

IV. How were the special issues of a strike handled, and would these issues be handled the same in the future?

1. Schools were kept open during the strike. All 48 respondents reported that their schools were open during the strike. All responding teachers' representatives were against schools being open. Typical responses from teachers indicated that they were certain that no education was taking place during
**TABLE 33**

Responses to Negotiator Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the board's negotiator influence strike length?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Did the teachers' negotiator influence strike length? | Yes | No | Don't Know |
| Superintendents  | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Board presidents  | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Teachers  | 5 | 7 | 0 |
| PTA  | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Community  | 3 | 4 | 1 |

<p>| Did board's negotiator influence size or type of final settlement? | Yes | No | Don't Know |
| Superintendents  | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| Board presidents  | 4 | 8 | 0 |
| Teachers  | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| PTA  | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Community  | 1 | 6 | 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did teachers' negotiator influence size or type of final settlement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did board's negotiator have preconceived goals?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did teachers' negotiator have preconceived goals?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions and respondents</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did board’s negotiator influence attitudes?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did teachers’ negotiator influence attitudes?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the strike and that the board of education's only reason for keeping schools open was to save the money they would normally be paying for teachers' salaries.

One superintendent recommended that schools be open in his district but would not do so again because he felt negotiations might become serious from the beginning and the violence and anxieties involved at picket lines with teachers, students, and substitutes would be avoided if schools were closed during a strike. A board president from a different district echoed these same feelings. The remaining board presidents and superintendents perceived the continuation of school during a strike as a moral and legal obligation to the students and the greatest pressure tactic they could use against the teachers.

Responses from the PTA presidents and community members were quite diffused, with no discernable pattern established.

2. Most of the respondents (12 superintendents, 11 board presidents, 11 teachers' representatives, 3 PTA presidents, and 7 community leaders) reported that substitute teachers were used during the strike to keep schools open. In those situations where a respondent reported that substitutes were not used and all other respondents in that school reported that substitutes were used, a very small number of substitutes were available. Most classroom responsibilities were handled by parent volunteers and administrators. With such a large number of parents and a small number of substitutes, it would have been possible for some respondents not to realize the difference between volunteers and substitutes.

Those boards of education who were able to obtain lists of substitutes who were willing to cross picket lines were able to hire more substitutes than those who could not obtain such a list. These lists were compiled by schools who had experienced strikes earlier in the same general geographic location.
3. Picket limitation injunctions were sought against teachers in 9 of the 12 districts. Those schools not filing injunctions against teachers reported that the strike was too short to consider any court action. Those schools filing injunctions typically reported that they sought an injunction: 1. because the community expected them to, 2. it provided the teachers with a face saving way to limit picket activity or avoid it, 3. it would add pressure on the teachers, and 4. it would make access to and from buildings easier for working personnel. These types of comments were diffused among the respondents with most coming from superintendents and board presidents.

4. The Ferguson Act was not used against teachers in any of the districts investigated. Only one of the respondents reported that the Ferguson Act was invoked. This one respondent considered a back to work injunction filed by the board of education to be the same thing as the Ferguson Act. A diffusion of reasons for not using the Ferguson Act made a pattern among the respondents impossible. Typical responses included: 1. too complicated, 2. too time consuming, and 3. too expensive.

It is worth noting that 2 superintendents and 2 board presidents from different schools stated that they did not use the Ferguson Act because they believed it would increase hard feelings and swing public sympathy to the teachers.

5. Political figures did not participate in the strikes. Most respondents (8 superintendents, 10 board presidents, 7 teachers' representatives, 2 PTA presidents, and 5 community leaders) reported that political figures did not want to become involved in the strike. Those political figures who did participate were usually mayors or other elected officials who had an influence over the local police. The differences in the number of respondents replying to this question is due
to the fact that some political figures made offers of help to specific individuals but never made these offers known to the general public.

6. Most of the respondents (11 superintendents, 11 board presidents, 9 teachers' representatives, 4 PTA presidents, and 8 community leaders) did not make plans to cope, avoid, or deal with the tensions or violence caused by the strike among the participants. Even after living through the experience one time, most respondents (9 superintendents, 8 board presidents, 9 teachers' representatives, 3 PTA presidents, and 8 community leaders) had no plans to deal with these problems in the future. Typical responses from superintendents and board presidents related that nothing could be done to avoid anxieties. Anxieties, violence, and threats were considered a part of a strike and only time could "soften" emotions and feelings. Teachers gave responses which indicated that "human nature" controlled peoples' emotions and nothing could be done. PTA presidents and community leaders gave a large variety of responses, none of which could form any type of pattern or typical response.

7. Those superintendents, board presidents, or teachers' representatives who made plans to organize for the strike and prepare for as many problems as possible indicated that they were "pleased" with their plans and would use the same plan in the future if necessary.

A very small sample of the respondents in this study made detailed plans to organize themselves and their respective groups for their strike.

8. Plans to deal with the special problems of substitute teachers during the strike were seldom made, nor were plans made to avoid these problems in the future. Despite the fact
that most substitute teachers were harassed crossing the picket lines, followed home, harassed at home, or had their cars damaged, few arrangements were made to cope with these problems.

9. The key issues which caused the strikes in this study remained the key issues throughout the strike, with only 2 respondents from the same district indicating any hidden agendas.

10. More communication is needed between all parties involved during a strike. Every respondent commented sometime during the interview that more or better communication would have avoided the strike or at least helped both parties to reach a settlement sooner and with less hostility. Responses as to what type of communication, by whom, and when were diffused across the respondent types. Superintendents and board presidents were most frequently criticized by the other respondents for not presenting their side of the issues or communicating their position.

11. Despite reports of extensive property damage during some of the strikes, the only isolated personal violence reported was in one of the districts and that occurred between two community members. Although threats of death and beatings were made toward many of the respondents and houses were shot at, no personal violence was reported by anyone. Many teachers claimed they were hit by cars while they walked the picket lines, but only one of these teachers claimed to have received any medical attention for such an injury. (For the purposes of this study, any pushing or shoving on picket lines or at doorways that did not lead to fights or injury were not considered personal violence.)
12. Longer strikes produced more violence, threats, lost friendships, and long term bad feelings. One or two day strikes produced no violence while longer strikes produced more violence as each day progressed.

V. Of the four interviewed groups, which ones favor legislation supporting the various aspects of collective bargaining?

1. Each group of respondents except the community patrons favored legislation which would mandate collective bargaining with teaching personnel. (See Table 34) Typical responses from all other respondents in favor of this new legislation indicated that guidelines from the state would be better than the chaos that occurred before, during and after the strike. Opponents of this type of legislation related fears that control would be lost by the local people. No pattern of responses occurred among any subgroups. (See Table 34)

2. Teachers were very much against new legislation prohibiting their right to strike. (See Table 34) The remainder of the respondents were diffused between responses. The respondents in favor of this legislation typically expressed concerns that public employees should not strike and interrupt the education of children. Typical responses against a new anti-strike law included; 1. doubts that such a law would not be enforceable, and 2. a strike was the only weapon teachers had.

3. Legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step was strongly opposed by board presidents and favored by teachers. (See Table 34) Other respondents were diffused over the available responses forming no patterns. Board presidents typically responded against binding arbitration because of the loss of local control, costs to schools,
### TABLE 34
Responses to Legislative Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you support legislation prohibiting teacher strikes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you support binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 34 (continued)
Responses to Legislative Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Depends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining be open to the public?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board presidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and a perceived lack of understanding of school finances by board presidents of arbitrators in general. Teachers and the other respondents favoring binding arbitration of grievances typically responded that only a third party could settle differences.

4. Legislation requiring the use of binding arbitration as a substitute for a strike received majority support only from teachers. These teachers perceived arbitration as a way of settling contract disputes without the violence and hard feelings normally associated with a strike. Opponents of this type of legislation from all subgroups perceived arbitration as a loss of local control, a process in which teachers would always win something, and possible financial ruin for school districts.

5. Legislation mandating open bargaining was opposed by all responding groups (See Table 34). Although many different responses were made, the most frequent responses by all groups was a fear that open bargaining would result in the real bargaining still being done behind closed doors with the open bargaining just a "show" to gain public support for each side. This show atmosphere was perceived by all opposing respondents to slow down the process, drive up the costs, and be less efficient than the current method. Those respondents in favor of open bargaining believed it would require both sides to make more realistic demands.

VI. Are the answers similar when school district geographic location and enrollment are considered?

1. Answers to all questions did not vary when school district geographic location or enrollment are considered.
Implications for Practice

Based on the findings of this study, the following implications are presented:

1. The results of this study indicate that in the districts studied very little planning goes on before, during, or after a strike. Since the lack of communication, organization, and planning may have added to the likelihood of having a strike or added to the length of a strike, there may be a need for school leaders to develop local plans and strategies to deal with a strike situation.

2. This study indicated that the teachers' strategy before, during, and after the strike was to keep the school board and administration on the defensive. The administration and board of education may want to consider:
   a. counterproposals rather than merely reactions to teachers' proposals
   b. informational press releases rather than reaction to teachers' accusations
   c. a plan for strike situations before they happen rather than crisis management

3. The results of this study indicated that most of the respondents interviewed (34) had no prior experience with strikes. Training for educational leaders through college courses, inservice, or professional organizations may be needed to better prepare these leaders for the problems and decisions they will need to make.

4. The results of this study indicated that the respondents were not in agreement as to the role each participant did and should play during the strike. Since all participants interviewed are involved in the same goal - the education of children, it would appear that there is a need for these groups to discuss the roles and responsibilities of each group before
a strike situation occurs.

5. The results of this study indicate a complete lack of use of the Ferguson Act to resolve or avoid teacher strikes. It would appear that the legislature needs to consider establishing a public sector collective bargaining law that speaks to the issues and is more useful.

6. The results of this study indicate a majority of the respondents favor mandated bargaining with the teachers. It would appear that the legislature and governor's office should reassess the need for such legislative guidelines within the state of Ohio.

7. The results of this study indicate that the respondents in schools which were investigated tend to follow national trends toward the use of outside negotiators, legislation for bargaining guidelines, and binding arbitration. If the schools studied tend to follow national trends, it would appear that schools experiencing strikes in Ohio can expect demands from their teachers that are similar to national trends. It would also appear that schools in Ohio who have not experienced a strike, could look to the contracts of those schools in Ohio who have struck to determine what trends await their bargaining sessions.

8. Since all 12 districts remained open during their strikes and only 2 indicated that they would consider closing in a similar situation in the future, it would seem that it would be appropriate to ask how superintendents and board presidents expect to keep schools open when they make few if any plans to deal with problems incurred when substitute teachers are used in a strike situation.
Implications for Further Study

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

1. Study the attitudes of teachers not working during a strike and also not actively participating in the strike and compare their attitudes with the striking teachers who do participate in strike activities.

2. Study the roles and perceptions of superintendents, board presidents, PTA presidents, and presidents of non-certified workers during a strike by non-certified employees.

3. In the districts studied, 8 superintendents left their position between the time of the strike and the interview for this study. Study:
   a. What conditions resulted in their departures?
   b. What are the implications of these conditions on the bargaining process?
   c. What are the implications of these conditions on the role of the superintendent?

4. Examine the training, background, and professional roles of outside negotiators for school boards and teachers. Study:
   a. implications for the bargaining process
   b. implications for career opportunities
   c. common or uncommon backgrounds
   d. teacher negotiation "schools"
   e. where training is received

5. Investigate the need and/or acceptability of region- or statewide bargaining.

6. Study collective bargaining preparation, backgrounds, and training of school board presidents and superintendents.

7. Investigate still further the need to communicate with community groups concerning collective bargaining.
8. What role, if any, should law enforcement agencies play in school district teacher strikes?

9. Study the perceptions of the school leaders in a state with collective bargaining laws in the public sector and a long history of bargaining and compare the perceptions with the perceptions of Ohio school leaders.

10. Investigate the impact of collective bargaining on the public schools. How does the general public feel? How do these attitudes affect the bargaining process?

11. Examine the impact of collective bargaining on the community image of the teacher.

12. Examine the relationship between professional teachers' organizations and the PTA. Do they support each other?

13. Examine public and private sector bargaining. Is there a difference? How do these differences, if any, effect the public schools?

14. Since a uniform role for the board of education or teachers' negotiator was not found within this study, it may be worthy of further study to investigate the need to hire a full time staff member in order to handle the uniqueness of each district's employee relations.

15. Nine of the twelve school districts investigated filed some type of injunction against the teachers. It would appear that an investigation of the effect, if any, these injunctions have on the length and emotional atmosphere of a strike is needed.

16. During this investigation it was discovered that three of the community leaders interviewed ran for and were elected to the board of education after the strike was over. Since many community leaders who were active during the strike were not interviewed, it could be assumed that others may have decided to run for a school board position. It would be worthy of future research to investigate the number of community leaders who become members of the board of education as a
17. A majority of the superintendents and board presidents interviewed made limited or no strike plans at all prior to their strike. It may be worthy of further study to investigate schools whose superintendents and boards now have strike plans but have never had a strike and study their perceptions as to if being prepared for a strike has had any effect on avoiding a strike.

18. Since the amount of violence reported in this study increased as the strike lengthened and was most critical during the longer strikes, it may be worthy to see at what point, if any, violence adds to or detracts from a quick settlement.

19. Since many respondents in this study indicated that communication with the media was needed, it may be worthy of further study to investigate:
   a. What part, if any, does the media play in a strike?
   b. Which groups of leaders use the media to their advantage?
   c. How do they use the media to their advantage?

20. This study indicated that the board of education's negotiator was not perceived to have the influence on the strike that the teachers' negotiator did. Investigate:
   a. Do teachers turn more of the responsibility of their negotiations over to their negotiator than the board does to theirs?
   b. In what ways are the negotiators' responsibilities different?
   c. Why are their responsibilities different?
   d. Does the difference in responsibilities affect the negotiator's effectiveness or influence on the strike?

21. All responding groups, except the teachers, related hostilities toward the teachers' outside negotiator, but few respondents made similar comments about the board's outside negotiator. Investigate:
   a. Does the teachers' outside negotiator intend to
play the role of the "scapegoat?"
b. What influence does this role have on the strike?
c. Does the lack of a "scapegoat" role played by the board's outside negotiator explain why so many superintendents leave their position after a strike?

22. It would appear that when considering the extensive reports of intimidation, material violence, and harassment that a study is needed to investigate what part, if any, intimidation, violence, and threats play in the strike process and settlement.
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Appendix A
Interview Guide
**Interview Guide**

The main questions will be listed numerically. Possible related probe questions will be listed under each main question.

1. How many years have you served here in this position?

2. Was this your first strike experience?
   a. Where were the others?
   b. How many others?
   c. Were they school related strikes?
   d. What was your position there?

3. Are negotiations at the bargaining table open to the public?
   a. If so, how long has it been open?

4. How do you feel about negotiations being open to the public?
   a. Why?
   b. Do you think open bargaining will become widespread?
   c. Why?
   d. When?

5. When was the possibility of a strike first realized by the group you represent?
   a. What alerted you to this possibility?
   b. Can you describe your feelings at that time?

6. What were the key issues that caused the strike?
   a. Why these issues?

7. Approximately how many weeks did negotiations proceed before an impasse was declared?
   a. Who declared the impasse?
   b. Why?
   c. If there is a next time, what would you do differently?

8. Were there any plans made for handling a strike made before, during, or after this strike?
   a. Do you believe there should have been?
   b. Why?
c. If plans were made were they effective?
d. Why, or why not?
e. If there is a next time, what would your
group do differently?

9. Did the administration keep schools open during the
strike?
   a. How do you feel about that?
   b. Who supported this position?
   c. Why?
   d. How did they support it?
   e. Who opposed it?
   f. Why?
   g. How did they oppose it?

10. What percentage of the teachers participated in the
strike?
    a. How did they participate?
    b. If some did not, why not?
    c. How did they oppose it?

11. What was the school board's official position of
    staying open or closed?
    a. Why do you think they took this position?
    b. Do you agree with that?
    c. Why or why not?

12. What was the teachers' official position on keeping
school open or closed during the strike?
    a. Was this an official or an assumed position?

13. Were there any personal anxieties that you are aware
of during the strike among:
    a. teachers
    b. students
    c. substitute teachers
    d. non-parent community members
    e. parents
    f. PTA members
    g. members of the administration
    h. members of the board of education

14. How were these anxieties manifested?
    a. How were these problems handled?

15. Were any of these anxieties a result of threats of
    violence or actual violence?
    a. Which, violence or threats?
    b. What kinds?
    c. How many of each?
    d. Towards whom?
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e. By whom?
f. How were these threats or acts dealt with?

16. Were the local law enforcement agencies ever involved?
   a. How?
   b. Why?
   c. How often?
   d. How do you feel about their involvement?
   e. If there is a next time how would you like to see this handled?

17. Who was the head negotiator for the board of education?
   a. If an outside negotiator, from what source was he/she obtained?
   b. Has this person been used before?
   c. How many times?

18. What was your impression of the role played by the board's negotiator?
   a. What makes you say this?

19. Who negotiated for the teachers?
   a. From where was this person obtained?
   b. Was this person used before?
   c. How many times?

20. What was your impression of the role played by the teachers' negotiator?
   a. What makes you say this?

21. Did either negotiator bring in any preconceived goals, ideas, or opinions of the outcome of the strike?
   a. What were they?
   b. How did these items effect the outcome of the settlement?

22. If either side used an outside negotiator, how did they handle emotional issues?
   a. If outside negotiators were not used, do you believe their use would have changed the way emotional issues were handled?
   b. How?
   c. Why?

23. Did either negotiator change the attitudes of any of the parties toward collective bargaining?
   a. Which negotiator?
   b. Whose attitudes were changed?
   c. How were the attitudes changed?
24. Did the board of education's negotiator effect the size or type of settlement?
   a. If yes, how was this done?
   b. How much difference did they make?
   c. Was the fact that the negotiator was or was not an outsider have any effect on this?
   d. Why?

25. Did the teachers' negotiator effect the size or type of the settlement?
   a. If yes, how was this done?
   b. How much difference did they make?
   c. Was the fact the negotiator was or was not an outsider have any effect on this?
   d. Why?

26. Did the board's negotiator effect the length of the bargaining process? The length of the strike?
   a. How did they effect it?

27. Were substitute teachers used during the strike?
   a. What are your feelings about this practice?
   b. If there is a next time, how would you like to see this handled differently?
   c. Why?

28. Did the substitutes encounter any special problems?
   a. What kinds of problems?
   b. Were they threatened?
   c. How?
   d. How were their problems dealt with?
   e. If there is a next time, how should this be handled differently?

29. What was your opinion of press and other media coverage before, during, and after the strike?
   a. Were your observations shared?
   b. By whom?
   c. How did the coverage affect the strike?
   d. If there is a next time, would your group attempt to deal with the media differently than they did this time?

30. What steps were taken by your group to help reach a settlement of the strike?
   a. Why these steps?
   b. Do you feel they were successful?
   c. Why, or why not?
   d. If there is a next time, would you use the same steps?
   e. Why, or why not?
   f. What steps would you take?
31. What were the key issues in settling the strike?
   a. Why?
   b. Were they different than the issues that caused the strike?
   c. How were they different?
   d. Was one person or group instrumental in settling the strike?

32. What part, if any, did the community at large play in the strike?
   a. What was your reaction to this?
   b. Did it influence the strike?
   c. How?

33. Did your group encourage the public to be involved?
   a. Why?
   b. How were they encouraged?

34. Was the Ferguson Act invoked?
   a. Why, or why not?
   b. How do you feel about this?

35. Did you seek any type of injunction?
   a. If so, why, or why not?
   b. If so, what kind?
   c. Did you receive the injunction?
   d. Did the injunction do what you intended?
   e. Given the same situation again, would you go for this same injunction again?
   f. Why, or why not?

36. What part, if any, did the PTA play in the strike?
   a. Did this influence the strike in any way?
   b. How?

37. How did local political figures participate in the strike?
   a. How did they participate?
   b. Did this participation influence the strike?
   c. How?

38. Were there any post-strike anxieties? Who was effected?
   a. How were these anxieties manifested?
   b. How were these problems handled?
   c. Should they have been handled differently?
   d. Why?
   e. If there is a next time, should these problems be handled differently?
   f. How?
39. If there is a next time, what would be the most important thing your group would do differently?
   a. Why?

40. What is the most important thing your group could do to avoid a next time?
    a. Why this?
    b. Has your group made plans already to do this?
    c. If so, what are they?

41. How do you feel about the collective bargaining process in Ohio?
    a. Why?
    b. How would you change it?

42. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining with the teaching staff?
    a. Why, or why not?
    b. What kind of legislation would you support?

43. Would you support legislation prohibiting teachers' the right to strike?
    a. Why, or why not?

44. Would you support legislation mandating binding arbitration as a final grievance step?
    a. Why, or why not?

45. Would you support binding arbitration as an alternative to a strike?
    a. Why, or why not?
    b. What kind of legislation would you support as an alternative?

46. Would you support legislation mandating collective bargaining be open to the public?
    a. Why, or why not?
    b. What kind of legislation would you support?

47. Was the strike worth it?
    a. Why, or why not?
    b. Who benefited from the strike?
    c. Who lost the most?

48. How would you rate the post-strike atmosphere?
    a. Was it bitter?
    b. If so, can you list examples?
    c. Why were feelings expressed this way?

49. Has this atmosphere changed?
    a. How and why?
Appendix B
Superintendent's Questionnaire
Superintendent Questionnaire

1. Average compensation per teacher before the strike; include salary, supplemental contracts, and fringe benefits. (Consider everything the board pays for except retirement to be fringe benefits)
   $________________________

2. Average compensation per teacher after the strike settlement. (Include those items you included in question #2)
   $________________________

3. ADM during the strike; if you stayed open. ____________

4. What is the final step in your grievance policy? ____________

5. Who negotiated for the board of education? ____________

6. Did you use third party intervention to attempt to resolve impasse? ____________

7. If so, which kind? ____________

8. What was the estimated number of individual hours spent by the superintendent during the entire collective bargaining procedure the year of the strike? ____________

9. Estimated number of individual hours spent by the board of education on collective bargaining during the strike? ____________

10. Estimated hours spent by other administrators. ____________

11. Estimated hours spent by clerical help. ____________

12. Estimated total cost of legal fees incurred. ____________

13. Days made up as a result of the settlement. ____________

14. Estimated total costs to the board of education for the preparation and distribution of the negotiated agreement. ____________
Appendix C
Superintendent's Contact Letter
Dear superintendent _______________,

As a graduate student of educational administration at The Ohio State University and a former high school administrator, I am conducting dissertation research to collect information regarding collective bargaining under strike conditions. As part of this research, I am interviewing superintendents, board president, PTA presidents, and teachers' association representatives.

This is where I need your assistance. You and eleven of your colleagues were selected through a random process as one of the superintendents who experienced a strike during either the 1977-78 or 1978-79 school years. Will you please meet with me for an hour to share your insights and experiences with me? Your knowledge in this area would be very helpful to my research. All of your responses to any part of my research will be handled in strictest confidence and complete anonymity for you and your school.

I would like to conduct these interviews between March 3rd and March 28th, 1980. I will be calling you within the next week to request an appointment and answer any questions you may have.

I look forward to meeting with you and greatly appreciate your time and expertise in this matter.

Respectfully,

David D. Baker
Appendix D
Superintendent's Confirmation Letter
Dear superintendent__,

This letter is to confirm our meeting on **(Date & Time)** at **(location)** for the purpose of discussing your reactions to the strike you recently experienced.

Enclosed is a brief pre-interview questionnaire which I would like you to have one of your assistants fill out to provide my research with some background information about your strike. I will pick up the questionnaire when we meet for the interview.

Again your responses to the questionnaire and the interview will have complete anonymity.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

David D. Baker
Appendix E
Letter of Confirmation to Other Respondents
Dear ____________,

This letter is to confirm our meeting on ____________ (date) at ____________ (location) to discuss your views on the strike in which your school system recently participated. It is important for both of us that your responses be held in strictest confidence.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

David D. Baker
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