

49
122

STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS
IN WEST VIRGINIA
TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

by

Michael Wayne McPherson

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Education Administration

APPROVED:

Dr. Kenneth E. Underwood

Dr. Carl Holland

Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune

Dr. Ronald McKeen

Dr. Robert R. Richards

July, 1986

Blacksburg, Virginia

28-0-8-2
8-2-87

STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS
IN WEST VIRGINIA
TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
AND
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

by

Michael W. McPherson

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant variances exist among the attitudes of educational leaders in West Virginia toward collective bargaining and what influences certain demographic variables might have as predictors of attitudes. Eight categories of educational leaders were included in this study, with membership determined by employment or organizational position held. Twenty-one items concerning demographic information were included to gather pertinent background material. Data were collected by mail survey using a Likert Scale.

The data were analyzed as follows: differences across categories of leaders were tested using the one-way analysis of variance, and predictors of attitudes were sought with a multiple regression and a Scheffe test. The results indicated that there were significant differences between groups in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining and certain demographic variables at the .05 level of significance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Kenneth Underwood for his guidance and assistance during this study. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Jimmy Fortune for his patience and guidance in assisting with research related questions, and to Dr. Carl Holland, Dr. Ronald McKeen, and Dr. Robert Richards for their advice and encouragement during the writing of this dissertation.

I would like to thank Ramona Fletcher for her assistance in proof reading, Carolyn Robinson who provided assistance in relation to statistical concerns, and Paulette Gardner for her organizational and typing expertise.

Appreciation is expressed to my family and friends who have assisted and offered encouragement when needed. A special debt of gratitude is owed to my daughter, who on many occasions was denied my presence and assistance during the completion of the author's graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
One INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	5
Significance	5
Definition of Terms	9
Limitations of the Study	12
Two REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Historical Background	14
Review of West Virginia Collective Bargaining Literature	27
Related Literature Review	31
Summary	48
Three RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	52
Target Population--Sampling Technique	53
Development of Survey Instrument and Research Design	55
Data Collection	58
Data Analysis	61
Four DATA ANALYSIS	63
Target Population	63
Non-Responses	64

Table of Contents (continued)

CHAPTER	Page
Research Question One	66
Analysis of Data	78
Research Question Two	85
Demographic Data	86
Statistical Significance of Demographic Variables	93
Multiple Regression	105
Summary	106
Five DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . .	110
Discussion	110
Findings	113
Conclusions	116
Implications	119
REFERENCES	122
APPENDICES	133
VITA	168

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Work-Related Incidents, State of West Virginia .	4
2	Dates that State Associations Were Organized . .	19
3	Statutory Overview by State of Teacher Bargaining Rights	28
4	Statutory Overview of State Education Bargaining	29
5	Number of Responses to Key Concepts	79
6	Positions of Groups in Relation to Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining	82
7	Analysis of Variance for Significance of Group Attitudes	84
8	Multiple Regression for Determining Effective Demographic Predictors of Attitudes	107
9	Groups' Responses to Statements	135
10	Responding Groups' Demographic Responses	152

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Collective bargaining as an instrument for employees attempting to obtain desired goals in the public education sector has gained ground rapidly in the last two decades. However, despite the increased acceptance of collective bargaining in the public education sector, attitudes toward collective bargaining are by no means uniform as is evidenced by the number of states and school districts that refuse to allow collective bargaining within the realm of public education (National Education Association, 1984).

An overview of collective bargaining by teachers, K-12, shows that thirty-three states have a duty to bargain, one state to meet and confer, thirteen states have no statute concerning collective bargaining, and three states prohibit the collective bargaining process (National Education Association, 1984). Virginia, although listed in the publication by the National Education Association as prohibiting collective bargaining, is not prohibited by legislative statute, but is limited by the Virginia Supreme Court decision of 1977 which ruled that collective bargaining is unconstitutional and must cease. The gains that have been obtained by bargaining are often used as models to provide

evidence that employees within the public sector benefit from collective bargaining, while opponents in many of the states that do not allow collective bargaining disagree with these claims (West Virginia Education Association, June, 1984).

The urge to bargain collectively is a break with the more conservative attitudes of teachers involved in the educational process prior to the 1960's. As society became more liberal, the attitudes of teachers and of the public toward bargaining in the field of education have changed accordingly. This is evidenced by the fact that teacher strikes, an almost unheard-of occurrence in the 1940's and 50's, have increased from more than 130 per year beginning in the 1970's to 242 in 1980 (Colton, 1982).

Attitudes of the general public toward collective bargaining differ in relation to various factors, such as: the division of the labor force one is a member of, the issues involved, the perception of results obtained over previous years, and membership in various organizations (Stern and Bagley, 1981), (Fields and Reddick, 1979).

This study examines the attitudes of educational leaders in West Virginia toward collective bargaining in the public education sector. The influence that certain demographic variables might have, as predictors of these attitudes, is also considered.

The area of collective bargaining is very controversial among certain groups in West Virginia. A proposal for the establishment of collective bargaining rights for employees within the public education sector has been introduced in the state legislature in each of the past four years, finally gaining approval from the West Virginia State Senate in 1984, but failing to win approval from the House of Delegates.

Additional attempts have also been made to establish the right for public education employees to bargain collectively. Although these efforts have not succeeded, they provide insight into events that relate to the collective bargaining concept among West Virginia public employees (see Table 1).

Because of these widespread differences of opinion, the West Virginia State Legislature has refused to grant employees of the public education sector collective bargaining rights. These differences of opinion will continue, as is evident by the fact that one of the 1985 West Virginia Education Association's goals is the passage of a collective bargaining bill, while other groups are adamantly opposed to any form of collective bargaining for public education employees.

Regardless of whether one favors or opposes collective bargaining, the fact remains that this very important issue will continue to influence the attitudes of various factions that deal directly with the public education sector.

Table 1
 WORK-RELATED INCIDENTS
 STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Year	Incident	Outcome
1938	Attorney General's Opinion	Opinion was, that Co. Bd.'s of Ed. could not recognize a union as a bargaining agent
1942 1966	Attorney Generals' Opinions	Public employers were advised against recognizing a bargaining agent for state workers
1970	Kirker vs. Moore	Governor fired the workers and the West Virginia U. S. District Court upheld the decision
1974	Attorney General's Opinion	A Co. Bd. of Ed. may not enter into a collective bargaining contract; meeting and conferring is legal if Bd.'s are willing
1979	One-day protest by teachers, many refused to work	No action taken by employers
1980	Fairmont Hospital Case	Right of public employers to refuse to bargain with employees was recognized by the West Virginia State Supreme Court

(West Virginia School Journal, 1984)

Examining the perceptions of these factions is important, not only from the standpoint of identifying differing viewpoints, but also in order to clarify some concerns of the groups involved, so that these might be considered in future discussions of public education collective bargaining. Identifying the attitudes of the groups involved provides a means for those concerned with the collective bargaining issue to determine the basis of support or opposition to the concept.

Purpose of Study

The survey is descriptive in nature, being conducted to determine if significant variances exist among the attitudes of educational leaders in West Virginia toward collective bargaining and what influences certain demographic variables might have as predictors of attitudes.

Significance

Various groups in West Virginia have expressed concern regarding a collective bargaining bill that would enable the public education sector employees to exercise additional options in dealing with employers. The West Virginia Education Association has taken a position favoring the passage of a collective bargaining bill, while the West Virginia Association of School Administrators and the West

Virginia School Service Personnel Association are expressing opposition to collective bargaining rights.

Bills to grant collective bargaining rights to public employees have been introduced in the legislature, resulting in much debate concerning the bargaining concept. These bills to provide public sector employees with the right to negotiate with their employers have not been successful. However, the teachers' organization, WVEA, continues to lobby for passage.

During the 1984 gubernatorial race in West Virginia, both Clyde See, the Democratic candidate, and Arch Moore, the Republican candidate, expressed concerns relating to collective bargaining. Clyde See expressed opposition to the issue of collective bargaining, while Arch Moore expressed partial support of the concept (West Virginia Education Association--WVEA, September 21, 1984). This position indicates that while Governor Moore is not entirely opposed to collective bargaining, he is not the advocate that many supporters of collective bargaining were hoping to secure.

West Virginia is noted for its strong union commitment among laborers, which has caused controversy, especially in the mining industry. This loyalty is evident in the violence that has surrounded confrontations between union members and coal companies from the early 1900's to the present situation now existing at Lobata, West Virginia (Charleston Gazette,

February 24, 1985). With the widespread union sentiment and belief in the right of workers to negotiate, the fact that there is controversy in relation to collective bargaining rights for the public education employee is not surprising. It is reminiscent of the labor-management controversy that faced the state legislature and courts in the early 1900's.

The following events, some of which are expansions of information contained in Table 1, point to the controversy surrounding the extension of collective bargaining rights to public employees. In an Attorney General's opinion dated May 21, 1938, the State Superintendent of Schools was advised that a county board of education was without power or authority to recognize a labor union as the bargaining agent for the employees of the board. On April 16, 1942, the State Attorney General again advised against recognizing a bargaining agent for state workers. Again in 1956 and in 1966, the rights of state workers to bargain collectively were ruled against in State Attorney Generals' opinions. In 1974, Chauncey H. Browning, Jr., State Attorney General, stated "it remains the legal conclusion and official position of this office, that a county school board in West Virginia legally may not enter into a collective bargaining contract" (WVEA, June, 1984). However, the 1974 opinion did allow employees to negotiate some items of employment, if local school boards were willing. Browning made it clear that

collective bargaining in West Virginia is not legal, and that although a school board may meet with employees, negotiate legal concerns, and agree to a mediator, the county school boards are not legally bound to negotiate and are not bound by any decisions that a mediator might conclude.

A recent West Virginia State Supreme Court decision also deals, in part, with the question of collective bargaining. In ruling on the Fairmont Hospital case, 1980, the right of public employers to refuse to bargain with employees was recognized.

The attorney generals' opinions and the Fairmont Hospital case support the contention that collective bargaining is a controversial subject in relation to the public education sector. This controversy was also evident in 1981, when the West Virginia State Superintendent of Schools, was faced with the question of collective bargaining rights for public education employees. Superintendent Roy Truby said, "I think the state will stay out of the controversy and let county school boards decide whether to 'meet and confer' with teachers under a 1974 attorney general's opinion" (Charleston Daily Mail, May 28, 1981).

Since the issue of collective bargaining is a controversial topic, with various segments of the public education sector lobbying either for or against passage of a collective bargaining bill, the identification of attitudes

as they correspond to the various groups involved will enable the researcher to identify the perceptions of these groups toward many of the aspects relating to the collective bargaining process.

Definition of Terms

Administrators--Those employees who supervise and direct the employment activities of other workers employed within the field of education. Those considered as administrators are: superintendents, assistant superintendents, coordinators, directors, supervisors, principals, and assistant principals.

Administrative Sector--The administrators that are involved in the supervision of teachers and service personnel employees.

Attitudes--The feelings or positions that people or groups have toward a fact or state. In relation to collective bargaining, it is the position either in favor of, or in opposition to, the granting of collective bargaining rights to the public education sector.

Bargaining Unit--Those teachers or service personnel who have selected a representative to negotiate with their employer over legal employment concerns, as provided by collective bargaining regulations.

Collective Bargaining--The process of negotiating wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment into one agreement, which will cover all employees represented by the bargaining unit.

Educational Leaders--Presidents of County Education Associations, Presidents of County Elementary Principals Associations, Presidents of County School Boards, Presidents of County School Service Personnel Associations, Presidents of County Secondary School Principals Associations, Presidents of State Colleges and Universities, State Elected and Appointed Officials, and Superintendents of County School Systems.

Fringe Benefits--Those items, excluding salary, that employees consider valuable as compensation for employment.

Governing Bodies--Local county boards of education, the West Virginia Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the West Virginia Legislature.

Grievance--A claim by any member of a bargaining unit, or by a bargaining agent, that there has been a misinterpretation or misapplication of the approved master agreement. The claim is adjustable through the grievance procedure which is included as an article of the master agreement itself. The grievance procedure utilized is the one approved by the state legislature.

Master Agreement--The document that sets forth terms and conditions of employment, and lists procedures to be utilized in settling questions in relation to employment.

Negotiations--The process by which governing bodies and their administrative representatives bargain with employees to set wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment, inclusive of the methods established for handling grievances.

Service Personnel--Employees of a county school system that provide services in the position or area of aide, custodian, food service, maintenance, secretarial/clerical, or transportation.

State Elected and Appointed Officials--Officials who are either employed by the West Virginia State Department of Education, or are considered leaders of an educational organization. These State Elected and Appointed Officials are: Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Regents; Executive Secretary, West Virginia School Service Personnel Association; President, West Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals; President, West Virginia Board of Education; President, West Virginia Board of Regents; President, West Virginia Education Association; President, West Virginia Secondary School Principals Commission; and West Virginia State Superintendent of Schools.

Strike--A work stoppage for the purpose of settling differences with an employer.

Teachers--Employees of a county school system who are certified by the State of West Virginia to teach students in grades pre-kindergarten through twelve.

West Virginia Public Education Employees--Employees of the West Virginia State Education Department and employees of the West Virginia County and State School Systems, who work with public school students in grades pre-kindergarten through college.

West Virginia Public Education Sector--The organizational structures, including all county and state school system employees, that are responsible for operating the State of West Virginia Public Schools (includes state colleges).

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to the state of West Virginia. It is designed to measure the attitudes of educational leaders toward the concept of collective bargaining. Selected demographic variables were also investigated in order to determine if any significance exists among these variables in relation to collective bargaining. Only the attitudes of the following were considered in this study:

1. Presidents of County Education Associations
2. Presidents of County Elementary Principals Associations
3. Presidents of County School Boards

4. Presidents of County School Service Personnel Associations
5. Presidents of County Secondary School Principals Associations
6. Presidents of State Colleges and Universities
7. State Elected and Appointed Officials
 - (Includes) Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Regents
 - Executive Secretary, West Virginia School Service Personnel Association
 - President, West Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals
 - President, West Virginia Board of Education
 - President, West Virginia Board of Regents
 - President, West Virginia Education Association
 - President, West Virginia Secondary School Principals Commission
 - West Virginia State Superintendent of Schools
8. Superintendents of County School Systems

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is a review of the literature relevant to attitudes toward collective bargaining and certain demographic variables, as they relate to the public education sector. Studies concerning collective bargaining in the private sector, when pertinent to the subject being investigated, are also included.

In order to present this information, the chapter is subdivided into four sections, which are: section one, the historical background of collective bargaining in the United States; section two, collective bargaining in West Virginia; section three, research related to the collective bargaining concept; and section four, a summary of the chapter.

Historical Background

The early history of public education in the United States reveals very little bargaining of any type for employees of school systems. Kazalunas (1984) pointed out that education, until recently, was often rigorously controlled by a few powerful citizens who imposed stringent conditions on teachers; they included: low pay, long hours, extra duties, no married women on the staff, and unreasonable

moral strictures (p. 30). Private sector labor activities laid the groundwork for present statutory and judicial regulation of unions. State statutes governing public employee collective bargaining reflect this in many ways; for example, scope of bargaining, representation procedures, impasse redress, etc., all have earmarks of the private experience (p. 639).

Collective bargaining has been practiced in America since early colonial times. Bargaining between managers and representatives of craft unions has been occurring for more than two centuries. Collective bargaining between the managers of industries and other segments of the private sector, which employ mainly unskilled labor, did not occur until much later. It was not until after the 1930's that collective bargaining, through successful union organization, made significant headway.

It was the Civil War that served as a catalyst for intensifying the trends of early unionization. The need for quantities of products that only mass-production methods could provide firmly established an industrial base in America. Union organization efforts were ongoing during this time period but did not make significant advancement.

Collective bargaining and unionization efforts were, and still are, controversial. The concern that collective bargaining and union demands should be balanced with the

legitimate interests of the public encouraged government involvement. "A government claiming to promote the public interest cannot be neutral toward the private interests of management and unions or toward the activity in which they engage their separate, and often opposing, interests: collective bargaining" (Beal & Begin, 1982, p. 127). Historically, according to Beal & Begin (1982), this policy toward labor in the United States originated in the English common law. That principle was first recorded in American law in the Philadelphia Cordwainers' case in 1806 and has undergone several court interpretations since then (Beal & Begin, 1982, p. 127).

National legislation dealing with collective bargaining and unionization in the private sector was fostered by the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890. Originally intended to prevent employer monopolies and restraint of trade, the Supreme Court, in a landmark decision that came from the Pullman strike of 1893, established the act as a basis for injunctions against strikes and boycotts.

The Clayton Antitrust Act was passed in 1914, as an attempt by Congress to prevent the use of antitrust laws against legitimate strikes and to remove the federal courts from the labor-management disputes. However, in two decisions--*Duplex v. Deering* and *Bedford Stone Cutters*--the Supreme Court neutralized this attempt. Current federal

statutes that govern collective bargaining in the private sector are: 1. Norris-La Guardia Act of 1932; 2. the Wagner-Connery Act of 1935; 3. the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, with amendments; and 4. The Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959. The Railway Labor Act of 1926 is also a current federal statute, but it only applies to privately owned but publicly franchised railways and airlines.

The establishment of unions and collective bargaining rights for workers has been affected by numerous events. These events are not restricted to the passage of legislation and court decisions; they are the culmination of various happenings. A partial listing of these events follows:

Chronology of Events in the History of Collective Bargaining
(partial listing of more important events)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Event</u>
1786	Strike, Philadelphia Journeymen Printers
1799	First recorded attempt at collective bargaining - by the Philadelphia Cordwainers
1806	Cordwainers found guilty of conspiracy to raise wages
1820	Depression year, unions died out
1824	With return of prosperity, unions became active again
1827	Formulation of first City Central organization, resulted in political concessions from major parties
1834	First attempt to form a national organization of labor - the National Trades' Union
1837	Depression year, drop-off of union activity
1840-60	Gradual (though intermittent) increase in union activity
1861-65	Civil War intensified union activity
1866	National Labor Union established (William H. Sylvis)
1869	Knights of Labor Founded (Uriah H. Stevens)

(continued on next page)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Event</u>
1873	Financial panic, depression
1877	Railroad strike, Baltimore & Philadelphia, more than 100 killed
1878	Knights of Labor organized nationally
1881	Delegates formed the Federation of Labor (forerunner of AFL)
1886	Decline of Knights of Labor, American Federation of Labor formed (Samuel Gompers)
1894	Pullman strike
1908	U.S. v. Adair, yellow dog contracts declared illegal
1914	Clayton Act approved
1914-19	War-boom period, National War Labor Board created
1917	Supreme Court upholds yellow dog contract
1926	National Railway Act
1929	Stock Market Crash, widespread unemployment
1932	Norris-La Guardia Act
1935	Wagner Act, CIO formed
1941	World War II, National War Labor Board
1947	Taft-Hartley Act
1955	AFL-CIO merger
1959	Landrum-Griffin Act
1962	Civil rights campaign starts
1967	Executive Order 10988
1969	United Transportation Union Formed
1970	Wildcat Postal Strike
1972	Chavez wins recognition, Teamsters and AFL-CIO clash
1974	Taft-Hartley amended, brings more workers under NLRB
1975	California brings farm workers under state labor relations board, Boyle convicted, Hoffa disappears
1978	Woodcock (UAW) appointed ambassador to China
1980	Fraser (UAW) elected to Chrysler Corporation board of directors, J. P. Stevens firm signs labor agreement
1981	Auto Workers reaffiliated with AFL-CIO

(Beal and Begin, 1982)

The public education sector had state associations organized as early as 1840, but did not have a national organization for educators until 1857 (see Table 2). In 1857, 43 educators gathered in Philadelphia, at the urging of the leaders of ten state teachers' organizations, to found

Table 2

DATES THAT STATE ASSOCIATIONS WERE ORGANIZED
(INCLUDES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND PUERTO RICO)

State	Year	State	Year
AL	1840; reorganized, 1856	MD	1866
NY	1845	GA	1867
RI	1845	NB	1867
OH	1847	AR	1869
CT	1848	CO	1875
DC	1849	TX	1880
SC	1850	MT	1882
VT	1850	MS	1884
KY	1851; reorganized, 1852	SD	1884
MI	1852	FL	1886
PA	1852	NM	1886
IL	1853	ND	1887
NJ	1853	NV	1888
WI	1853	OK	1889
IN	1854	WA	1889
IA	1854	ID	1890
NH	1854	AZ	1891
MO	1856	LA	1892
NC	1857; reorganized, 1884	WY	1892
ME	1859; reorganized, 1902	UT	1892-93
MN	1861	OR	1899
CA	1863	PR	1911
KS	1863	MA	1911
VA	1863; reorganized, 1905	DE	1919
WV	1863	HI	1921
TN	1865	AK	1922

(Cresswell, Murphy, and Kerchner, 1980, p. 59).

an organization that was to become the National Education Association. The organization founded in Philadelphia was given the title, National Teachers' Association. Despite the title, classroom teachers had little participation either in its founding or in its activities for the next several decades (Creswell, Murphy, and Kerchner, 1980, p. 59).

There was tension between the state organizations and the national body, which would continue until the 1960's when the national body was finally able to assert its supremacy. During the first 30 years of its existence, the National Teachers' Association accomplished very little to improve conditions for teachers; it was mainly concerned with curriculum areas and talking about schools. The National Teachers' Association merged with the National Association of School Superintendents, becoming known as the National Educational Association, later dropping the al and becoming the National Education Association (NEA) in 1906.

The earliest teachers' organization to be affiliated with organized labor was the Chicago Teachers' Federation, which was founded in 1897 and which voted to affiliate with the Chicago Federation of Labor in 1902. The Chicago Board of Education opposed the union, and eventually required teachers to sign yellow-dog contracts, which in effect prohibited employees from joining unions. The CTF contested

the action, but in 1917 the Illinois Supreme Court upheld the action.

In 1916, eight local teachers' associations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and formed the American Federation of Teachers. The main impetus for forming the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) was the dissatisfaction of certain educators with the NEA's approach, or lack of approach, in handling teachers' grievances.

The NEA underwent a period of growth, organizational consolidation, and developing self-sufficiency from 1920-1960. Although it followed the previous philosophy of the organization, it became less dependent on prominent leaders of the day and became a "smooth, well oiled, faceless machine" (Cresswell, Murphy, and Kerchner, 1980, p. 69). During this time, the NEA continued its approach of persuasion, instead of advocacy. The NEA opposed the AFT and was very critical of the organization's union affiliation, and was responsible for considerable pressure on members of the education sector who belonged to the organization.

When the NEA started its organization changes (1920's) the AFT was struggling for survival. Membership in the AFT was about 10,000 in 1920, but due to pressure from administrators, school boards and the NEA, membership had declined to about 3,500 by 1924. During the next three decades, the AFT continued to struggle, not only for members,

but for identity. This was partly due to the character of its urban locals and also due to its minority status. Another problem that caused considerable concern and membership problems for the AFT, as it did for other labor groups, was the communist scare of the 1940's.

The salaries of teachers suffered during the depression years, with many teachers even losing their jobs. The rebound in the economy during the 1940's did not extend to the education sector to the same degree as other areas and, as a result, teachers became more vocal and wanted their organizations to take more assertive action. The economic conditions were problems for the NEA and AFT and caused both unions internal dissension.

The number of educators joining the AFT increased during the 1950's-1970's, helping to stabilize the union. Some of the reasons for increased growth for the AFT were: in the 1950's Carl Megel's leadership gave stability; the union became more supportive of teacher grievances and concern about pay; the bread and butter unionists of the large urban districts were insisting on more of an advocacy position during the 1960's; and there were successful strikes by certain locals (for example, New York City).

Membership in the NEA also increased during the period from the 1930's to the 1960's. Several of the reasons for increased membership were: a change in direction of purpose,

with more concern for teacher grievances; change in leadership, moving away from administrative groups to teacher-orientated groups; and competition from the AFT, which caused the NEA to seriously reexamine its policies.

The growth periods for the AFT were: from 1916-1920 with an increase in membership from 0.4 percent to 1.4 percent of the teaching force; from 1930-1938, an increase from 0.8 percent to 3.4 percent; from 1942-1946, an increase from 3.0 percent to 4.3 percent; and from 1960 to 1970, an increase from 4.0 percent to 11.3 percent. Since 1970, the membership has increased from 11.3 percent of the organized teaching force to over 19 percent of the force, showing continued gains.

The number of educators joining the NEA during certain periods of time also increased dramatically. Some of the periods showing increases were: from 1916-1922, an increase from 1.3 percent to 16.3 percent of the teaching force; from 1936-1946, an increase from 19.0 to 41 percent. The NEA membership remained fairly stable between the years 1948-1972, with about 53 percent of the teaching force. Between 1972 and today, an increase from 53.4 percent to over 80 percent of the organized teaching force took place.

Teachers' organizations have increased membership to the point that the NEA is now one of the largest unions in the United States, with over 2,000,000 members. The AFT, while not as large, enjoys over 450,000 members and one of its

locals, the AFT of New York City, is the largest union local in the AFL-CIO. The membership for these two teachers' organizations totals about 91 percent of the total teaching force in America (Cresswell, Murphy, & Kerchner, 1980, p. 105).

While the national teacher's organizations have made spectacular gains in membership and influence, the state organizations are still very influential and are still the organizations that are dealing with local issues of collective bargaining. The issues of salary, class size, work load, fringe benefits, teaching assignments, and seniority are issues that either the state or local teachers' associations deal with, although the national association assists in these areas. Some of the more important gains enjoyed by certain teachers associations are: Cicero, Illinois, the first collective bargaining contract for public school teachers (1944); the first representation election was held in a Chicago suburb in 1946; in Pawtucket, Rhode Island (1946), the teachers' organization forced negotiation for salary increases; and in 1959, the legislature in Wisconsin enacted the first comprehensive public sector bargaining law.

Since the 1960's, unionism in the public sector has increased dramatically. The rapid growth of collective bargaining in the public sector during the 1960's can be attributed in large part to President Kennedy's Executive Order 10988 in 1962, and President Nixon's Executive Order

11491, which reinforced the concepts of Kennedy's order. With these orders Federal Employees were extended the right to bargain collectively, and collective bargaining in the public education sector progressed dramatically. Throughout the remainder of the 1960's and the first half of the 1970's, collective bargaining spread at a rapid and consistent pace to the point where, by 1976, approximately 39 percent of all public employees were members of bargaining organizations. Thus, in the space of less than 20 years, public sector unionism developed to the point where it surpassed the level of penetration achieved by unions in the private sector, which is currently around 20 percent.

The Midwest Center of Public Sector Labor Relations (1979) has reported that labor legislation affecting public school employees is progressing and that the process of enacting and amending state statutes on collective bargaining is under consideration in many states. However, Lewin, Ferville, and Kochan (1981) point out that union growth in the public sector has slowed. In the past five years, few states have enacted new laws providing bargaining rights for public employees; instead, most legislative activity has focused on amending existing laws in those states that passed their initial legislation in earlier years. Various reasons have been postulated for this decline, some being: economic conditions, backlash against teacher strikes, demands for

government accountability, political climate, and unemployment rate (Donley, 1977), (Lewin, Ferville, and Kochan, 1981). Cooper (1982) makes a strong case for the position of increased teacher activism. He points out that membership in the NEA and AFT has soared to about 2.5 million, and that the prevailing strategy seems to be one of a dual approach utilizing collective bargaining and political action, at all levels of government.

Collective bargaining within the public education realm varies greatly nationwide. Teachers' rights to bargain collectively range from statutes that guarantee bargaining rights to statutes that prohibit collective bargaining. Many of the states that are reluctant to grant bargaining rights are located in areas where unionism has not been strong, and a number of these states are advocates of right-to-work laws.

A listing of approaches to collective bargaining and the states involved will provide additional insight into the statutory provisions.

Approaches to collective bargaining:

Duty to Bargain	-	33 states and Washington, DC
Meet and Confer	-	1 state
No Statute	-	13 states
Bargaining Prohibited	-	3 states

(Collective Bargaining Quarterly, April, 1984).

Additional information concerning state regulations are provided in Tables 3 and 4, on the following pages.

Review of West Virginia Collective Bargaining Literature

In 1863, the West Virginia Education Association was formed as a professional organization for educators. During this time period (1860's), William R. White, the West Virginia State Superintendent of Schools, addressed the association members at a meeting and told them that they should make teaching the business of their lives, nurture the missionary spirit, and follow their vocation whether or not they were adequately rewarded financially. Many spoke up to oppose that view, and there was consensus only after much debate. The consensus finally arrived at was that teachers were afflicted as much with a hankering after the "mammon of unrighteousness" as other people (Donley, 1976, p. 113).

The early West Virginia Education Association was heavily influenced by administrators, much like the early NEA, and it was not until the late 1960's and early 1970's that teachers and their representatives were able to establish firm control of the organization. Membership in the organization has increased in recent years, and some of the recent goals of the organization have been: limitations on class size; improved retirement system; passage of a

Table 3

STATUTORY OVERVIEW BY STATE
OF TEACHER BARGAINING RIGHTS
(DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCLUDED)

Duty to Bargain	Meet and Confer	No Statute	Prohibited
AK	AL	AZ	NC
CA		AR	TX
CT		CO	VA
DE		GA	
DC		KY	
FL		LA	
HI		MS	
ID		MO	
IL		NM	
IN		SC	
IA		UT	
KS		WV	
ME		WY	
MD			
MA			
MI			
MN			
MT			
NB			
NV			
NH			
NJ			
NY			
ND			
OH			
OK			
OR			
PA			
RI			
SD			
TN			
VT			
WA			
WI			

(NEA, Collective Bargaining Journal, 1984)

Table 4
 STATUTORY OVERVIEW OF STATE
 EDUCATION BARGAINING
 (STRIKE POLICIES)

Teachers	Education Support Personnel
Limited Rights	Limited Rights
AK, HI, IL, MN OH, OR, PA	HI, IL, MN, OH, OR, PA, VT, WI
Penalties	Penalties
AK, FL, IA, MN, NB, NH, NY, PA, SD	FL, LA, MD, MA, NB, NV, NH, NY, OK, PA, WA, WI

(NEA, Collective Bargaining Journal, 1984).

collective bargaining bill for teachers; an increase in salaries; and a revised grievance procedure.

The issue of collective bargaining has been present since the 1930's, as is shown by a State Attorney General's opinion in 1938, which stated that the State Superintendent of Schools was without authority to recognize a labor union as the bargaining agent for employees. The right to bargain collectively has been a controversial issue and has been addressed by State Attorney Generals in 1942, 1956, 1966, and in 1974. All of the interpretations have stated that it is not legal, in West Virginia, for school boards to enter into bargaining agreements with teachers. A 1980 State Supreme Court Decision, the Fairmont Hospital case, also ruled that the right of public employers to refuse to bargain was recognized.

The West Virginia Education Association has placed the collective bargaining issue on a priority level in relation to organizational goals. The association has been able to gather enough support from state legislators to have the collective bargaining bill introduced as possible legislation during the past five legislative sessions. The collective bargaining bill introduced in 1984 gained approval in the State Senate, but it failed to receive approval from the House of Delegates. The other bargaining bills introduced, including the one in 1985, were not reported out of

committees in order to be considered by both legislative bodies. Despite these setbacks, all indications are that the collective bargaining bill will again be a priority item of the West Virginia Education Association during the 1986-1987 legislative session.

Related Literature Review

One of the earliest studies to determine the attitudes of teachers and principals toward collective action was by Patrick W. Carlton (1966). The study was implemented through the use of two attitude-measuring devices, the Collective Action Scale, developed by Carlton, and Kerlinger's Education Scale I. The population for the study included all North Carolina teachers and principals. The total sample size was 1249, with 845 usable responses obtained. The data were analyzed by the Pearson Product-Moment correlation.

The findings and conclusions of the study were:

1. A low but significant correlation between attitudes toward collective action and progressivism in education.
2. No significant relationship between ideas dealing with collective action and traditionalism.
3. Male teachers were more favorable to collective action than female teachers.
4. Female teachers tended to be neutral on the subject of collective negotiations.
5. Male teachers were more favorable to collective action than male principals.

6. Male principals were less negative toward collective action than female principals.
7. Male and female teachers showed similar attitudinal patterns toward progressive educational ideas and toward traditional educational ideas.
8. Male principals were found to be more progressive than female principals in their educational beliefs.
9. Attitudes of the educators toward progressive educational thought apparently were not significantly affected by positions of employment.
10. Male and female teachers were found to be more traditional in their educational philosophies than male and female principals.
11. The respondents showed a degree of inconsistency in their replies on the progressivism and traditionalism scales, perhaps indicating the lack of a single educational philosophy.

Carlton's work is also important from the standpoint of serving as the basis for additional research by other investigators into the area of collective bargaining.

A study conducted in South Carolina examined attitudes of teachers toward the use of collective bargaining actions, and certain respondent characteristics. The study revealed that there were significant relationships between teacher attitudes toward one of the collective bargaining actions, strikes, and the following characteristics: sex, race, dissatisfaction, and years of teaching experience. The research also indicated that there was a significant relationship between attitudes toward collective bargaining and age (Towers, 1969).

Two contradicting studies were completed in Michigan. The studies considered certain demographic information in relation to attitudes toward collective action. Some of the demographic variables considered were: sex, education, teaching experience (years), marital status, age, and teacher organizational membership. Although the studies did not include all the same demographic characteristics, there was considerable overlap. Marguardt (1969) found no significant relationship, while Phelps (1970) found a significant relationship between these variables and attitudinal differences.

The purpose of a study in the state of Washington was to investigate the relationship between selected demographic variables and the attitudes of Washington's public school teachers toward collective bargaining. Results of the investigation revealed that there were significant relationships between the attitudes of the respondents toward the concept of collective bargaining and certain demographic variables. The demographic variables that proved significant were: sex, marital status, education, teaching experience, teaching level, and professional affiliation (Peterson, 1972).

Miskel (1974) stated the purpose of his study was to predict and compare the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward the legitimacy of including issues on

the negotiation agenda. The research considered the significance of certain demographic variables in relation to teacher and administrator attitudes toward the negotiations process. The demographic variables considered were: age, sex, experience and marital status. Certain attitudinal variables were also considered, which included: primary life interests, satisfaction, voluntarism, aspiration, and teacher association support.

A Collective Negotiations Index was developed to measure the level of agreement toward specific bargaining issues. The index developed contained 49 items, with a five-category Likert-type response scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A random sample of 1,075 certified employees from the State of Kansas were included in the study. The response rate to the questionnaire was 79.7 percent, with 771 teachers and 76 administrators responding. The data received was treated by the statistical procedure, multiple stepwise regression.

The findings indicated that the demographic and attitudinal variables were poor predictors of the relative legitimacy that educators place on bargaining issues. However, the observation by Krist (1970) that teacher organizations are primarily concerned with a narrow scope of negotiation issues, could perhaps be generalized to teachers in this study. The differences between the attitudes of

teachers and administrators indicates that there is a probability of continued conflict in the negotiations process.

In order to investigate factors useful for predicting faculty attitude toward collective bargaining in higher education, Gress (1976) identified certain potential explanatory variables. These variables were: perceptions of potential bargaining issues; organizations affiliated with; perceptions of organizations as bargaining agents; age; highest degree earned; higher education experience; employing institution; current appointment status; professorial rank held; tenure status; level of compensation; discipline; professional activity; and marital status. The study investigated the nature of multivariate relationships between the attitude measure used as criterion and the 14 predictor measures taken as a group.

The questionnaire used asked college professors to supply response data to items relevant to the criterion and predictor measures. A Likert-type scale was developed for items, with positive or greater responses scored at the higher ends of the respective continua and negative or lesser responses scored at the lower ends. Questionnaires were distributed to 1,588 faculty members at three higher-level education institutions in Ohio. The response rate was 41 percent from the first institution, 66 percent from the

second, and 37 percent from the third. Correlation coefficients were used to indicate strength and significance of the relationships; the multiple regression procedure was utilized with the collective bargaining attitude measure as criterion variable with all 14 potential predictors.

Results obtained indicate that four of the relationships were significant at the .001 level, these being: perception of issues, professorial rank, tenure status, and institutional compensation. Five of the relationships were significant at the .01 level of significance, these were: organizations affiliated with, highest earned degree, higher education experience, employing institution, and professional activity.

Richard B. Peterson (1976) conducted a cross-cultural study of secondary school teachers' attitudes regarding job satisfaction, professionalism, and collective negotiations in Sweden and the State of Washington. In this study, Peterson used a five-part questionnaire to ascertain the attitudes of the participants toward the selected dependent variables. The investigation of teachers' attitudes for both locations used similar formats. The questionnaire consisted of the following sections:

- a. background questions on the respondents, including sex, age, marital status, teaching level, educational level, teaching experience, professional affiliation, and occupational background of fathers.

- b. questions of job satisfaction based upon the major dimensions of the Purdue Teachers Opinionnaire.
- c. questions on professionalism based upon the major elements suggested by the literature.
- d. questions on collective negotiations adapted from earlier research.
- e. questions dealing with overall assessments of attitudes and interrelationships among the three variables.

The attitudinal sections used a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from minimum to maximum opportunity to satisfy the given element.

The portions of the questionnaire that dealt with attitudes asked the teachers to respond in terms of "how much is there" and "how much should there be" for each element. Mean scores were calculated for the first measure. The study also utilized the subtractive method developed by Porter and Lawler, whereby the level of satisfaction is determined by subtracting the second measure from the first measure.

The overall response rate was in excess of 50 percent, with 318 Washington and 308 Swedish responses usable. The results indicated that two background characteristics (age and teaching experience) accounted for significant correlations on the separate responses for both groups, using Pearson Product Moment correlations.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Governor's Study Commission (1978) completed 18 months of work, including holding hearings on collective bargaining in

the public education sector. It was decided to study the attitudes and opinions of those involved in and directly affected by collective bargaining in the public schools. The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) and study commission developed an opinionnaire for distribution to five categories of respondents in each of the 504 operating school districts--the superintendent, school board president, teacher bargaining unit head, a parent representative and a student representative. The 53-item survey form was sent to 2,520 participants, with a total of 1,805 replies returned. The overall return was 72 percent.

The PDE completed a computer analysis on the data, using the chi-square analysis for significance of comparisons. The comparison of responses from districts where strikes have occurred with districts with no strikes showed that relatively few statistically significant variations existed. Results indicated that there were significant differences between the perceptions of teachers and all other participating groups on more than half the items. This was also true of students compared to teachers, superintendents and board members.

Further analysis of the data showed that certain pairs of respondents were in close agreement on many of the items. Overall, superintendents and school board presidents responded similarly to the issues presented. In about 75

percent of the issues, parents and students responded congruently, and in over 60 percent of the cases, school board presidents and parents responded in similar fashion. The students' and superintendents' responses were not significantly different in over 50 percent of the issues presented. There were four areas in which all categories of respondents significantly agreed. These areas are: usefulness of fact finding; effectiveness of mediation services by the Department of Labor and Industry; need to revise the bargaining calendar; and the need to improve in-service training for both negotiating teams.

Research data collected in 1969 were used as the basis of this research report (Jessup, 1978) and was previously reported by Jessup in 1971. The study concerns the growth of teacher militancy in six suburban New York school districts. The purpose of the study was to inquire into relationships among teachers' interests in autonomy, powerlessness and union participation, exploring the conditions under which they are related.

The data were gathered by a self-administered questionnaire sent to classroom teachers in grades 1-12. The questionnaires were sent to 452 teachers, with a response rate of 55 percent being obtained. Results of the study indicate that age, sex, level of graduate training and liberalism are significantly related to the dependent

variables, union membership, activism and militancy. The data also indicates that teachers' motives for participating in unions were highly related to concerns for improving educational services.

Feyerherm and Muchinsky (1978) report a study concerning the impact that several structural and attitudinal factors had on the process of collective negotiations between Iowa public school teachers and their respective school boards. Sixty-one Iowa school districts were chosen from a possible 272 districts, based on criteria selected for the study.

Superintendents and teachers in the selected districts were asked to complete a questionnaire that dealt with structural aspects of bargaining, and with attitudinal questions regarding preferences for the chief negotiators and the perceived role of communication. The chi-square test was used to analyze the results in relation to the projected hypotheses. The findings indicated that teachers and superintendents have significantly different attitudes about negotiations. Superintendents felt that collective negotiations are not beneficial to the educational process while teachers felt the opposite. Most teachers preferred an internal chief negotiator for the school board, while most superintendents preferred an external chief negotiator for the school board.

This study compares teacher attitudes in the Cumberland County and Putman County, Tennessee public school systems. The purpose of the study was to compare attitudes of teachers to a 16-item questionnaire before and after collective bargaining activities. Changes were noted on five items in the survey. Other items showed no change in attitudes, or attitude change in only one school system. Few generalizations were possible from the data. The researcher's intent was to gauge teachers' feelings about job satisfaction, interpersonal trust, organizational commitment and career satisfaction (Fields and Reddick, 1979).

In examining the effects of collective bargaining environments on the hiring of school principals, 66 school districts were selected from five states, providing equal samples from collective bargaining environments and from environments without collective bargaining. The purpose of the survey was to determine if small or medium-size school districts that engage in collective bargaining will hire significantly more outsiders as principals. The findings revealed positive relationships between outsider principal selection and collective bargaining environments. Behavior perceptions of administrative staff were also significantly different in bargaining and nonbargaining districts (Caldwell, Curfman, 1979).

This study assessed teachers' affective states in relation to prediction of teacher contract negotiations. The survey was conducted to analyze and quantify teachers' feelings of professional role deprivation and attitudinal militancy and to assess the relationship between the two. Questionnaires were sent to a selected portion of Alberta (Canada) teachers. Results indicated significant relationships between professional role deprivation feelings and political activism, strikes, and militancy. A major conclusion was that in the survey period there was very little attitudinal militancy among Alberta teachers (Fris, 1979).

In 1979 a study was started to assess the attitudes of Virginia's public school teachers towards collective negotiations. The survey included 2,039 members of the Virginia Education Association. Based on the findings, an overwhelming majority of teachers were disposed favorably toward collective bargaining. This conclusion was based on responses to statements designed to indicate favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward collective bargaining. The male, young, secondary school teacher was more favorably inclined to collective bargaining than any other group. Years of experience and age accounted for the greatest difference in scores, with the older, experienced teachers more conservative in their attitudes toward collective

bargaining in comparison with younger teachers (Carlton and Johnson, 1979).

The perceptions of 2,056 teachers, principals, central office personnel, and superintendents, in relation to participation in decision-making were considered in a study by Freeman (1980). The survey, conducted in Tennessee, also considered satisfaction in relation to six decision categories and attitudes toward unionization. Teachers' self-perceptions of participation in policy decision-making generally were at lower levels than comparison groups. Satisfaction with decision-making was moderately high for all respondents, with principals indicating the highest satisfaction levels overall. All respondent groups indicated a moderate to high willingness to participate in collective bargaining, with teachers having the highest militancy levels. Correlation between satisfaction, participation, and militancy implied that there are ingredients other than participation in key decisions that affect teachers' satisfaction levels and a willingness to unionize.

Respondents in this study were asked to agree or disagree with five statements, each presenting in simplified form a position on one of the major issues in the contract negotiations held between the Chicago Teachers Union and the Chicago Board of Education. Administrators and teachers essentially agreed on ten issues relating to contract

provisions affecting teachers and administrators similarly, and disagreed over 15 items that appeared to encroach on the control of principals and superintendents over school administration (Stewart, 1980).

A survey instrument was administered to members of Virginia's School Boards in 1981, in order to collect information regarding their attitudes toward collective bargaining and coercive action. The results indicated that the school board members held significantly more conservative views regarding collective bargaining than teachers (Carlton and Johnson, 1980).

This investigation dealt with faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining, utilizing a scale previously developed by Bigoness. The survey was conducted with 225 faculty members and administrators, with the respondents' choices formatted according to the Bigoness scale. The independent variable included two measures of job satisfaction and demographic variables of rank, salary, years of employment and age. From the sample correlations for both men and women and for men alone, five of the six best predictors of ACB were attitudinal/perceptual, with salary being the exception. For females, none of the variables correlated significantly with ACB. For both the total sample and for men alone, the three statistically significant predictors were, in order, a measure of job satisfaction, a perceptual measure (Internal

Orientation), and one demographic variable, salary (Grossnickle, 1980).

Selinger (1980) did a resurvey of secondary teachers in Ontario, Canada to see if attitudes toward collective bargaining and sanctions had changed since a 1973-1974 study. An attitudinal scale was designed to elicit emotional responses rather than responses which were the product of an experience and association of the respondents to the topic under study. Guilford (1954) states that there is a positive correlation between what people say on a subject and what they will do about it. The design and methodology employed are a partial replication of studies done by Carlton (1979) and Fisher (1967), with the statistical analyses differing.

The questionnaire contained 30 items, 15 indicating agreement with the collective bargaining concept, and 15 indicating opposition to the concept. The survey instrument also requested biographical information about each teacher, with each respondent requested to indicate: age, marital status, years lived in Ontario, education, years of teaching experience, and geographic area in which teaching. Three hundred and sixty-three questionnaires were distributed, with a return rate of 82.64 percent.

The overall result of the data showed a decrease in teacher militancy with regard to the issue of collective negotiations and use of sanctions. The only significant

predictor of militancy toward the issue of collective negotiations was sex. Males were more militant than females. With regard to the use of sanctions, two predictors were identified, sex and years of residency in Ontario.

Data were collected by Greer and Brown (1982) concerning the attitudes of teachers in Oklahoma City toward unions and strikes. The survey was conducted following an illegal strike and involved 150 teachers who were drawn from a list of 2,250 full-time teachers in the Oklahoma City public school system. The response rate obtained from the survey was 55 percent.

Attitudinal measures of the respondents were measured using a five-interval Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The analysis of variance revealed that the only significance was that younger teachers, relative to older teachers, attribute more power to unions. Conclusions of the study were that younger teachers, males and union members had more positive attitudes toward the service provided by unions.

A 1983 study involved the collection of data from the Virginia school systems concerning incidences of teacher activism in the areas of public appeals, concerted group actions, political actions, and job actions from 1976-1982. The results showed that activism among Virginia's teachers

had more than doubled in five years (Richards and Carlton, 1983).

In order to determine if changes had occurred since his 1977 survey, Carlton conducted a follow-up study. His 1983 survey consisted of 2,081 members of the Virginia Education Association with 60 percent of the sample responding. The survey instrument utilized contained five scales, which were: collective negotiations/political activism; merit pay; stress; Virginia Education Association Services; and strikes. The respondents were somewhat older when compared to the former study, and had more years of teaching experience. The results indicated that the commitment of teachers in Virginia to the passage of a collective bargaining law has remained constant. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the study was the increase in support for collective action.

In 1975, the California Legislature enacted its collective bargaining act for public school teachers known as Senate Bill 160, or the Rodda Act. Speck (1984) conducted a study of California high school principals to determine the effect of collective bargaining on their role as principals.

A 35-question survey was sent to 198 high school principals, on a random basis. An 87 percent response rate was obtained from the survey. The response scale was set from (0) unable to judge, to (5) great, for the respondent

to answer how they felt collective bargaining had affected their role in relation to the included items.

The principals who responded thought that collective bargaining had affected them most in the following areas: scheduling and assigning; supervising; evaluations; maintaining personnel files and records; recommending dismissal of teachers; teacher transfers; developing and maintaining extra and co-curricular activities; resolving teacher grievances; and fulfilling the principal's role.

There were no significant differences in the perceptions of high school principals based on size of the school district, years of service, union or nonunion environment, or percentage of union membership in economic areas. There was a significant relationship between the medium percentage of union membership in economic areas and the California Teacher Association affiliates as well as the medium-sized districts.

Summary

The history of collective bargaining can be traced from early colonial times to the present. Collective bargaining between managers and craft unions has been occurring for more than two centuries. The development of collective bargaining did not occur for employees who were mainly unskilled laborers until the early 1800's. It was not until 1834 that

the first attempt occurred to form a national organization of labor, the National Trades' Union (Beal and Begin, 1982, p. 77). The Civil War was a main catalyst for intensifying the early trends toward unionization, as there was a demand for goods that only methods of mass production could provide.

Collective bargaining and unionization efforts were, and still are controversial. This is evident from the violence that has often been associated with unionization, for example: Homestead Steel Strike; Pullman Strike; McCormick Reaper Works; and the violence that has been (and still is) associated with the coal mining industry. The issue of collective bargaining and the demands of unions are concerns of the state and federal governments. Through the concept of public interest, numerous attempts have been made to balance the interests of those for and against unionization, one of the first examples being the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890. The issue of collective bargaining in the public sector has been dealt with by various state and federal laws, and court proceedings. The right of workers to unionize in the public sector has been established, but not without controversy.

Efforts at organizing in the public education sector were present as early as the 1840's, as is evidenced by the advent of state teachers' associations. These organizations, and the early National Educational Association, were not

actively involved in organized efforts to upgrade teachers' working conditions and pay through collective bargaining actions, but relied more on persuasion. The NEA and many of the state organizations were controlled primarily by school administrators and college presidents. The earliest attempts to affiliate teachers' organizations with organized labor were not successful until 1902, when the Chicago Teachers' Federation voted to affiliate with the Chicago Federation of Labor.

In 1916, eight local teachers' associations met, due in part to dissatisfaction with the NEA's course of action, and formed the American Federation of Teachers. This organization, while not enjoying the growth of the NEA, has grown in membership and is representative of the changing direction in public education bargaining.

The real gains in collective bargaining have occurred on the state levels, as education is generally recognized as a state mandate, and most laws concerning collective bargaining in the public education sector are implemented on the state level. Efforts to gain collective bargaining rights for members of the public education sector in West Virginia are characteristic of this trend and have had political implications, which were recently evident in state elections.

Research in the area of collective bargaining has revealed differences in attitudes between various groups, and has identified several demographic variables that have proven significant. Examples of groups significantly differing on the subject of collective bargaining are: teachers, school administrators, school board presidents, parents, and students. Several demographic variables have also been identified as being significantly related to attitudes toward collective bargaining, some of these being: sex, age, years of teaching experience, social class, political affiliation, religious preference, professional affiliation, and highest earned degree.

Chapter Three

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

This study is designed to investigate whether significant variances exist among the attitudes of educational leaders in West Virginia toward collective bargaining and what influences certain demographic variables might have as predictors of attitudes. This chapter describes the research methodology selected for the study, identifies the target population and sampling technique, discusses the survey instrument, describes the collection of data, and explains the data analysis procedures.

Survey research was utilized in this study for the purpose of obtaining an accurate assessment of relationships between certain sociological and psychological variables. The sociological variables include attributes of individuals that spring from their membership in social groups. Some examples are: sex, income, political and religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, education, age, living expenses, occupation, and race. The psychological variables include opinions and attitudes on the one hand, and behavior on the other (Kerlinger, 1973).

Studies, such as this one, that use the context of ongoing phenomena to answer questions about general concerns

relating to education make up descriptive research. The significance of the descriptive research approach is evidenced by the attention to those questions that can best be answered by studying present conditions through comparison, contrast, and analysis of relationships. This approach seeks to answer those questions about the present state of affairs which have implications beyond the limits of the subjects or other elements studied (Hopkins, 1980).

Target Population--Sampling Technique

The population included in this study consists of educational leaders from West Virginia. These educational leaders consist of the following: (1) Presidents of County Education Associations; (2) Presidents of County Elementary Principals Associations; (3) Presidents of County School Boards; (4) Presidents of County School Service Personnel Associations; (5) Presidents of County Secondary School Principals Associations; (6) Presidents of State Colleges and Universities; (7) State Elected and Appointed Officials; and (8) Superintendents of County School Systems.

In order to construct the listing of those individuals who are members of the population considered, the researcher contacted the West Virginia State Department of Education, requesting a listing of the names and addresses of individuals needed for this study. The organizations that

had members included in this study were also contacted for desired information. Another very valuable source for obtaining information of the population included in the study was the West Virginia Directory, which was provided by the West Virginia Department of Education. The directory proved to be a most helpful source in securing names and addresses. In those instances where needed information could not be obtained from the sources previously listed, phone calls were made to county school systems in order to secure the desired information. The information obtained by these methods enabled the researcher to obtain a complete listing of the population considered for this study.

Preliminary indications placed the total number of members in the target population to be 353. One member of the population, a county school superintendent, was excluded due to familiarity with the study, and one position, president of a county education association, was vacant. The total for the population considered was 351.

If a random sampling method had been used for selecting participants, the number needed to be representative of the population considered would have been 186 (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). Hopkins recommends using as large a sample as possible, as most questions about sample size involve the differences between a sample's data and the characteristic values of its population (Hopkins, 1980). The survey

instrument was sent to all 351 members of the population considered in this study.

Development of Survey Instrument and Research Design

The survey instrument developed was sent to the selected population, with the format, instructions and cover letters in identical form. The one-page demographic portion of the survey instrument was designed to collect the following information:

sex	ethnic group
age	place of birth
marital status	years lived in West Virginia
political preference	family's total income
religious preference	social class membership
contract status	militant friends
employment status	union status of spouse
level of higher education	union status of mother
years of employment	union status of father
employment affiliation	occupational status of father

(size of school district was obtained from the State Department of Education and assigned to respondents)

The sociological variables listed enabled assessments to be developed in relation to the psychological variables present.

A two-page collective bargaining survey was used to determine the attitudes of educational leaders in West Virginia toward collective bargaining as delineated by this research survey. The survey utilized was constructed after a review of instruments developed by Carlton in 1966 and Walker in 1984.

Carlton's scale consisted of a 30-item, Likert-type scale designed to elicit attitudes of educators toward collective action by teachers. Each of Carlton's statements contained in the scale was designed for respondents to make their responses on a scale from 5 to 1. Statements indicating a favorable response to collective negotiations were assigned a weight of 5, indicating a "strongly agree" response. A weight of 3 indicated an "undecided" response, and a weight of 1 indicated a "strongly disagree" response. The assignment of weights was reversed for statements not favorable to collective negotiations.

Walker's collective action survey was adapted from Carlton's original work. The 30 statements were expanded to 48 in order to include additional topics that were felt to be timely topics in relation to the areas being researched. The statements were designed so that half would be favorable to collective action and half unfavorable. This precaution helped ensure that the response set was controlled as a potential biasing variable. "The advantage of having both kinds of statements represented in the final scale is to minimize possible response sets of subjects that might be generated if only favorable or unfavorable statements were included in the scale" (Edwards, 1957, p. 155).

The survey instrument developed by Walker was field-tested in Prince William County, Virginia. The 48

randomly organized statements were evaluated by the respondents, using a four-point Likert-type scale similar to Carlton's, except for response number 3, "undecided," which was omitted. The reliability rating yielded a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .93 which indicated that substantial confidence can be placed in the internal consistency of the survey instrument (Walker, 1984).

The questionnaire developed for this survey is an adaptation of Walker's instrument. Originally, a survey instrument was developed which contained questions similar to those found in Walker's study and a number of other studies, for example: Carlton, 1966; Gilson, 1982; Peterson, 1976; Slavin, 1982-1983; and the West Virginia University Faculty-Staff Survey, March 1972. However, with the internal consistency, the high reliability rating, and the similar type of questions included, the instrument developed by Walker was used with minor adaptations. These minor adaptations consisted of changing the wording of certain questions so that they applied to the State of West Virginia instead of Virginia and to make the questions relevant to the groups included in the study, instead of teachers only. The content of the questions was not changed, nor was the basic format.

The questionnaire consists of 48 questions, with a Likert-type scale, which respondents were requested to answer

with one of the following: (1) "Strongly Agree"; (2) "Agree"; (3) "Disagree"; and (4) "Strongly Disagree." The respondents were directed to circle the appropriate number that corresponded to their choice. The questionnaire was designed with the statements divided, 24 questions being favorable toward collective bargaining, and 24 negative toward the bargaining concept. The weight assigned to the answer scale was reversed for those questions that were negative toward the collective bargaining concept.

Data Collection

The survey instrument was sent to the 351 members of the population selected, and it contained the following information: the demographic questionnaire; the collective bargaining survey; a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey and containing general information; and a stamped self-addressed envelope (see Appendix C).

The demographic portion of the survey instrument was coded, so that those who failed to respond could be readily identified. The following format, which lists the groups included in the study, was used to distribute the collective bargaining survey instrument:

Presidents of County Education Associations	... 54 surveyed
Presidents of County Elementary Principals Associations	... 55 surveyed
Presidents of County School Boards	... 55 surveyed
Presidents of County School Service Personnel Associations	... 55 surveyed

Presidents of County Secondary School Principals Associations	... 55 surveyed
Presidents of State Colleges and Universities	... 15 surveyed
State Elected and Appointed Officials	... 8 surveyed
Includes: Chancellor, WV Board of Regents	
Executive Secretary, WV School Service Personnel Association	
President, WV Association of Elementary School Principals	
President, WV Board of Regents	
President, WV Education Association	
President, WV Secondary School Principals Commission	
President, WV Board of Education	
WV State Superintendent of Schools	
Superintendents of County School Systems	... 54 surveyed

Members of the population being considered were assured of confidentiality in regard to their names not being placed on the questionnaires, and in regard to their responses. The purpose of coding was for a follow-up on non-respondents, and for comparison purposes in relation to group membership. The positions included in the survey that contained only a few respondents were not utilized in a manner that would allow identification of a particular individual.

When the surveys were mailed, those receiving the survey instrument were requested to return their responses within ten days. A follow-up request was mailed to the non-respondents, encouraging them to please respond as their opinion needed to be included in the study being conducted. If a response was not received, the respondent's position was marked, and the non-respondent was again contacted. When contacted on the third occasion, the request was again made to please respond, and the importance of their response was

again stated, along with the assurance of confidentiality. When the second cover letter was sent, the non-respondent also received a copy of the survey instrument, a form indicating reasons for not responding, which could be completed if desired, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Those non-respondents who did not complete any information on the second request were again sent a follow-up letter, including all related material provided previously. If there was still no response, phone calls were made in an attempt to secure the needed information.

Responses to mail questionnaires are generally poor. Returns of less than 40 or 50 percent are common in mail surveys (Kerlinger, 1973). Babbie prescribes a very conservative set of figures for rate of return; 50 percent is adequate for analysis and reporting; 60 percent is good; and 70 percent is very good (Hopkins, 1980).

After all follow-up contacts were made, a 78 percent usable return rate was obtained. Although the goal of 100 percent could not be obtained, the return rate exceeds the 50 percent ratio that Kerlinger reports as common, and also is in excess of the 70 percent that Babbie reports as very good.

Data Analysis

When respondents returned the survey instruments, they were checked for accuracy and completeness. Any items not completed correctly were noted. Those questionnaires that were returned without the requested demographic information were discarded. In the event that the questionnaire was not complete but usable, the missing response was properly coded and the information included in the results.

The data received were analyzed to determine if there were significant differences between attitudes of the eight selected groups and the dependent variable, collective bargaining. This was accomplished by an analysis of variance, with the post hoc test, Scheffe, utilized to determine which of the groups were significantly different.

Demographic variables were analyzed using the one-way analysis of variance, in order to determine if significant relationships existed between the independent variables, when taken alone, and attitudes toward collective bargaining. The Scheffe procedure was selected to identify significant differences between groups contained in the demographic variables, in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining.

The statistical procedure, multiple regression, was employed for the purpose of determining if selected demographic variables, when taken together, were effective

predictors of the criterion variable, scale score. The .05 level of significance was selected for use with the multiple regression and all other statistical procedures used in relation to this study.

Chapter Four

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter is designed to provide a description and interpretation of the data obtained for this study. It contains information concerning the returns, an examination of the Demographic Questionnaire, and the Collective Bargaining Survey. The statistical procedures used for interpretation purposes are also included. Summaries of results obtained and comparisons of groups are also included in tables.

Target Population

The population included in this study consisted of the Educational Leaders of the West Virginia Public Education Sector, as defined in the definitions (Chapter 3). The number, if all members had been included, would have been 353. However, due to a vacancy existing in one position and familiarity with the study by one individual (which had a biasing possibility), the number available for inclusion was 351. As most questions about sample size involve the differences between a sample's data and the characteristic values of its population (Hopkins, 1980), it was decided that the entire population would be canvassed in order to provide

as large a sample as possible, which ensures that the characteristic value of the population is maintained.

Non-Responses

The time frame for the study was to be May, 1985 to September, 1985. However, due to a poor response rate on the original distribution of the questionnaire and the follow-up request, the time frame was adjusted. The time frame was lengthened, with questionnaires again sent to the population in November, 1985, with additional follow-up requests sent in order to obtain a total response set. Despite these efforts, and phone calls to non-respondents, the goal of a 100 percent response was not possible. The original questionnaire response and follow-up effort resulted in a 60 percent return rate, with 51 percent being usable information. The second questionnaire distribution and follow-up requests increased the return rate to 89 percent (counting non-responses), with 78 percent of the survey instruments in acceptable form for inclusion in the study.

Typical responses of non-respondents as to why they did not return the survey instrument were:

1. I did not want to take the time necessary to complete.
2. Subject was of no interest to me.

3. Subject was of a controversial nature, and I do not want involved.
4. My association answers for me in this area.
5. My time is valuable, and I do not waste it on answering surveys.
6. I do not like to participate in answering surveys.
7. I am afraid that my answers may be identifiable, and, considering the political nature of the survey questions, I prefer not to answer.

When non-respondents who failed to return the non-response survey form were telephoned, the usual responses were: "I just didn't want to answer, and I prefer not to discuss it," "I am just too busy," "If I had wanted to participate in your survey, I would have returned it," and "I was afraid my answers would be identified and I didn't want that to happen; my answers might not be what my association supports."

The non-respondent population was comparable to the ratio of the respondent population in relation to sexual gender. The various groups involved in the survey were also comparably represented in the non-respondent population. Based on the follow-up information obtained, it was determined that the non-respondent sample did not contain any characteristics that would be considered potential biasing factors.

Research Question One

In this portion of the study, the attitudes of West Virginia Educational Leaders toward collective bargaining are considered. The attitudes, pro and con, are presented for the various groups, and the question of whether there is a significant difference in attitudes among groups is investigated.

The educational leaders (351) who were included in this study returned 275 usable responses. There were 38 respondents who indicated that they were not willing to participate in the study through either phone call follow-ups, or by return of the form provided for non-response. A Likert-type scale was used for the survey, which contained 48 questions that were designed to obtain responses dealing with 24 areas concerning education and the concept of collective bargaining. The participants were requested to respond to the questions by using one of the following categories: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The following items included on the survey were designed as reciprocal statements, and the responses to these areas are indicative of the respondents' positions concerning the concept of collective bargaining (see Table 5 and Appendix A).

Teachers' Organizations and Hiring Practices (1, 20)

Seventy-nine percent of those responding indicated that teachers' organizations should not participate in the hiring of new teachers. Presidents of the county education associations had the lowest percentage (56 percent) indicating that teachers' organizations should not participate in hiring. In relation to the teachers' organizations seeking to regulate the standards for the hiring of new teachers, 69 percent of the respondents felt that the teachers' organizations should not regulate standards for the hiring of new teachers. The two groups indicating strongest support of organizational regulation were the presidents of the county education associations and the presidents of the county school service personnel associations (59 percent and 58 percent, respectively). Superintendents of county school systems accounted for 16 percent of the 69 percent that were not supportive of the regulation concept.

Type of Service, Representation for Members (2, 40)

There were 63 percent of the respondents who felt that teachers' organizations should not serve members in a fashion similar to labor unions. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents indicated that the teachers' organizations should be more like professional organizations, such as the American

Medical Association, than like trade unions. On both items, 2 and 40, the presidents of county education associations had the highest percentage of support for teachers' organizations serving members more like unions.

Teacher Options in Securing Goals (3, 10)

Only one group, presidents of county education associations, indicated that teachers should withhold services or strike if they could not obtain desired goals from school boards (58 percent). In contrast, 78 percent of those responding were in opposition to teachers withholding services when satisfactory agreements could not be obtained, and 82 percent opposed teachers striking to enforce their demands.

Threat of Withholding Services, and Strikes, as Part of the Collective Bargaining Process (4, 8)

The majority, 77 percent, felt that the threat of teachers withholding services should be omitted from the collective bargaining process, and 81 percent agreed that strikes on the part of teachers were an undesirable consequence of collective bargaining. For both concepts, withholding services and strikes, 54 percent of the presidents of county education associations indicated they were supportive of these methods. Superintendents of county

school systems had the highest percent in opposition to the two concepts (86 percent), with the second highest percent in opposition to the two concepts being presidents of county boards of education (85 percent).

Right to Bargain Collectively and Union Membership (5, 39)

Fifty-four percent of those responding opposed teachers being able to bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary. However, two groups were supportive of teachers being able to bargain collectively for working conditions and salary; these groups and the percentage of support for the concept were the presidents of county education associations (98 percent), and the presidents of county secondary school principals associations (51 percent). Forty-six percent of the respondents did not feel that a professional educator could be a member of a union. The group that contained the highest percentage believing that a professional educator cannot be a union member was the presidents of county school boards (64 percent).

Censure Through Media Sources (6, 24)

A majority of the respondents, 71 percent, supported the idea that teachers' organizations should publicize unfair school board practices through media sources. Fifty-six percent of the respondents also agreed that censure by use

of the mass media was a legitimate technique for teachers to use. The group that had the highest percentage of opposition to teachers using media sources for censure purposes was the presidents of county boards (64 percent).

Collective Bargaining, Conspiracy or Greater Order (7, 29)

A large majority of respondents (83 percent) did not feel that collective bargaining by teachers was a conspiracy against the country. In relation to collective bargaining bringing greater order to education, 73 percent of those responding did not support the position that collective bargaining could bring greater order and system to education.

Militant Teachers' Groups and Leaders' Characteristics (9, 19)

Most of the respondents, 64 percent, rejected the idea that militant teachers' groups are made up of malcontents and misfits. Only one group, presidents of county school boards, was supportive of the statement concerning the make up of militant teachers' groups. However, 68 percent of the respondents rejected the conjecture that leaders in the drive for collective bargaining are sincere power seekers with the best interests of education at heart. There was only one group, presidents of county education associations (85 percent), that responded favorably toward the statement that

leaders in the drive for collective bargaining are sincere power seekers with the best interests of education at heart.

Teachers' Salaries (11, 35)

A minority of respondents, 42 percent, believed that good teachers could always get the salary they need without resorting to collective bargaining. The group that had the largest percent of members who felt that teachers could always get the salary they need without resorting to collective bargaining was presidents of county service personnel associations (69 percent). In regard to the statement that collective bargaining would result in improved salaries for teachers, 62 percent of the respondents did not feel that collective bargaining would result in higher salaries. Only one group, presidents of county education associations, had a majority (93 percent) indicating that collective bargaining would result in higher salaries.

Perception of Teacher Involvement (12, 37)

The majority of respondents, 58 percent, did not agree that collective bargaining was beneath the dignity of teachers. While indicating that collective bargaining was not beneath the dignity of teachers, a large percentage (75) did not feel that collective bargaining would enhance the status of the teaching profession. Only one group, presidents of

county education associations, answered favorably (93 percent) that collective bargaining would bring more status to the teaching profession.

Utilization of Protest Devices (13, 22)

Most respondents (76 percent) agreed that using strikes, sanctions, and boycotts were improper procedures for public school employees to use when dissatisfied with conditions of employment. Only the presidents of county education associations disagreed with the majority position. The belief that sanctions are a step forward in regard to teacher self-discipline and an effective educational program was supported by only 36 percent of the respondents.

Professional Ethics and Organizational Cohesiveness (14, 16)

Seventy-six percent of the educational leaders responding felt that if teachers withheld their services they were violating professional ethics and trust. Only the group, presidents of county education associations, indicated that they believed teachers can withhold their services without violating professional ethics and trust. A majority of respondents, 69 percent, indicated that they did not think that the collective bargaining process can help to unite the teaching profession into a cohesive body.

Traditional Control of Education (15, 25)

Of the groups responding, 67 percent of the respondents thought that collective bargaining was chipping away at local control of education. The only group that believed that collective bargaining was not eroding local control was the presidents of county education associations. Seventy-two percent of the groups responding also indicated that the only defensible position for a sensible school board to take is that teachers, as public employees, may not strike. The group, presidents of county school boards, was most supportive of the no-strike position.

Consequences of Collective Bargaining (17, 18)

Only 51 percent of the respondents agreed with the statement that collective bargaining may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship by the teachers. Three groups did not agree with the majority position, these groups being: presidents of county education associations, presidents of county secondary school principals associations, and state elected and appointed officials. Of the total participants responding, 32 percent indicated that they believed collective bargaining can provide for greater dignity and independence for teachers in performing their duties.

Imposing Sanctions (21, 27)

The view that teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards was opposed by 57 percent of the respondents. Respondents also indicated, by a 54 percent majority, that sanctions or any other coercive measures used by teachers are completely unprofessional.

Opinions Concerning Sanctions (23, 45)

The opinion, of 32 percent of the respondents, was that sanctions were a means for improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service. The only group with a majority of support for this viewpoint was the presidents of county education associations. Sixty percent of those responding believed that community support of education makes collective bargaining with the threat of sanctions unnecessary. The group most supportive of this position was the presidents of county school service personnel associations.

Influence on Quality Educational Programs (26, 36)

Sixty-nine percent of the educational leaders viewed the public welfare as more essential than the right of teachers to strike. However, a slim majority (51 percent), did not think that collective bargaining would necessarily result in depriving students of a quality education. The three groups

that felt that students could still receive a quality education with the presence of collective bargaining and their percentage of support were: presidents of county education associations, 95 percent; presidents of county secondary school principals associations, 58 percent; and presidents of state colleges and universities, 67 percent.

Shared Decision-Making (28, 34)

Eighty-five percent of the respondents agreed that teachers should have input in the selection and adoption of textbooks and other curricular materials. All eight groups involved in the study were in agreement on the selection issue. Similarly, the responding groups were all in agreement on the statement that the authority to adopt and select textbooks should be shared by teachers and school boards. The percentage of respondents that were supportive of this position (87 percent) indicated strong support for shared authority in this area.

Withholding Services for Benefits (30, 33)

A large proportion, 85 percent, of the respondents did not favor teachers withholding services in order to get desired salaries and benefits. The only group favoring such actions was the presidents of county education associations (55 percent). Seventy-four percent of the respondents were

also against teachers withholding services in order to gain better working conditions.

Attitudes Concerning Withholding Services (31, 47)

A 70 percent response rate was received from respondents who believed that if teachers withheld services their job security would be jeopardized. Only one group, presidents of county education associations, varied from the majority viewpoint about job security, and this group's percentage rate for believing it would not be jeopardized was only 51 percent. Only 8 percent of the respondents indicated that they believed principals would approve of teachers withholding services in order to obtain better working conditions. All responding groups were in agreement as to the viewpoint principals would support.

Salary Scales (32, 41)

Eighty-four percent of those responding agreed that teachers who perform extra duties and have more demanding work loads should receive higher pay. All participating groups were in agreement on this issue. In comparison, only 44 percent of the respondents were in agreement with the statement that teachers with the same number of years of experience in teaching should not receive the same pay.

Working Relationships and Collective Bargaining (38, 43)

The majority of those responding (70 percent) felt that the working relationship between teachers and administrators would be hampered if collective bargaining was instituted. One group, presidents of county education associations, was the only responding group not in agreement with the majority viewpoint. Seventy percent of those responding also felt that differences between teachers and administrators could not be resolved more effectively through the vehicle of collective bargaining.

Salary Received (42, 48)

Fifty-four percent agreed with the statement that for the salary, present teaching positions require an unreasonable work load. The groups that were in agreement with the majority viewpoint were: presidents of county education associations, presidents of county elementary principals associations, presidents of county secondary school principals associations, and presidents of state colleges and universities. In response to the statement, "I think that salaries are reasonable for most present teaching positions": only 26 percent of the respondents agreed with the stated viewpoint. The group, presidents of county school service personnel associations, was the only group that agreed with the statement (56 percent).

Satisfying Teaching Experience (44, 46)

From the data received, all responding groups indicated that teachers enjoy satisfying collegial relationships. Eighty-two percent of those responding indicated support for this viewpoint. When asked for a response to the statement, "I do not think that present teaching positions provide a satisfying teaching experience for teachers," there was a 64 percent response indicating that most respondents believed teaching was a satisfying experience for teachers. However, two groups disagreed with this position, indicating that they did not perceive the job of teaching as providing a satisfying experience. The two groups and the percentage of respondents disagreeing with the majority view were: presidents of county education associations, 69 percent; and presidents of state colleges and universities, 67 percent (see Table 5 and Appendix A).

Analysis of Data

In order to determine the position, pro or con, of the responding groups, a + or - value was assigned each item answered on the Collective Bargaining Surveys that were returned. The results were then totaled for each individual, and, if the majority of answers were +'s or -'s, the individual was assigned either a pro or con position in relation to collective bargaining. If assigned to the +

Table 5

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO KEY CONCEPTS

Items	SA	A	D	SD	Number Responding
1	158	58	30	28	274
20	18	66	102	85	271
2	30	70	69	104	273
40	106	102	31	24	263
3	20	39	37	178	274
10	144	82	31	16	273
4	161	49	32	30	272
8	154	65	25	27	271
5	60	67	58	89	274
39	60	66	93	52	271
6	35	43	123	69	270
24	35	115	77	41	268
7	22	24	101	124	271
29	34	40	76	122	272
9	38	60	98	74	270
19	26	59	91	92	268
11	44	71	84	73	272
35	29	75	99	69	272
12	49	87	76	61	273
37	33	34	89	115	271
13	123	85	32	33	273
22	21	77	108	63	269
14	119	88	43	23	273
16	35	51	85	103	274
15	36	52	73	109	270
25	83	104	54	32	273

(continued on next page)

(Continuation of Table 5)

Items	SA	A	D	SD	Number Responding
17	56	82	75	59	272
18	42	47	115	70	274
21	30	88	87	68	273
27	65	81	94	32	272
23	22	59	104	67	252
45	38	122	66	40	266
26	24	56	103	76	259
36	58	74	95	45	272
28	21	21	131	99	272
34	129	109	21	16	275
30	13	27	79	150	269
33	95	107	47	23	272
31	55	132	61	18	266
47	6	15	117	134	272
32	103	125	26	17	271
41	34	84	89	64	271
38	103	87	43	39	272
43	37	38	96	100	271
42	59	86	100	26	271
48	16	56	103	98	273
44	33	188	39	8	268
46	28	68	141	33	270

(plus) category, the individual was counted as being supportive of bargaining, and the - (minus) category represented those in opposition to bargaining. The number of individuals in these categories was then totaled, with the majority of responses used to determine if the group was supportive or in opposition to the collective bargaining concept.

The positions of the eight groups included in this study were: Group 1, Presidents of County Education Associations, supportive of collective bargaining; Group 2, Presidents of County Elementary Principals Associations, opposed to collective bargaining; Group 3, Presidents of County Boards of Education, opposed to collective bargaining; Group 4, Presidents of County Service Personnel Associations, opposed to collective bargaining; Group 5, Presidents of County Secondary School Principals Associations, opposed to collective bargaining; Group 6, Presidents of State Colleges and Universities, opposed to collective bargaining; Group 7, State Elected and Appointed Officials, opposed to collective bargaining; and Group 8, Superintendents of County School Systems, opposed to collective bargaining (see Table 6).

The data obtained from the various groups were further analyzed for statistical significance. A one-way analysis of variance was completed, in order to determine if group differences were present at the .05 level of statistical

Table 6

POSITIONS OF GROUPS IN RELATION TO ATTITUDES
TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Group	Favoring Concept	Opposing Concept
1 Presidents of County Education Associations	43	1
2 Presidents of County Elementary Principals Associations	8	34
3 Presidents of County School Boards	3	37
4 Presidents of County School Service Personnel Associations	6	31
5 Presidents of County Secondary School Principals Associations*	13	31
6 Presidents of State Colleges and Universities	3	9
7 State Elected and Appointed Officials	2	4
8 Superintendents of County School Systems	3	46
	81	193

Grand Total 275

*One neutral response was received

Percent Favoring Collective Bargaining - 30

Percent Opposing Collective Bargaining - 70

significance. The one-way analysis of variance yielded an F-ratio of 51.1932 ($p < .0001$) (see Table 7).

In order to determine if groups differed significantly at the .05 level of significance, post hoc tests were administered. The Duncan, Tukey-hsd, and Scheffe procedures were administered to obtain the desired information. After obtaining the results, the Scheffe procedure was selected for group comparisons. One advantage of the Scheffe is that the chance of a Type I error is kept at a minimum. However, the Scheffe is more prone to Type II errors and will account for the smallest number of significant differences in any experiment (Ferguson, 1976, p. 300). Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979), pointed out that when there were large differences in sample sizes, only the Scheffe procedure was recommended (p. 276). Ferguson (1976) stated as follows: the problem of choosing a particular posteriori multiple-comparison procedure to apply to a particular set of experimental data has never been properly resolved. This choice is made by each investigator in the light of considerations which appear relevant to him or her (p. 300). The results of the Scheffe were:

Table 7
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIGNIFICANCE OF GROUP ATTITUDES

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
Between Groups	7	119516.5972	17073.7996
Within Groups	267	89049.0392	333.5170
Total	274	208565.6364	F = 51.1932

F Probability = 0.0000

Mean	Group	G r p 1	G r p 6	G r p 7	G r p 5	G r p 2	G r p 4	G r p 3	G r p 8
84.1364	Grp 1								
125.2500	Grp 6	*							
125.3333	Grp 7	*							
130.2000	Grp 5	*							
132.7619	Grp 2	*							
141.4865	Grp 4	*							
144.1250	Grp 3	*							
146.5918	Grp 8	*			*				

The groups that differed significantly at the .05 level of significance were: Group 6 with Group 1, Group 7 with Group 1, Group 5 with Group 1, Group 2 with Group 1, Group 4 with Group 1, Group 3 with Group 1, and Group 8 with Group 1 and Group 5 (see Table 5 for item responses).

Research Question Two

What demographic variables are significant in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining? The statistical procedure, one-way analysis of variance, was applied in order to determine if significant relationships were present between the independent variables, when taken alone, and the dependent variable. The Scheffe post hoc test was the statistical procedure chosen to determine if significant differences among groups existed. In order to determine if any of the demographic variables when taken together were significant predictors of the criterion variable, scale

score, the statistical procedure multiple regression was employed.

Demographic Data

In order to understand the characteristics of the responding population, the data were totaled according to categorical responses (see Appendix B).

Sex

The female respondents numbered 69 (25.1 percent), while the male respondents numbered 206, which represents 74.9 percent of the total population responding. These figures are representative of the 351 members of the population considered, in relation to sexual gender. There were 275 usable questionnaires included in this study, and in this particular category there were no missing cases.

Age

The category of age ranged from under 35 to over 56. The age range 46-55 accounted for 33.9 percent of the responses in this area, with the age range 41-45 having the second highest percentage with 20.4 percent. There was one missing case in this category.

Marital Status

The response for this category indicated that the majority of those responding were married. The married respondents accounted for 88.2 percent, with 11.8 percent included in the single, divorced, separated or widowed category. There were three missing cases in this category.

Political Affiliation

Responses obtained in this category indicated that 64.6 percent were affiliated with the Democratic Party, 27.7 percent with the Republican Party, and 7.7 percent with the Independent Party. Four people failed to indicate their political affiliation and were counted as missing cases.

Religious Preference

The Protestant religious category represented the majority of respondents, with 82.6 indicating a preference for the Protestant faith. Those indicating preferences for other religious faiths were represented in the following manner: Catholic, 8.4 percent; Jewish, .7 percent; other, 4.7 percent; none, 3.6 percent. All members of the population considered (275) responded to this portion of the demographic questionnaire.

Contract Status

The majority of respondents, 69.9 percent, indicated that they were tenured. The percentage for non-tenured was 6.7 percent, with 23.4 percent indicating other types of contract status. There were six respondents who failed to respond to this category and were counted as missing cases.

Employment Status

The largest percentage within this group were administrators, with 48.7 percent. Other responding groups were: elementary, 18.5 percent; secondary, 16.2 percent; and employed outside the field of education, 16.6 percent. There were 16 respondents who failed to provide the requested information and were treated as missing cases.

Level of Higher Education

The majority of respondents, 44.9 percent, held a Master's degree. Other responding groups included those with a Bachelor's degree (9.1 percent), respondents with a sixth-year certificate (12 percent), those respondents with a Doctorate degree (13.9 percent), and 20.1 percent who indicated that the level of higher education choices listed were not applicable. There was one missing case, due to a response being omitted from this category.

Years of Active Employment

The category that contained the largest number of responses was the 11-17 years of employment, which accounted for 30.9 percent of those responding. The 18-25 years of employment group accounted for 29 percent of the responses, while the over-25 years of employment group accounted for 25.4 percent. The 1-3 years of employment group contained 1.5 percent of the responses, and the 4-10 years of employment group accounted for 13.2 percent of the returns. There were three respondents treated as missing cases in this area.

Affiliated With (Organization)

Responses for this category were indicative of organizational membership in relation to employment. The following responses were obtained: professional educational association, 66.8 percent; educational service personnel association, 12.6 percent; union or organized labor, 1.1 percent; professional association not related to education, 4.4 percent; and the last category, other, 15.1 percent. There were four respondents who were treated as missing cases in this category.

Ethnic Group

A large majority of the respondents, 97 percent, were members of the Caucasian race. Only 3 percent were members of the other racial groups listed. Two respondents in this category failed to provide the requested information.

Place of Birth

Most of those responding, 43.7 percent, claimed the East as their place of birth. The South was claimed by 30.6 percent as their place of birth, with the North and West accounting for 22.7 percent of the total respondents in this category. The category labeled "other" accounted for 3 percent of the responses in this area. Seven respondents failed to indicate their place of birth.

Years Lived in West Virginia

Of the total respondents, 84 percent indicated they had lived for over 17 years in West Virginia. The other categories of years lived in West Virginia were: 1-3 years, 1.5 percent; 4-10 years, 6.5 percent; and the 11-17 years, 6.2 percent. The category of nonresident contained 1.8 percent of the respondents. There were no missing cases in this category, as all 275 respondents provided the requested information.

Percentage of Family Income

Of the total respondents for this category, 82 percent of those responding reported that their income accounted for over 51 percent of the total family's income. Only 5.6 percent reported that their income accounted for less than 25 percent of the total family income, and 12.4 percent said that their income accounted for 25-50 percent of the total family income. Eight respondents failed to indicate their percentage of income contribution to total family income and were counted as missing cases.

Social Class Membership

Respondents to this category were requested to decide which of five social classes to which they belonged. The membership results were: lower class, .4 percent; lower middle class, 8 percent; middle class, 57.1 percent; upper middle, 34.1 percent; and upper class, .4 percent. There were two people who were counted as missing cases in this area.

Militant Friends

Respondents were requested to indicate the number of militant friends they had. The majority, 82.1 percent, said that they did not have any friends they felt were militant. Only 13.9 percent said they had one militant friend, and there were 4 percent who indicated they had two or more

militant friends. One respondent did not answer and was treated as a missing case.

Union Membership of Spouse

Most respondents, 83.5 percent, indicated that their spouse did not belong to a union. Only 16.5 percent indicated union membership for their spouse. Nine respondents failed to provide the requested information and were treated as missing cases.

Union Membership of Mother

The majority of responses, 95.3 percent, indicated that their mothers did not belong to a union. Only 4.7 percent indicated union membership. One respondent was treated as a missing case, as needed information was not provided.

Union Membership of Father

The responses in this area indicated that 59.9 percent of the fathers were not union members, while 40.1 percent indicated union membership for their fathers. One respondent was treated as a missing case in this category.

Occupational Background of Father

Responses for this category were unskilled, semiskilled, clerical, technical or professional, and managerial or

executive. The percentages for responses received were: unskilled, 11.4 percent; semiskilled, 46.1 percent; clerical, 2.6 percent; technical or professional 26 percent; and managerial or executive, 13.9 percent. Two respondents failed to provide the requested information and were treated as missing cases.

Size of School District

The number of respondents that were considered for inclusion in this category totaled 257. The respondents who were state elected or appointed officials were not included, nor were the presidents of state colleges and universities. Responses for this area were: 1-3000 students, 35.4 percent; 3001-7000 students, 33.5 percent; and 7001 or more, 31.1 percent. All 257 respondents were included in the categories, and there were no missing cases recorded.

Statistical Significance of Demographic Variables

The statistical technique, one-way analysis of variance, was applied in order to determine which variables, when taken alone, would have a significant effect upon the dependent variable. All 21 demographic variables were tested at the .05 level of significance, with seven of the variables failing to meet the established criteria for significance. The seven variables eliminated were: religion, ethnic group, place of

birth, percentage of salary contribution, spouse's union membership, occupational background of father, and size of school district. The 14 variables determined to be significant, and their F-ratios were:

1. Sex (7.7962)
2. Age (18.0103)
3. Marital Status (12.2717)
4. Political Affiliation (3.0956)
5. Contract Status (11.0609)
6. Employment Status (33.7899)
7. Level of Higher Education (9.8914)
8. Years of Active Employment (11.5344)
9. Affiliated with (Organization) (8.0424)
10. Number of Years Lived in WV (5.2219)
11. Social Class Membership (5.6534)
12. Number of Militant Friends (6.6118)
13. Union Membership of Mother (5.8796)
14. Union Membership of Father (3.9095)

The results obtained from the one-way analysis of variance, and the results of the Scheffe procedure are presented for the variables identified as effective in predicting attitude toward collective bargaining.

Sex

The F-ratio for this variable, was 7.7962 ($p < .0056$). There were 275 respondents in this category, 206 males and 69 females. Seventy-five percent of the males who returned the surveys were opposed to collective bargaining. The response for the majority of females participating was also negative toward collective bargaining, with 59 percent opposed to the concept.

Ace

For this demographic category, there were four groups, under 35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-55, and 56-over. The F-ratio for this category was 18.0103 ($p < .0001$). Sixty-eight percent of those under 35 responded favorably toward collective bargaining, while only 9 percent of those 56 or older responded favorably.

The results of the Scheffe post hoc test which indicates significant group differences at the .05 level of significance were: Group 2 with Group 1; Group 3 with Group 1; Group 5 with Group 1; Group 4 with Group 1, Group 2 and Group 3.

Marital Status

The F-ratio for marital status was 12.2717 ($p < .0005$). Twenty-six percent of the respondents who were married responded positively toward the collective bargaining concept, with the remaining 74 percent responding negatively. The group containing the single, divorced, separated and widowed respondents was favorable toward collective bargaining, with 53 percent of the group indicating approval of the concept. There was one married respondent whose attitude toward collective bargaining could not be verified from the information available, and there were three

respondents counted as missing cases, due to insufficient information.

Political Affiliation

Three groups were included in this category. Republicans responded negatively toward the bargaining concept, with 77 percent of the respondents in opposition to collective bargaining. Seventy percent of the democrats also responded negatively toward the bargaining concept, while 62 percent of the independents responding were opposed to collective bargaining. The F-ratio for political affiliation was 3.0956 ($p < .0469$).

Contract Status

The analysis of variance for contract status established the F-ratio as 11.0609 ($p < .0001$). The Scheffe procedure denoted pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level of significance. The results were:

Mean	Group	G	G	G
		r	r	r
		p	p	p
		1	2	3
124.5851	Grp 1			
124.8333	Grp 2			
142.6349	Grp 3	*	*	

The majority of tenured respondents, 68 percent, were opposed to the concept of collective bargaining. Seventy-two percent of Group 2, the non-tenured respondents, were negative toward

collective bargaining. Group 3, the group classified as "other," was the group containing the largest percent of respondents in opposition to collective bargaining. Ninety-two percent of the respondents in this group rejected the bargaining concept, with only 8 percent responding favorably.

Employment Status

Results obtained from the statistical procedures applied to this independent variable established it as an effective predictor of attitude toward collective bargaining. The F-ratio obtained was 33.7899 ($p < .0001$). The employment status portion of the questionnaire consisted of four groups: Group 1, elementary; Group 2, secondary; Group 3, educational administration; and Group 4, employed outside the field of education.

The configuration that resulted from the Scheffe procedure was:

Mean	Group	G r P 2	G r P 1	G r P 3	G r P 4
103.9048	Grp 2				
113.2083	Grp 1				
138.2937	Grp 3	*	*		
142.7422	Grp 4	*	*		

Fifty-two percent of the respondents who indicated their employment status was on the elementary level had a positive

response toward collective bargaining, while 48 percent responded negatively to the collective bargaining survey. On the secondary level, 71 percent of the respondents were favorable toward collective bargaining, with 29 percent indicating a negative position toward the bargaining concept. Sixteen percent of the educational administrators were positive toward the concept of collective bargaining, while 84 percent indicated opposition to the collective bargaining concept. For those included in the group employed outside the field of education, only 9 percent expressed support for collective bargaining, while 91 percent were opposed to the bargaining concept.

The groups that differed significantly at the .05 level of significance were: Group 3, educational administrators, with Group 1 and Group 2; and Group 4, employed outside the field of education, with Group 1 and Group 2. One of the members included in the educational administrative group responded in a manner that prevented inclusion in either the favorable or unfavorable response group. There were 16 missing cases in the area of employment status.

Level of Higher Education

The F-ratio for this variable was 9.8914 ($p < .0001$). The respondents in this category were opposed to the concept of collective bargaining, with 72 percent of the respondents

answering negatively toward the bargaining concept. Only one group, those holding a Bachelor's degree, was favorable toward collective bargaining. Fifty-six percent of the respondents holding Bachelor's degrees were supportive of the bargaining concept. The majority responses for other groups were: 64 percent of those with a Master's degree were negative toward collective bargaining; 88 percent of those with a CAGS (6th year certificate) were opposed to collective bargaining; 84 percent of those with Doctorate degrees were negative toward the bargaining concept; and the category, Not Applicable, had 85 percent of the respondents opposed to collective bargaining. The configuration obtained from the Scheffe procedure was:

Mean	Group	G r P 1	G r P 2	G r P 4	G r P 3	G r P 5
107.3600	Grp 1					
124.5366	Grp 2					
133.8158	Grp 4	*				
136.3030	Grp 3	*				
142.3818	Grp 5	*	*			

Years of Active Employment

The F-ratio for this independent variable was established as 11.5344 ($p < .0001$). The demographic variable, years of active employment, was established as being significant in the prediction of attitudes toward collective bargaining. The groups that the Scheffe multiple-comparison

test established as being significantly different at the .05 level of significance were:

Mean	Group	G r p 3	G r p 2	G r p 4	G r p 1	G r p 5
117.7143	Grp 3					
118.0278	Grp 2					
134.1646	Grp 4	*	*			
141.0000	Grp 1					
142.6232	Grp 5	*	*			

In Group 1, 1-3 years of active employment, 12 percent were favorable toward collective bargaining and 88 percent opposed. Fifty-three percent of the respondents who were members of the second group, 4-10 years of active employment, responded in favor of the bargaining concept, while 47 percent were negative in their response. The third group, 11-17 years of active employment, had 44 percent in favor of collective bargaining and 56 percent indicating opposition. Twenty-four percent of Group 4, 18-25 years of active employment, indicated support for collective bargaining, while 76 percent responded negatively. Group 5, 25 or more years of active employment, had 10 percent of the respondents who were favorable toward collective bargaining, while 90 percent responded negatively.

Groups that differed significantly at the .05 level of significance were: Group 4, with Group 3, and Group 2; and Group 5, with Group 3, and Group 2. One member of Group 3 did not respond either positively or negatively toward the

concept of collective bargaining, and three respondents did not provide the requested demographic information for this area and were counted as missing cases.

Affiliated with (Organization)

Respondents were requested to indicate which of five groups described their organizational membership. The F-ratio for this variable was 8.0424 ($p < .0001$), which exceeded the .05 level of significance. The post hoc test, Scheffe, was used to identify pairs of groups that were significantly different at the .05 level of significance. The results obtained from the application of the Scheffe were:

Mean	Group	G r P 1	G r P 4	G r P 2	G r P 5	G r P 3
122.8729	Grp 1					
132.5000	Grp 4					
141.9706	Grp 2	*				
143.2927	Grp 5	*				
149.6667	Grp 3					

Group 1, respondents who belonged to a professional education association were against the concept of collective bargaining, with 61 percent responding negatively, and 39 percent indicating approval of the bargaining concept. Group 2, those that were members of an educational service personnel association, rejected the collective bargaining concept, with the majority (85 percent) in opposition to collective bargaining and only 15 percent indicating positive

support. Group 3, respondents who indicated membership in a union or organized labor group, responded 100 percent in opposition to the collective bargaining. Group 4, professional organization not related to education, responded with 83 percent of the members opposed to the bargaining concept, while 17 percent of the members were supportive of the concept. Respondents who selected the category, other, were opposed to the collective bargaining concept, with 93 percent rejecting the concept, and only 7 percent responding positively.

The groups that differed significantly at the .05 level of significance were: Group 2 differed with Group 1; and Group 5 differed with Group 1.

Number of Years Lived in West Virginia

The F-ratio for this category was 5.2219 ($p < .0005$). Seventy-two percent of the respondents in this category were opposed to collective bargaining. Only one group, those having lived in West Virginia for 13-17 years, was supportive of collective bargaining. The Scheffe procedure did not reveal any significant group differences at the .05 level of significance.

Social Class Membership

The F-ratio for this variable was 5.6534 ($p < .0002$). The lower-middle class was supportive of collective bargaining, with the respondents indicating by a 55 percent response that they were favorable toward the concept. The other categories responding were: lower, only one person was included in this category and that person was supportive of the bargaining concept; middle, 29 percent of those responding were favorable toward the concept; upper middle, 19 percent of the respondents indicated support for collective bargaining; and upper, one person was included in this category and that person was supportive of collective bargaining. The Scheffe procedure identified the following groups as differing significantly at the .05 level of significance:

Mean	Group	G r P 2	G r P 3	G r P 4	G r P 1	G r P 5
104.8636	Grp 2					
129.2051	Grp 3	*				
134.4516	Grp 4	*				
141.0000	Grp 1					
148.0000	Grp 5					

Militant Friends

Respondents in this category were requested to indicate, using the prescribed choices, the number of friends they considered militant. The categories were: none, one, two,

and three. The F-ratio established for this area was 6.6118 ($p < .0003$). The configuration of the Scheffe procedure at the .05 level of significance was:

Mean	Group	G r p 3	G r p 2	G r p 1	G r p 4
113.5556	Grp 3				
113.6053	Grp 2				
132.5200	Grp 1		*		
142.5000	Grp 4				

Twenty-five percent of the respondents in Group 1, those who indicated that they did not have any best friends they considered militant, were supportive of collective bargaining, while the majority of respondents (75 percent) were opposed to the concept. Group 2, having at least one militant friend, responded with 53 percent supporting the concept, and 47 percent opposed to the collective bargaining issue. Forty-four percent of the respondents, in Group 3, who indicated they had two militant friends were supportive of collective bargaining, with 56 percent opposed to the bargaining concept. The members of Group 4, who had three militant friends, were all opposed to collective bargaining.

Union Membership of Mother

The F-ratio for this variable was 5.8796 ($p < .0160$). For those responding that their mother does (or did) belong to a union, 53 percent of those responding were favorable

toward the concept of collective bargaining. Twenty-five percent of those respondents that answered "no" to the question of union membership responded favorably toward the bargaining concept.

Union Membership of Father

Respondents who indicated that their father does (or did) belong to a union, were against collective bargaining, with 73 percent of the group indicating opposition to the bargaining concept. For those responding "no" to the union membership question, 76 percent indicated that they were negative toward collective bargaining. The F-ratio for union membership of father was 3.9095 ($p < .0490$).

Multiple Regression

In order to determine if any of the 14 independent variables, when taken together, were effective predictors of the criterion variable, scale score, a multiple regression analysis was applied. The multiple regression analysis revealed only six of the demographic variables to be significant when R square change was tested by the systematic removal of each variable. These six predictor variables, and the significance of F changes were: marital status, .0491; contract status, .0117; employment status, .0001; years of

active employment, .0063; affiliated with (organization) .0001; and number of militant friends, .0035.

A multiple R, which is a Pearson product-moment coefficient, of .65734 was obtained from the multiple regression procedure. The square of the multiple R indicates that approximately 43 percent of the proportion of variance in the criterion variable was accounted for, or shared with, these six predictor variables (see Table 8).

Summary

This chapter considered the data collected for the study, and provided the statistical treatment for determining significance. The following areas were considered: attitudes of respondents toward collective bargaining; group differences concerning attitudes toward collective bargaining; which demographic variables, when taken alone, were significant in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining; significant group differences in relation to the demographic variables; and when taken together, which demographic variables were effective predictors of the criterion variable.

The answers to the collective bargaining survey were assigned a + (pro) or - (con) weight to determine the positions of individuals and groups toward the collective bargaining concept. The one-way analysis of variance was used

Table 8

MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR DETERMINING EFFECTIVE
DEMOGRAPHIC PREDICTORS OF ATTITUDES

Multiple R	.65734
R Square	.43210
Adjusted R Square	.39486
Standard Error	20.45816

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	16	77701.83579	4856.36474
Residual	244	102122.90751	418.53651
F = 11.60320		Significant F = .0000	

to determine if significant differences in attitudes toward collective bargaining existed between the groups. Results obtained from the analysis of data indicated the F-ratio to be 51.1932 ($p < .0001$). The Scheffe post hoc test was then applied to identify the groups that differed significantly. The groups found to differ significantly were: Group 2 with Group 1; Group 3 with Group 1; Group 4 with Group 1; Group 5 with Group 1; Group 6 with Group 1; Group 7 with Group 1, and Group 8 with Group 1 and Group 5.

In order to determine which demographic variables, when taken alone, were significant in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining, the statistical procedure one-way analysis was utilized. The 14 variables found to be significant were: sex, age, marital status, political affiliation, contract status, employment status, level of higher education, years of active employment, affiliated with (organization), number of years lived in West Virginia, social class membership, number of militant friends, union membership of mother, and union membership of father. The Scheffe procedure was employed to determine if any significant group differences were present, in relation to the demographic categories. The results indicated that there were several significant group differences present.

A multiple regression was employed to determine if any demographic variables, when taken together, were effective

predictors of the criterion variable, scale score. The demographic variables that proved significant, at the established .05 level of significance, in predicting attitudes toward collective bargaining were: marital status, contract status, employment status, years of active employment, affiliated with (organization), and number of militant friends.

The majority of respondents (70 percent) were opposed to the collective bargaining concept as presented. The only group that responded favorably toward collective bargaining was the group of presidents of county education associations. The membership of this group consists primarily of teachers from the West Virginia public education sector.

Chapter Five

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter is designed to present the findings of the study that enabled valid conclusions to be drawn concerning the research considerations, and to provide implications for further consideration and study. The first research question dealt with whether statistically significant group differences existed between groups of educational leaders in West Virginia. The second research question examined the relationship between selected demographic variables and attitudes toward collective bargaining.

Discussion

Research Questions

The groups considered for this study were examined to determine if there were significant variances in their attitudes toward the concept of collective bargaining. Activism among those who are supportive of the collective bargaining concept in West Virginia has resulted in conflicting opinions and actions. Various Attorney Generals' Opinions (1942-56-66-74), decisions from state courts (1978, 1980), and bills introduced into the state legislature (WV

State Senate approved one bill) support the significance of investigating attitudes toward collective bargaining in the public education sector.

Certain demographic variables were also considered in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining. The significance of these variables as predictors of attitudes toward collective bargaining was considered. Results of the study showed that there were significant relationships between certain demographic variables and attitudes toward collective bargaining.

Descriptive Research. Sample of the Population

Descriptive research was chosen for investigating the area of collective bargaining. Certain members of the public education sector of West Virginia have expressed the desire for collective bargaining, while others oppose the bargaining concept. The research methodology selected provided the means for studying the attitudes of educational leaders in West Virginia in relation to collective bargaining. According to Hopkins (1980), all educational questions require description, and one use for such descriptions is to "generate generalizable knowledge and add to the body of knowledge about educational concerns" (p. 269).

The population of this study involved eight groups of educational leaders in the West Virginia public education

sector. In order to avoid certain biasing possibilities, the entire population being considered was canvassed. The survey instrument utilized for collecting information was designed to obtain demographic information (21 items) and to solicit answers to statements concerning collective bargaining, using a Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Statistical Procedures

In order to determine the attitude of respondents (positive or negative) toward collective bargaining, descriptive statistics were used. The one-way analysis of variance was the statistical test utilized to determine if significant differences of attitudes toward collective bargaining existed, with the Scheffe post hoc test used to identify groups that differed significantly. The one-way analysis of variance was also chosen as the procedure for investigating the significance of relationships between selected demographic variables, taken alone, and attitudes toward collective bargaining. Significant group differences in relation to demographic variables were determined by the Scheffe procedure. The statistical treatment, multiple regression, was applied to selected demographic variables in order to determine which variables (taken together) were significant predictors of the criterion variable, scale

score. The .05 level was chosen for determination of significance for all statistical test procedures employed.

Findings

The descriptive statistics revealed the following groups' attitudes toward collective bargaining to be:

		Pro (+)	Con (-)
Group 1	Presidents of County Education Associations	43	1
Group 2	Presidents of County Elementary Principals Associations	8	34
Group 3	Presidents of County School Boards	3	37
Group 4	Presidents of County School Service Personnel Associations	6	31
Group 5	Presidents of County Secondary School Principals Associations	13	31
Group 6	Presidents of State Colleges and Universities	3	9
Group 7	State Elected and Appointed Officials	2	4
Group 8	Superintendents of County School Systems	3	46
Total		81	193

One respondent in a county Secondary School Principals' Association conveyed a neutral attitude toward collective bargaining.

The analysis of variance that was used for determining if significant differences existed between groups in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining yielded an F-ratio

of 51.1932 ($p < .0001$). The Scheffe procedure was utilized to determine which groups differed significantly in attitudes toward collective bargaining. The following groups were found to be significantly different: Group 6 with Group 1; Group 7 with Group 1; Group 5 with Group 1; Group 2 with Group 1; Group 4 with Group 1; Group 3 with Group 1; Group 8 with Group 1 and Group 5.

The one-way analysis of variance was employed to determine which of the demographic variables, when taken alone, were significant in relation to attitudes toward collective bargaining. The 14 that were significant and their F-ratios were:

Sex (7.7962)
 Age (18.0103)
 Marital Status (12.2717)
 Political Affiliation (3.0956)
 Contract Status (11.0609)
 Employment Status (33.7899)
 Level of Higher Education (9.8914)
 Years of Active Employment (11.5344)
 Affiliated With (Organization) (8.0424)
 Number of Years Lived in WV (5.2219)
 Social Class Membership (5.6534)
 Number of Militant Friends (6.6118)
 Union Membership of Mother (5.8796)
 Union Membership of Father (3.9095)

The application of the Scheffe procedure indicated that the following groups differed significantly in attitude toward collective bargaining: age, the group 35-40 differed with the group under 35, the group 41-45 differed with the group under 35, the group 56 or over differed with the group under 35, and the group 46-55 differed with the groups under

35, 36-40, and 41-45; contract status, the group classified as other differed significantly with the tenured and non-tenured group; employment status, the group classified as educational administration differed significantly with the elementary group and the secondary group, and the group classified as employed outside the field of education differed significantly with the elementary group and the secondary group; level of higher education, the group identified as having a Doctorate differed with those with a Bachelor's, the group with a CAGS certificate differed with those with a Bachelor's, and the group identified as not applicable differed with the Bachelor's group and the Master's group; years of active employment, the group 18-25 differed with the group 11-17 and the group 4-10, the group over 25 differed with the group 11-17 and the group 4-10; affiliated with (organization), the group educational service personnel association differed with the group professional educational association, the group other differed with the group professional educational association; perceived social class membership, the group identified as middle class differed with the group lower-middle, and the group upper-middle differed with the lower-middle; number of militant friends, the group indicating that they had no militant friends differed with the group having one militant friend.

The statistical procedure, multiple regression, identified six independent variables, when taken together, as significant predictors of the criterion variable, scale score. These six variables and their significance of F-changes were: marital status (.0491); contract status (.0117); employment status (.0001); years of active employment (.0063); affiliated with (organization) (.0001); and number of militant friends (.0035).

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are that significant differences exist among groups of West Virginia Educational Leaders' attitudes toward collective bargaining and that the relationships among certain demographic variables and attitudes toward collective bargaining are also statistically significant. Conclusions that can be drawn from the results of the study include:

1. That seven of the groups included in this study were opposed to the concept of collective bargaining. The two groups that contained the highest percentage of members in opposition to the bargaining concept were the presidents of county school boards, and the superintendents of county school systems. These two groups indicated opposition to every item that was favorable toward the collective bargaining concept.

Over 92 percent of the presidents of county school boards, and the superintendents of county school systems were negative toward the bargaining concept.

2. That the only group supportive of collective bargaining is the presidents of county education associations, this group consisting primarily of teachers. This group had the highest percentage of agreement toward the bargaining concept, with 97 percent of the members included in this category indicating support for the bargaining concept.
3. The results generated in this study support many of the basic premises found in previous studies. Some of the data found significant in this study and in previous studies were: (1) administrators and school board presidents have similar attitudes toward the concept of collective bargaining, similar to the results obtained in the Pennsylvania State Department of Education study completed in 1978; (2) that teachers' attitudes toward collective bargaining differ with those of administrators toward the concept of collective bargaining, similar to the results obtained in the Pennsylvania State Department of Education study completed in 1978; (3) that teachers tend to be positively inclined toward the collective bargaining concept, similar to

results from the studies by Walker (1985), and the Pennsylvania State Department of Education (1978).

4. Many of the demographic variables that were found to be significant in this study, sex, age, years of active employment, affiliated with (organization), and social class membership, were also found to be significant in previous studies, some examples being:

sex (Fisher, 1967; Phelps, 1970; Phillips, 1970; Peterson, 1976; Walker, 1985; et.al.)

age (Towers, 1969; Peterson, 1976; Walker, 1985; et.al.)

years of active employment (Phelps, 1970; Peterson, 1976; Walker, 1985; et.al.)

years of experience (Walker, 1985; Phelps, 1970; Peterson, 1976; et.al.)

affiliated with (organization) (Walker, 1985)

social class membership (Walker, 1985)

5. Teachers in West Virginia will find little support for collective bargaining among the groups of educational leaders in West Virginia, except for the educational leaders that are presidents of county education associations. In order to obtain collective bargaining rights in West Virginia, it will be necessary for those who desire this goal to obtain support through increased political activity. It is suspected that as employees in

public service, teachers can expect to find little support from the private sector without this increased political involvement, regardless of the pressure of a strong union tradition in the state.

Implications

The lack of agreement between the presidents of the teachers' organizations, and the other groups included in the study is indicative that there is controversy surrounding the passage of collective bargaining rights for the public education sector in West Virginia. The group, presidents of county education associations, had only 3 percent of its members responding negatively toward the bargaining concept, while the three administrative groups--presidents of elementary principals associations, presidents of county secondary school principals associations, and superintendents of county school systems--responded with 81 percent of their members opposed to the concept. The group, presidents of county school boards, which deals directly with educational matters on the county level, also responded negatively toward the bargaining concept, with 92 percent indicating opposition.

The attitudes toward collective bargaining, among members of certain groups of educational leaders in West Virginia, are comparable to attitudes of other similar groups

(Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1978 and Walker, 1985). The groups of educational leaders in West Virginia whose attitudes are comparable include: presidents of county education associations, presidents of county school boards, and superintendents of county school systems.

The results of this study indicate an extreme polarization of attitudes toward the concept of collective bargaining. Only one group, presidents of county education associations, was supportive of the bargaining concept, with 97 percent of their members in favor of collective bargaining; while two of the groups that develop policies and deal directly with the presidents of county education associations, the presidents of county school boards and the superintendents of county school systems, indicated that over 92 percent of their members opposed the bargaining concept. The percent of either support or opposition to the concept of collective bargaining among these three groups is extremely high when compared to similar studies. Due to the crystallization of viewpoints among these three groups, and to the high degree of internal consistency among the other groups included in this study, one could project that there will be continued disagreement concerning the granting of collective bargaining rights to public education employees in West Virginia.

Information provided by this study could assist those with opposing viewpoints toward collective bargaining to better understand the position of others in relation to the bargaining concept. Although this understanding will not necessarily ensure one common viewpoint, it might encourage cooperation, due to an increased awareness of the attitudes held by the other groups concerned with collective bargaining for employees of the public education sector.

REFERENCES

- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR). (1969). Labor-management policies for state and local government--A commission report. Washington, DC: The Commission.
- Alexander, J., Bond, D., & Soffer, R. (1979). The impact of P.L. 94-142 on collective bargaining at the local school district level. Dallas, TX: University of Texas at Austin. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 101).
- Alexander, K. (1980). School law. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Alvey, D. T. (1985). A national survey of the separation of responsibilities between school boards and superintendents. (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University).
- Beal, E. F., & Begin, J. P. (1982). The practice of collective bargaining. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Borus, D. M., & Wisner, R. E. (1975). A research survey--Faculty collective bargaining: Does the student win? Community College Review, 2(4), 68-73.
- Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (1983). Government Employee Relations Report, 21(1), Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (1983). Special Report: Labor Relations in Elementary and Secondary Education. Government Employee Relations Report, Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (1984). Government Employee Relations Report, 22, Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (1985). Government Employee Relations Report, 23, Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Caldwell, W. E., & Curfman, W. L. (1979). The relation between collective bargaining environments, and principal selection and organizational behavior perceptions. San Francisco, CA: Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research

Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 913).

Carlton, P. W. (1966). Attitudes of certificated instructional personnel in North Carolina toward questions concerning collective negotiation and "sanctions". (Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina).

Carlton, P. W. (1983). A survey of teacher perceptions of five current noteworthy issues. Virginia Education Association.

Carlton, P. W., & Goodwin, H. I. (1969). The collective dilemma: Negotiations in education. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company.

Carlton, P. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1977). The attitudes of Virginia educators toward collective negotiations, strikes, and sanctions. Virginia Education Association.

Carlton, P. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1979). Attitudes of teachers in Virginia, where collective negotiations is unconstitutional. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 8(1), 83-90.

Carlton, P. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1980). Collective bargaining and Virginia school board members: Perceptions and purposes. Peabody Journal of Education, 57(2), 110-118.

Carlton, P. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1980). Collective bargaining in Virginia: What teachers and school board members say. Virginia Journal of Education, 74(4), 20-23.

Carlton, P. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Teacher-board relations in Virginia: A case of perceptual discontinuity. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 10(3), 267-278.

Charleston Daily Mail (May 28, 1981). Charleston, WV: Author.

Charleston Gazette (February 24, 1985). Charleston, WV: Author.

- Coffinberger, R. L., & Bright, T. L. (1981). The status of collective bargaining by public employees in Virginia. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 10(1), 75-83.
- Colton, D. L., & Graber, E. E. (1982). Judicial structuring of collective bargaining in local school districts. New York: American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 993).
- Conley, P. (1960). History of West Virginia coal industry. Charleston, WV: Education Foundation, Inc.
- Cooper, B. S. (1982). Collective bargaining, strikes, and financial costs in public education: A comparative review. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 441).
- Cooper, B. S. (1982). Managerial identification and the unionization of school administrators. Administrator's Notebook, 30(1), 1-4.
- Cresswell, A. M., Murphy, M. J., & Kerchner, C. T. (1980). Teachers, unions, and collective bargaining in public education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.
- Doh, H., & Johnson, S. (1974). Collective bargaining in SUNY: The experience of 50 local SPA leaders during the first year. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 25(2), 55-73.
- Donley, M. O., Jr. (September, 1976). The American school teacher: From obedient servant to militant professional. Phi Delta Kappan.
- Donley, M. O., Jr. (1977). The future of teacher power in America. Bloomington, IA: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Duckworth, K., & De Bevoise, W. (1982). The effects of collective bargaining on school administrator leadership. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Dunlap, J. F. (1978). California's chicken-or-egg question: Statewide union or statewide bargaining first? Phi Delta Kappan, 59(7), 458-61.

- Eberts, R. W. (1982). The effects of district personnel policies and teacher attitudes on teacher mobility. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Eberts, R. W., & Stone, J. A. (1984). Unions and public schools. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Edwards, A. L. (1957). Techniques of attitude scale construction. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Engel, R. A., & Else, D. (1983). The impact of collective bargaining in a rural setting: A retrospective assessment. Research in Rural Education, 2(1), 9-14.
- Ferguson, G. A. (1976). Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Feyerherm, A. E., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1978). Structural and attitudinal factors related to collective negotiations in public school systems. Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, 7(1), 73-82.
- Fields, J. C., & Reddick, T. L. (1979). A study of professional attitudes of teachers in three public school systems in Tennessee before and after professional negotiation. Cookeville, TN: Tennessee Technological University, (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No. ED 182 855).
- Fisher, J. R. (1967). The relationship of sex, level, and position of Oregon educators to attitudinal statements that deal with collective negotiations and sanctions. (Report No. OSSC-BU11-Vol-13-NO-1). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Oregon School Study Council. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 081 071).
- Fris, J. (1976). Militancy and accommodativeness in teachers' negotiations: Two Ontario surveys. American Journal of Education, 89(2), 147-187.
- Fris, J. (1979). Teachers' attitudes toward the use of strikes, mass resignations, arbitrators, and so on. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: The University of Alberta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 175 129).
- Fris, J. (1980). Perspectives on teachers' attitudes toward collective bargaining tactics. Canadian Administrator, 19(8), 1-6.

- Giandomenico, L. L. (1973). Teacher needs, militancy, and the scope of collective bargaining. The Journal of Educational Research, 66(6), 257-259.
- Gilson, T. Q., & Ramose, E. T. (1982). Public school teacher attitudes toward unionization. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 11(2), 145-154.
- Gonder, P. O. (1981). Collective bargaining (problems and solutions). Sacramento, CA: Education News Service.
- Gorgone, K., & Jackson, E. W. (1975). Professional negotiations. Educational Forum, 39(3), 306-315.
- Greer, C. R., & Brown, M. P. (1982). Teachers' attitudes toward unions, working conditions, and strikes following an illegal strike in the Southwest. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 11(3), 243-257.
- Gress, J. R. (1976). Predicting faculty attitude toward collective bargaining. Research in Higher Education, 4(3), 247-256.
- Grossnickle, W. F. (1980). Psychological variables related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining. Washington, DC: Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 182).
- Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Herman, E. E., & Skinner, G. S. (1976). Faculty representation: The vote at Cincinnati. Monthly Labor Review, 99(3), 44-48.
- Hinkle, D. E., Cox, J. R., & Ewing, L. E. (1979). Applying statistical concepts. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1979). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Chicago, IL: Rand McNalley College Publishing Company.
- Hopkins, C. D. (1980). Understanding educational research. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Hunt, J. C., & White, R. A., (1983). The legal status of collective bargaining by public school teachers. Journal of Labor Research, 4(3), 213-224.

- Jessup, D. K. (1971). The new unionism: A study of the growth of teacher militancy in six suburban school districts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.
- Jessup, D. K. (1978). Teacher Unionization: A reassessment of rank and file motivations. Sociology of Education, 51, 44-55.
- Kazalunas, J. (1984). Collective bargaining revisited. Thrust, June, 30-32.
- Kazlow, C., & Giacquinta, J. (1977). Tenure, support of collective bargaining, and unionism in higher education: some challenging findings. Research in Higher Education, 6, 45-63.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Kirst, M. (1970). Politics of education at local, state, and federal level. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Kraft, R. J. (1977). The community of scholars and faculty unions. North Central Association Quarterly, 51(3), 321-330.
- Krahn, H., & Lowe, G. S. (1984). Public attitudes towards unions: Some Canadian evidence. Journal of Labor Research, 5(2), 149-164.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.
- Levine, M. J., & Lewis, K. G. (1982). The status of collective bargaining in public education: An overview. Law Journal Public Education, March, 177-186.
- Lewin, D. (1985). The effects of regulation on public sector labor relations: Theory and evidence. Journal of Labor Research, 6(1), 77-95.
- Lewin, D., Feuille, P., & Kochan, T. A. (1981). Public sector labor relations. Sun Lakes, AZ: Thomas Horton and Daughters.
- Lieberman, M. (1979). Bargaining before during and after. Chicago, IL: Teach'em, Inc.

- Lozier, G. G., & Mortimer, K. P. (1975). "No representative" Victories in faculty collective bargaining elections. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 26(1), 34-47.
- Lozier, G. G., & Mortimer, K. P. (1976). A collective bargaining election: Issues and Faculty Voting Behavior. Research in Higher Education, 4(2), 193-208.
- Marguardt, E. T. (1969). Perceptions of elementary teachers of the impact of collective negotiations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Meyer, J. A. (1982). A national survey of the attitude of school board members toward community participation-community control. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Miskel, C. (1973). Teacher and administrator attitudes toward collective negotiation issues. Education and Urban Society, 6(3), 284-296.
- National Education Association. (1984). State bargaining laws for educational employees: K-12, higher education, and K-6 support personnel. Collective Bargaining Quarterly, 7(1), 3-74.
- Neumann, Y. (1979). Determinants of faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining in university graduate departments: An organizational climate approach. Research in Higher Education, 10(2), 123-138.
- Neumann, Y. (1980). Organizational climate and faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining: A university in a major labor dispute. Research in Higher Education, 13(4), 353-369.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., Bent, D. H. (1975). Statistical package for the social sciences. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Nielson, R., & Polishook, I. H. (1985). Higher education and collective bargaining: Past, present, and future. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 36(2), 52-57.
- Pennsylvania State Department of Education. (1978). Views on bargaining in Pennsylvania's public schools. Results of opinion research conducted for the governor's study

commission on public employee relations. Washington, DC: Civil Service Commission.

- Peterson, R. B. (1972). Teacher attitudes toward professionalism, job satisfaction and collective negotiations: A cross cultural-study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 279).
- Peterson, R. B. (1976). A Cross-cultural study of secondary professionalism, and collective negotiations (Sweden and State of Washington), Journal of Collective Negotiations, 5(2), 113-124.
- Phelps, J. L. (1970). Differences of attitudes toward collective bargaining goals in education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Phillips, W. H. (1970). A comparison of the attitudes of rural and urban New Mexico educators toward negotiation, sanction, traditionalism, and progressivism in education (Doctoral Dissertation, New Mexico State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 1517A.
- Pisapia, J. R. (1976). Does teacher unionism affect professional commitment? Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, 5(2), 167-176.
- Popham, W. J. (1975). Educational evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Porter, L., & Lawler, E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Randles, H. (1978). Toward further understanding of public sector negotiations: Attitudes among school personnel in New York state. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 7(4), 369-80.
- Randles, H., & Baum, S. (1985). Attitudes of professional educators toward labor and management. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 14(1), 77-89.
- Reddick, T. L., Fields, J. C., & Peach, L. E. (1980). A study of professional attitudes of teachers in the Cumberland County public school systems in Tennessee. Cookeville, TN: Tennessee Technological University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 915).

- Richards, R. R. (1978). Public school employer and employee leaders' attitudes toward contract dispute resolution devices. (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University).
- Richards, R. R., & Carlton, P. W. (1983). Relative deprivation and teacher militancy in Virginia: A model and its application. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 12(4), 355-361.
- Richards, R. R., & Carlton, P. W. (1983). How far will it go? Virginia Journal of Education, 76(8), 19-21.
- Richardson, B. A. (1975). Listen. Mr. Shanker. It's not quite as simple as you make it sound. American School Board Journal, 162(5), 46-49.
- Riley, T. (1975). The collective bargaining threat to public education. Thrust for Education Leadership, 4(4), 12-13.
- Rose, J. C. (1983). Collective bargaining laws among the states. PSBA Bulletin, June, 18-21.
- Schulman, M., & Hakken, D. (1973). Faculty organization. Today's Education, 62(4), 40-42.
- Selinger, A. D. (1980). Attitudes of Ontario secondary school teachers toward aspects of professional negotiations and sanctions. Canadian Journal of Education, 5(3), 34-53.
- Skorpen, E. (1978). The professoriate and faculty unions. Educational Forum, 42(4), 395-410.
- Speck, M. (1984). Collective bargaining and the role of high school principals: A study. Thrust, June, 34-35.
- SPSS, Inc. (1983). SPSS X User's guide. New York: McGraw-Hill. Author.
- Stern, D., & Bagley, K. (1981). How participants in collective bargaining for public school teachers in California perceive the interests of teachers in relation to other groups. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 10(1), 63-73.
- Stewart, W. O. (1980). The opinions of administrators and teachers on the process of collective bargaining and the 1979-80 negotiated contract between the Chicago board

- of education and the Chicago teachers' union. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Sarasota).
- Tilbury, M. S. (1982). Attitudes of professional school of nursing faculty toward collective bargaining in the service setting. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 11(1), 23-36.
- Towers, R. L. (1969). The relationship between selected variables and the attitudes of teachers in South Carolina toward collective actions. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina). Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, 5178A.
- Towers, B., Whittingham, T. G., & Gottschalk, A. W. (1972). Bargaining for change. London, England: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Walker, N. A. (1985). A study of the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward collective action and selected demographic variables. (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University).
- Webster, Sr., W. G. (1985). Effective collective bargaining in public education. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (1984). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc.
- West Virginia Department of Education. (1982-83). West Virginia Education Directory. Author.
- West Virginia Department of Education. (1984-85). West Virginia Education Directory. Author.
- West Virginia Department of Education. (1985-86). West Virginia Education Directory. Author.
- West Virginia Education Association. (June, 1984). Legal basis for bargaining. Author.
- West Virginia Education Association. (1984). West Virginia School Journal. Charleston, WV: 113(2), p. 2, 12. Author.
- West Virginia Senate (February 14, 1984). Engrossed Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 332.

West Virginia University. (1972). West Virginia University
faculty staff survey. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia
University Publication, Author.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table 9
Groups' Responses to Statements

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category			Total Response	
			SA	A	D		SD
Teachers' organizations should not participate in the selection of new teachers.	1	1--Pres., CEA	9	15	11	8	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	28	7	3	4	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	27	7	2	4	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	15	13	6	3	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	34	4	4	3	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	5	4	3	0	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	4	1	1	0	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	36	7	0	6	49
		Totals:	158	58	30	28	274
		(Missing Cases = 1)					
Teachers' organizations should serve their membership in a fashion similar to labor unions.	2	1--Pres., CEA	16	19	6	2	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	3	11	6	22	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	3	9	12	16	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	1	8	11	17	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	6	11	13	14	44
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	2	5	5	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	2	2	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	8	14	26	49
		Totals:	30	70	69	104	273
		(Missing Cases = 2)					
Teachers should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organization and the school board cannot be reached.	3	1--Pres., CEA	11	15	10	7	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	6	6	29	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	3	2	0	35	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	0	5	4	28	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	4	6	7	28	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	3	5	3	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	1	1	4	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	0	1	4	44	49
		Totals:	20	39	37	178	274
		(Missing Cases = 1)					

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD	
The threat of teachers withholding services should be omitted from the collective bargaining process.	4	1--Pres., CEA	11	10	15	7	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	28	8	4	2	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	27	7	0	6	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	20	6	3	7	36
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	31	6	6	2	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	2	6	2	1	11
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	4	2	0	0	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	38	4	2	5	49
		Totals:	161	49	32	30	272
		(Missing Cases = 3)					
Teachers should be able to organize freely and to bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary.	5	1--Pres., CEA	34	9	1	0	44
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	4	14	15	9	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	4	5	7	24	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	1	13	5	17	36
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	10	13	8	14	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	3	5	3	1	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	2	0	3	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	3	6	19	21	49
		Totals:	60	67	58	89	274
		(Missing Cases = 1)					
Teachers' organizations at local, state, and national levels should not publicize unfair school board practices through the media such as TV, radio, newspapers and magazines.	6	1--Pres., CEA	1	0	11	32	44
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	5	8	21	6	40
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	7	10	14	8	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	5	5	20	7	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	6	9	19	10	44
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	3	8	1	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	1	5	0	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	11	7	25	5	48
		Totals:	35	43	123	69	270
		(Missing Cases = 5)					

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category					Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD	SD	
I believe that collective bargaining by teachers is a conspiracy against the country.	7	1--Pres., CEA	0	1	2	41	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	2	3	21	16	42	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	4	6	19	10	39	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	8	7	16	4	35	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	1	2	14	27	44	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	1	4	7	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	0	3	3	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	7	4	22	16	49	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 4)			22	24	101	124	271	
I feel that strikes on the part of teachers are an undesirable consequence of collective bargaining.	8	1--Pres., CEA	7	12	12	12	43	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	25	14	1	2	42	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	29	6	2	3	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	26	6	2	3	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	21	12	4	6	43	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	6	5	1	0	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	3	1	1	0	5	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	37	9	2	1	49	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 4)			154	65	25	27	271	
I believe that militant teachers' groups are made up almost entirely of malcontents and misfits.	9	1--Pres., CEA	1	2	12	29	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	7	5	21	8	41	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	8	14	15	3	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	8	16	7	5	36	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	5	7	18	14	44	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	2	2	3	4	11	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	1	3	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	7	12	21	8	48	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 5)			38	60	98	74	270	

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD	
Teachers should not strike in order to enforce their demands.	10	1--Pres., CEA	3	16	13	10	42
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	25	13	4	0	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	29	9	2	0	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	23	10	2	2	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	26	11	5	3	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	3	8	1	0	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	2	2	2	0	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	33	13	2	1	49
Totals:			144	82	31	16	273
(Missing Cases = 2)							
I feel that good teachers can always get the salary they need without resorting to collective bargaining.	11	1--Pres., CEA	1	0	6	37	44
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	6	11	17	8	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	12	12	11	5	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	12	13	9	2	36
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	4	10	16	14	44
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	3	7	0	11
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	3	1	2	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	8	19	17	5	49
Totals:			44	71	84	73	272
(Missing Cases = 3)							
I believe that collective bargaining is beneath the dignity of teachers.	12	1--Pres., CEA	1	0	8	35	44
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	6	12	18	6	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	12	18	6	4	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	12	16	7	2	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	5	12	19	9	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	5	5	0	11
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	3	0	2	5
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	12	21	13	3	49
Totals:			49	87	76	61	273
(Missing Cases = 2)							

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD	
I believe that strikes, sanctions, and boycotts are improper procedures to be used by the public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.	13	1--Pres., CEA	2	9	12	20	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	16	16	7	3	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	28	10	1	0	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	24	7	2	4	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	18	17	6	4	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	5	6	1	0	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	3	1	1	1	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	27	19	2	1	49
		Totals:	123	85	32	33	273
		(Missing Cases = 2)					
I feel that teachers cannot withhold their services without violating professional ethics and trust.	14	1--Pres., CEA	5	6	16	16	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	14	21	5	2	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	24	11	5	0	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	23	11	2	1	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	19	14	8	4	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	3	7	2	0	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	3	2	0	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	30	15	3	0	48
		Totals:	119	88	43	23	273
		(Missing Cases = 2)					
I feel that collective bargaining is not chipping away at local control and, therefore, should not be resisted.	15	1--Pres., CEA	24	16	3	1	44
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	10	15	14	40
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	0	3	9	28	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	2	5	11	18	36
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	7	9	15	13	44
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	6	3	3	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	1	2	2	5
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	2	2	15	30	49
		Totals:	36	52	73	109	270
		(Missing Cases = 5)					

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category					Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD	SD	
I think that collective bargaining can help to unite the teaching profession into a cohesive body.	16	1--Pres., CEA	21	20	3	0	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	0	8	21	12	41	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	2	5	14	19	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	2	3	13	19	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	6	9	14	16	45	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	2	8	2	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	2	2	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	4	2	10	33	49	
		Totals:	35	51	85	103	274	
		(Missing Cases = 1)						
I think that collective bargaining by teachers' organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship by the teachers.	17	1--Pres., CEA	0	0	8	35	43	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	6	18	15	3	42	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	11	17	11	0	39	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	17	12	4	4	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	8	10	17	10	45	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	4	4	3	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	1	2	1	5	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	12	20	14	3	49	
		Totals:	56	82	75	59	272	
		(Missing Cases = 3)						
I think that collective bargaining can provide a vehicle whereby teachers gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their duties.	18	1--Pres., CEA	32	12	0	0	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	5	26	9	41	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	2	4	21	13	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	1	5	14	17	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	5	11	20	9	45	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	3	8	1	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	3	1	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	5	23	20	49	
		Totals:	42	47	115	70	274	
		(Missing Cases = 1)						

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response		
			SA	A	D	SD			
I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective bargaining are sincere power seekers who have the best interests of education at heart.	19	1--Pres., CEA	15	19	3	3	40		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	10	19	11	41		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	0	4	20	16	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	3	1	11	22	37		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	6	11	15	13	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	3	7	1	11		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	3	2	1	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	8	14	25	48		
		Totals:			26	59	91	92	268
		(Missing Cases = 7)							
The local teachers' organizations should seek to regulate standards for the hiring of new teachers.	20	1--Pres., CEA	9	15	15	2	41		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	0	6	22	14	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	3	8	15	14	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	4	17	8	7	36		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	2	7	18	18	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	3	5	4	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	4	1	1	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	0	6	18	25	49		
		Totals:			18	66	102	85	271
		(Missing Cases = 4)							
I think that teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances.	21	1--Pres., CEA	18	21	3	0	42		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	15	14	12	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	2	8	16	14	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	6	12	14	5	37		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	3	14	15	13	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	7	4	1	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	3	3	0	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	0	8	18	23	49		
		Totals:			30	88	87	68	273
		(Missing Cases = 2)							

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category			Total Response	
			SA	A	D		
I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of teacher responsibility for self-discipline and for insistence upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education.	22	1--Pres., CEA	14	23	3	0	40
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	11	19	10	41
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	2	5	20	13	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	2	13	16	5	36
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	2	14	17	12	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	6	5	1	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	3	2	1	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	0	2	26	21	49
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 6)		21	77	108	63
I believe that sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.	23	1--Pres., CEA	13	19	6	0	38
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	11	18	9	39
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	1	4	16	17	38
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	4	8	17	5	34
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	2	10	17	14	43
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	4	6	1	11
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	1	2	1	4
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	2	22	20	45
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 23)		22	59	104	67
I believe that censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special reports, newspapers, and other mass media is a legitimate technique for teachers to use.	24	1--Pres., CEA	20	21	2	1	44
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	2	15	18	5	40
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	3	11	17	8	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	3	21	9	4	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	5	16	11	11	43
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	8	3	0	11
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	3	1	0	5
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	20	16	12	49
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 7)		35	115	77	41

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response		
			SA	A	D	SD			
I feel that the traditional position that teachers, as public employees, may not strike is the only defensible position for a sensible school board to take.	25	1--Pres., CEA	1	10	14	18	43		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	9	19	12	2	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	20	14	4	2	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	11	18	5	2	36		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	13	19	10	3	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	3	6	3	0	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	2	2	1	1	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	24	16	5	4	49		
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 2)			83	104	54	32	273
		I do not feel that the services of teachers are so necessary to the public welfare as to necessitate the forfeiture of their right to strike.	26	1--Pres., CEA	5	10	21	3	39
2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	2			12	16	11	41		
3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	3			9	9	18	39		
4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	6			7	14	8	35		
5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	5			4	19	13	41		
6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0			5	4	2	11		
7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0			2	3	0	5		
8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	3			7	17	21	48		
Totals: (Missing Cases = 16)				24	56	103	76	259	
I believe that sanctions or any other coercive measures used by teachers are completely unprofessional.	27			1--Pres., CEA	2	4	12	25	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	8	16	18	0	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	14	11	14	0	39		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	12	8	15	2	37		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	11	16	14	4	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	4	7	0	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	3	2	0	5		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	17	19	12	1	49		
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 3)			65	81	94	32	272

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category					Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD		
All attempts by teachers to infringe upon school board authority in the selection and adoption of textbooks and other curricular materials should be resisted.	28	1--Pres., CEA	1	1	6	36	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	2	28	11	42	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	3	2	23	12	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	4	5	17	11	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	7	2	23	12	44	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	3	3	5	11	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	0	4	2	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	5	6	27	10	48	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 3)			21	21	131	99	272	
I think that collective bargaining can bring greater order and system to education.	29	1--Pres., CEA	23	19	1	1	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	4	17	19	41	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	0	3	14	23	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	2	4	4	27	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	5	6	15	18	44	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	0	8	4	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	1	3	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	3	2	16	27	48	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 3)			34	40	76	122	272	
In order to get the salary and benefits deserved, teachers should withhold services (sick-out, work-to-the-contract, strike).	30	1--Pres., CEA	10	12	12	6	40	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	0	5	18	18	41	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	1	0	12	27	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	1	4	7	25	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	1	5	9	30	45	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	0	8	4	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	1	2	3	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	0	0	11	37	48	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 6)			13	27	79	150	269	

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response		
			SA	A	D	SD			
I believe that teachers' job security would be threatened if they withheld their services.	31	1--Pres., CEA	3	17	15	6	41		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	5	22	13	1	41		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	15	17	6	1	39		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	8	20	6	2	36		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	8	23	8	5	44		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	6	5	0	11		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	3	0	5		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	16	25	5	3	49		
		Totals:			55	132	61	18	266
		(Missing Cases = 9)							
Regardless of years of service, teachers who perform extra duties and have more demanding work loads should receive more pay.	32	1--Pres., CEA	13	18	7	3	41		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	16	20	5	1	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	22	14	3	1	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	10	17	3	6	36		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	18	22	3	2	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	4	6	1	1	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	2	4	0	0	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	18	24	4	3	49		
		Totals:			103	125	26	17	271
		(Missing Cases = 4)							
Teachers should not withhold services in order to gain better working conditions (smaller classes, fewer non-teaching duties, etc.).	33	1--Pres., CEA	0	9	17	15	41		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	10	20	10	2	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	18	17	3	2	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	16	8	12	1	37		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	18	17	9	1	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	5	6	1	0	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	2	1	3	0	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	26	19	2	2	49		
		Totals:			95	107	47	23	272
		(Missing Cases = 3)							

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category			Total Response	
			SA	A	D		
Teachers and school boards should share the authority to select and to adopt textbooks and other curricular materials.	34	1--Pres., CEA	31	10	2	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	16	24	0	42	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	19	13	5	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	17	15	3	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	18	21	3	45	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	7	3	1	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	4	0	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	20	19	5	49	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 0)			129	109	21	16	275
Collective bargaining would result in improved salaries for teachers.	35	1--Pres., CEA	20	19	3	42	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	2	18	14	42	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	2	7	19	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	0	4	15	37	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	4	12	17	45	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	5	5	11	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	0	2	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	0	10	24	49	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 3)			29	75	99	69	272
Collective bargaining would result in depriving students of the essential right to a quality education.	36	1--Pres., CEA	0	2	10	44	
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	6	12	20	40	
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	13	10	15	40	
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	14	16	5	36	
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	8	11	20	45	
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	2	2	8	12	
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	3	2	6	
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	14	18	15	49	
Totals: (Missing Cases = 3)			58	74	95	45	272

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response		
			SA	A	D	SD			
I feel that collective bargaining would enhance the status of the teaching profession.	37	1--Pres., CEA	25	15	1	2	43		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	4	18	17	40		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	3	4	13	20	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	0	2	15	20	37		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	4	6	15	19	44		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	0	8	4	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	1	2	3	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	0	2	17	30	49		
		Totals:			33	34	89	115	271
		(Missing Cases = 4)							
I believe that the professional working relationship between teachers and administrators would be hampered if collective bargaining were instituted.	38	1--Pres., CEA	0	3	16	24	43		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	15	17	7	3	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	21	16	2	1	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	20	13	2	2	37		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	18	14	8	4	44		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	2	7	2	0	11		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	2	1	2	1	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	25	16	4	4	49		
		Totals:			103	87	43	39	272
		(Missing Cases = 3)							
I believe that a professional educator cannot be a union member.	39	1--Pres., CEA	1	1	7	35	44		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	6	12	19	4	41		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	14	11	13	1	39		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	8	13	11	4	36		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	14	11	17	3	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	3	8	1	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	2	2	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	17	13	16	2	48		
		Totals:			60	66	93	52	271
		(Missing Cases = 4)							

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD	
I feel that teacher associations should be more like professional organizations, such as the American Medical Association, than like trade unions, such as the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.	40	1--Pres., CEA	1	15	14	11	41
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	18	15	3	3	39
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	23	13	3	0	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	14	14	4	4	36
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	15	20	4	5	44
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	8	3	0	0	11
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	3	1	0	5
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	26	19	2	1	48
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 12)		106	102	31	24
Teachers with the same number of years of experience in teaching should not receive the same pay.	41	1--Pres., CEA	2	6	10	25	43
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	4	15	13	10	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	8	17	9	5	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	2	6	20	9	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	7	12	17	8	44
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	2	9	1	0	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	1	3	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	9	17	18	4	48
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 4)		34	84	89	64
For the salary, present teaching positions require an unreasonable work load.	42	1--Pres., CEA	28	11	2	1	42
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	7	16	17	2	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	4	11	18	6	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	2	7	25	3	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	12	15	15	3	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	2	8	2	0	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	1	4	1	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	4	17	17	10	48
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 4)		59	86	100	26

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response		
			SA	A	D	SD			
Through the vehicle of collective bargaining, differences between teachers and administrators can be resolved more effectively.	43	1--Pres., CEA	26	17	0	1	44		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	0	5	21	15	41		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	2	2	16	19	39		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	3	3	14	17	37		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	4	7	13	19	43		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	0	11	1	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	2	1	2	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	2	20	26	49		
		Totals:			37	38	96	100	271
		(Missing Cases = 4)							
In the present teaching situations, teachers enjoy satisfying collegial (peer) relationships with members of the teaching staff.	44	1--Pres., CEA	3	25	11	4	43		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	4	32	5	1	42		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	6	30	1	2	39		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	7	22	6	0	35		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	5	31	8	1	45		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	11	0	0	12		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	4	0	0	5		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	6	33	8	0	47		
		Totals:			33	188	39	8	268
		(Missing Cases = 7)							
I believe that community support of education makes collective bargaining with the threat of sanctions unnecessary.	45	1--Pres., CEA	1	6	15	20	42		
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	5	19	10	5	39		
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	10	20	9	1	40		
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	9	20	4	3	36		
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	4	17	16	6	43		
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	8	2	0	11		
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	3	1	1	6		
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	7	29	9	4	49		
		Totals:			38	122	66	40	266
		(Missing Cases = 9)							

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 9)

Statement	Item #	Group	Responses by Category				Total Response
			SA	A	D	SD	
I do not think that present teaching positions provide a satisfying teaching experience for teachers.	46	1--Pres., CEA	13	16	9	4	42
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	0	15	24	1	40
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	1	11	24	4	40
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	5	4	23	5	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	7	8	23	7	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	8	4	0	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	1	1	3	1	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	5	31	11	48
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 5)		28	68	141	33
Most principals would favor teachers withholding services for better working conditions.	47	1--Pres., CEA	1	4	21	16	42
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	0	5	18	19	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	1	1	19	18	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	1	3	14	19	37
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	1	1	18	25	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	1	1	7	3	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	0	1	5	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	1	0	19	29	49
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 3)		6	15	117	134
I think that salaries are reasonable for most present teaching positions.	48	1--Pres., CEA	1	2	5	36	44
		2--Pres., Elem. Prin.	1	9	20	12	42
		3--Pres., Co. Bd. Ed.	1	13	17	8	39
		4--Pres., Sch. Ser. Pers.	10	10	14	2	36
		5--Pres., Sec. Prin.	1	11	15	18	45
		6--Pres., St. Coll. & Univ.	0	0	6	6	12
		7--St. Elec. & Appt.	0	2	2	2	6
		8--Supt. Co. Sch. Syst.	2	9	24	14	49
		Totals: (Missing Cases = 2)		16	56	103	98

APPENDIX B

Table 10

RESPONDING GROUPS' DEMOGRAPHIC RESPONSES

Demographic Data	Number of Responses	Valid Percent	Missing Cases
Sex			0
Male	206	74.9	
Female	69	25.1	
Age			1
Under 35	37	13.5	
36-40	54	19.7	
41-45	56	20.4	
46-55	93	33.9	
56 or over	34	12.4	
Marital Status			3
Married	240	88.2	
Single, divorced, separated, widowed	32	11.8	
Political Affiliation			4
Republican	75	27.7	
Democrat	175	64.6	
Independent	21	7.7	
Other	0		
Religious Preference			0
Protestant	227	82.6	
Catholic	23	8.4	
Jewish	2	.7	
Other	13	4.7	
None	10	3.6	

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 10)

Contract Status			6
Tenured	188	69.9	
Non-tenured	18	6.7	
Other	63	23.4	
Employment Status			16
Elementary	48	18.5	
Secondary (Middle or High School)	42	16.2	
Educational Administration	126	48.7	
Employed outside the field of education	43	16.6	
Level of Higher Education			1
Bachelors	25	9.1	
Masters	123	44.9	
CAGS (6th year)	33	12.0	
Doctorate	38	13.9	
Not Applicable	55	20.1	
Years of Active Employment			3
1-3	4	1.5	
4-10	36	13.2	
11-17	84	30.9	
18-25	79	29.0	
over 25	69	25.4	
Affiliated with			4
Professional Educational Association	181	66.8	
Educational Service Personnel Association	34	12.6	
Union of Organized Labor	3	1.1	
Professional Organization Not Related to Education	12	4.4	
Other	41	15.1	

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 10)

Ethnic Group			2
Caucasian	265	97.0	
Black	3	1.1	
Spanish Surname	1	.4	
Other	4	1.5	
Place of Birth			7
South	82	30.6	
North	47	17.5	
West	14	5.2	
East	117	43.7	
Other	8	3.0	
Years Lived in West Virginia			0
1-3	4	1.5	
4-10	18	6.5	
11-17	17	6.2	
over 17 years	231	84.0	
nonresident	5	1.8	
Your Salary Constitutes What Percentage of Total Family Income			8
Less than 25%	15	5.6	
25-50%	33	12.4	
51-75%	112	41.9	
Over 75%	107	40.1	
Social Class Membership			2
Lower	1	.4	
Lower Middle	22	8.0	
Middle	156	57.1	
Upper Middle	93	34.1	
Upper	1	.4	

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Table 10)

Number of Militant Friends			1
None	225	82.1	
One	38	13.9	
Two	9	3.3	
Three	2	.7	
Union Membership of Spouse			9
Yes	44	16.5	
No	222	83.5	
Union Membership of Mother			1
Yes	13	4.7	
No	261	95.3	
Union Membership of Father			1
Yes	110	40.1	
No	164	59.9	
Occupational Background of Father			2
Unskilled	31	11.4	
Semiskilled	126	46.1	
Clerical	7	2.6	
Technical or Professional	71	26.0	
Managerial or Executive	38	13.9	
Size of School District (only 257 possible responses)			0
1-3000	91	35.4	
3001-7000	86	33.5	
7001 or more	80	31.1	

APPENDIX C

NAME: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE COURSE: WEST VIRGINIA DATE: 1985

Please complete this Demographic Questionnaire and return it along with the Collective Bargaining Survey in the enclosed envelope.

DIRECTIONS: Complete this questionnaire by circling the appropriate number. Responses will be held in strict confidence.

1. SEX: 1. Male 2. Female 1 2 3 4 5
2. AGE: 1. Under 35 2. 36-40 3. 41-45 4. 46-55 5. 56 or Over 1 2 3 4 5
3. MARITAL STATUS: 1. Married 2. Single, Divorced, Separated, Widowed 1 2 3 4 5
4. POLITICAL AFFILIATION: 1. Republican 2. Democrat 3. Independent 1 2 3 4 5
5. RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE: 1. Protestant 2. Catholic 3. Jewish 4. Other 1 2 3 4 5
6. CONTRACT STATUS: 1. Tenured 2. Non-Tenured 3. Other 1 2 3 4 5
7. EMPLOYMENT STATUS: 1. Elementary 2. Secondary (Middle or High School)
3. Educational Administration 1 2 3 4 5
4. Employed Outside the Field of Education
8. LEVEL OF HIGHER EDUCATION: 1. Bachelors 2. Masters 3. CAGS (6th year)
4. Doctorate 5. Not Applicable 1 2 3 4 5
9. YEARS OF ACTIVE EMPLOYMENT (include this year): 1. 1-3 2. 4-10
3. 11-17 4. 18-25 5. Over 25 1 2 3 4 5
10. AFFILIATED WITH: 1. Professional Educational Association
2. Educational Service Personnel Association
3. Union or Organized Labor
4. Professional Organization Not Related to Education 1 2 3 4 5
5. Other
11. ETHNIC GROUP: 1. Caucasian 2. Black 3. Spanish Surname 4. Other 1 2 3 4 5
12. PLACE OF BIRTH: 1. South 2. North 3. West 4. East 5. Other 1 2 3 4 5
13. How many years have you lived in West Virginia (count this year)
1. 1-3 2. 4-10 3. 11-17 4. over 17 years 5. nonresident 1 2 3 4 5

(Actual document was one page.)

(continues on next page)

(Continuation of Demographic Questionnaire)

14. What percentage of your family's total income does your salary constitute?
 1. Less than 25% 2. 25-50% 3. 51-75% 4. Over 75% 1 2 3 4 5
15. Of which social class do you consider yourself to be a member?
 1. Lower 2. Lower-middle 3. Middle 4. Upper Middle 5. Upper 1 2 3 4 5
16. Of your three best friends, how many would you classify as militant?
 1. None 2. One 3. Two 4. Three 1 2 3 4 5
17. Does (did) your spouse belong to a union? 1. Yes 2. No 1 2 3 4 5
18. Does (did) your mother belong to a union? 1. Yes 2. No 1 2 3 4 5
19. Does (did) your father belong to a union? 1. Yes 2. No 1 2 3 4 5
20. What is the occupational background of your father? 1. Unskilled
 2. Semiskilled (farm or factory work) 3. Clerical
 4. Technical or Professional 5. Managerial or Executive 1 2 3 4 5

NAME: COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SURVEY COURSE: WEST VIRGINIA DATE: 1985

DIRECTIONS: Please use a No. 2 pencil to respond to the following statements 1-48. Circle the appropriate number that corresponds to your choice on the line to the right of the statements. Scale: (1) STRONGLY AGREE (2) AGREE (3) DISAGREE (4) STRONGLY DISAGREE.

1. Teachers' organizations should not participate in the selection of new teachers. 1 2 3 4
2. Teachers' organizations should serve their membership in a fashion similar to labor unions. 1 2 3 4
3. Teachers should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organization and the school board cannot be reached. 1 2 3 4
4. The threat of teachers withholding services should be omitted from the collective bargaining process. 1 2 3 4
5. Teachers should be able to organize freely and to bargain collectively for their working conditions and salary. 1 2 3 4
6. Teachers' organizations at local, state, and national levels should not publicize unfair school board practices through the media such as TV, radio, newspapers and magazines. 1 2 3 4
7. I believe that collective bargaining by teachers is a conspiracy against the country. 1 2 3 4
8. I feel that strikes on the part of teachers are an undesirable consequence of collective bargaining. 1 2 3 4
9. I believe that militant teachers' groups are made up almost entirely of malcontents and misfits. 1 2 3 4
10. Teachers should not strike in order to enforce their demands. 1 2 3 4
11. I feel that good teachers can always get the salary they need without resorting to collective bargaining. 1 2 3 4
12. I believe that collective bargaining is beneath the dignity of teachers. 1 2 3 4
13. I believe that strikes, sanctions, and boycotts are improper procedures to be used by public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment. 1 2 3 4
14. I feel that teachers cannot withhold their services without violating professional ethics and trust. 1 2 3 4

(Actual document was two pages.) (continues on next page)

15. I feel that collective bargaining is not chipping away at local control and therefore, should not be resisted. 1 2 3 4
16. I think that collective bargaining can help to unite the teaching profession into a cohesive body. 1 2 3 4
17. I think that collective bargaining by teachers' organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship by the teachers. 1 2 3 4
18. I think that collective bargaining can provide a vehicle whereby teachers gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their duties. 1 2 3 4
19. I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective bargaining are sincere power seekers who have the best interests of education at heart. 1 2 3 4
20. The local teachers' organizations should seek to regulate standards for the hiring of new teachers. 1 2 3 4
21. I think that teachers have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances. 1 2 3 4
22. I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of teacher responsibility for self-discipline and for insistence upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education. 1 2 3 4
23. I believe that sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service. 1 2 3 4
24. I believe that censure by means of articles in state association magazines, special reports, newspapers, and other mass media is a legitimate technique for teachers to use. 1 2 3 4
25. I feel that the traditional position that teachers, as public employees, may not strike is the only defensible position for a sensible school board to take. 1 2 3 4
26. I do not feel that the services of teachers are so necessary to the public welfare as to necessitate the forfeiture of their right to strike. 1 2 3 4
27. I believe that sanctions or any other coercive measures used by teachers are completely unprofessional. 1 2 3 4
28. All attempts by teachers to infringe upon school board authority in the selection and adoption of textbooks and other curricular materials should be resisted. 1 2 3 4
29. I think that collective bargaining can bring greater order and system to education. 1 2 3 4

(continues on next page)

30. In order to get the salary and benefits deserved, teachers should withhold services (sick-out, work-to-the-contract, strike). 1 2 3 4
31. I believe that teachers' job security would be threatened if they withheld their services. 1 2 3 4
32. Regardless of years of service, teachers who perform extra duties and have more demanding work loads should receive more pay. 1 2 3 4
33. Teachers should not withhold services in order to gain better working conditions (smaller classes, fewer non-teaching duties, etc.). 1 2 3 4
34. Teachers and school boards should share the authority to select and to adopt textbooks and other curricular materials. 1 2 3 4
35. Collective bargaining would result in improved salaries for teachers. 1 2 3 4
36. Collective bargaining would result in depriving students of the essential right to a quality education. 1 2 3 4
37. I feel that collective bargaining would enhance the status of the teaching profession. 1 2 3 4
38. I believe that the professional working relationship between teachers and administrators would be hampered if collective bargaining were instituted. 1 2 3 4
39. I believe that a professional educator cannot be a union member. 1 2 3 4
40. I feel that teacher associations should be more like professional organizations such as the American Medical Association, than like trade unions, such as the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. 1 2 3 4
41. Teachers with the same number of years of experience in teaching should not receive the same pay. 1 2 3 4
42. For the salary, present teaching positions require an unreasonable work load. 1 2 3 4
43. Through the vehicle of collective bargaining, differences between teachers and administrators can be resolved more effectively. 1 2 3 4
44. In the present teaching situations, teachers enjoy satisfying collegial (peer) relationships with members of the teaching staff. 1 2 3 4
45. I believe that community support of education makes collective bargaining with the threat of sanctions unnecessary. 1 2 3 4
46. I do not think that present teaching positions provide a satisfying teaching experience for teachers. 1 2 3 4

(continues on next page)

-
- 47. Most principals would favor teachers withholding services for better working conditions. 1 2 3 4
 - 48. I think that salaries are reasonable for most present teaching positions. 1 2 3 4

THANK YOU

May 24, 1985

Dear :

Bills to permit collective bargaining for public school employees have been introduced in the West Virginia Legislature on a number of occasions. Recent attempts to obtain collective bargaining rights resulted in approval by the State Senate, but were rejected by the House of Delegates.

With the present political emphasis on collective bargaining, I feel that it is important to know what West Virginia educational leaders think about collective bargaining. For this reason, I am concentrating my doctoral dissertation study at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in this area. The results should provide valuable insight regarding opinions toward collective bargaining.

Your opinion as an educational leader is valuable to me, and is an essential part of the survey. Please take the twelve minutes required to complete the survey and return it to me by June 3, 1985 in the self-addressed stamped envelope. A summary of the results will be available to participating parties upon request.

Please be assured of complete confidentiality. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire nor identified by anyone. Your cooperation and assistance are greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and valuable opinion.

Sincerely,

Michael W. McPherson
Graduate Student, VPI&SU
Principal, Thorn Elementary School
Princeton, West Virginia 24740

ENCLOSURES

June 25, 1985

Dear :

This is a follow-up request to the letter you received approximately 3 1/2 weeks ago concerning collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is a controversial topic in West Virginia at the present time, and hopefully this research project will provide additional information concerning this area.

I realize that this is a very busy time of the school year, and apologize for any inconvenience. The questionnaire is designed to take a minimum amount of your time (approximately 12 minutes), while providing needed information. Without your assistance, this research cannot be completed.

Please be assured of complete confidentiality. Your individual response will never be released to anyone, or identified in any manner whatsoever. Your cooperation and assistance is desperately needed, and would be greatly appreciated. If I can be of any assistance to you in the future, please contact me. Thank you for your time and valuable opinion (please respond, if at all possible, within the next two weeks).

Sincerely,

Michael W. McPherson
Graduate Student, VPI&SU
Principal, Thorn Elementary School
Princeton, West Virginia 24740

ENCLOSURES

November 20, 1985

Dear :

This is in reference to the survey you received previously. In order to get reliable information, the survey must be representative of the population being considered. I have not received enough responses to justify conclusions concerning this very important issue. Please, if at all possible, complete the survey and return as soon as possible.

Your viewpoint on collective bargaining is very important to me, and is essential if reliable results are to be obtained. You can be assured of complete confidentiality in relation to the survey. Your name will not be revealed to anyone, nor will your response be revealed.

Please take the twelve minutes necessary to complete the survey instrument. I have provided a copy of questionnaire, for your convenience. If you cannot complete the survey for some reason, please complete the non-response form that is enclosed. Thank you for your time and opinion.

Sincerely,

Michael W. McPherson
Graduate Student, VPI&SU
Principal, Thorn Elementary School
Princeton, West Virginia 24740

ENCLOSURES

April 15, 1986

Dear :

This is a follow-up letter concerning a survey I mailed last summer and again in November of this school year. If you received a copy and didn't complete it, please do so at this time. If you are new in the position, please complete the survey as it is essential for a dissertation I am completing at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University at Blacksburg, Virginia.

The subject of collective bargaining is of great interest to me, and your reply to the survey is very important. You can be assured of complete confidentiality and your survey will not be identifiable to anyone. If for some reason you do not complete the survey, please complete the non-response form and return it to me. Only if you respond can I complete this project. Please respond by April 21, if at all possible. Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael W. McPherson
Graduate Student, VPI&SU
Principal, Thorn Elementary School
Princeton, West Virginia 24740

ENCLOSURES

Nonresponse Survey

Please list below the reason or reasons for not responding to the questionnaire concerning collective bargaining. Please respond regardless of your opinion concerning collective bargaining. You may use one or more of the examples on the list or state your reason or reasons under OTHER. The list of examples is just that, a list that includes some common examples for not responding. The list was not meant to be all-inclusive. Please list any reason that you have for not responding. Your cooperation in returning this form is essential to the completion of this project.

The list may be checked if it includes your reason or reasons for not responding. Otherwise, use the section labeled OTHER.

- Questionnaire was too long
- Questionnaire was not appropriate to subject
- Questionnaire was worded improperly
- I did not want to take the time necessary to complete
- I do not feel that questionnaires are accurate
- Subject was of no interest to me
- Subject was of a controversial nature and I did not want involved
- I felt that I might be identified and did not want my feelings about the subject known to others
- I did not feel the questionnaire valid

OTHER: Please list any other reason or reasons you had for not responding.

Your completion of this form is greatly appreciated.

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**