This paper reports on an empirical investigation of teacher and administrator attitudes toward negotiation issues and processes. The study sought to determine the relationship between selected demographic and attitudinal variables and teacher and administrator attitudes toward the scope of the negotiations process. A Collective Negotiations Index (CNI) was developed to measure the level of expressed agreement by educators toward specific bargaining issues. Returns were received from 771 teachers and 76 administrators out of a random sample of 1,075 Kansas certified school employees. Analysis of study results disclosed that the demographic and attitudinal variables included in the investigation were poor predictors of the relative importance that educators place on bargaining issues.
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As the collective negotiations process has become increasingly pervasive in educational organizations, an anecdotal rather than an empirical-conceptual body of knowledge has developed. From this lore, a number of empirically untested and/or inconsistent assertions have been made. For example, Carlton and Goodwin (1969) have maintained that teachers are demanding a broad scope of negotiable items with the main thrust being a demand for equal power in formulating educational policy. Conversely, Kirst (1970) has observed that teacher organizations are primarily concerned with issues of salary, promotions, and working conditions.

The position of administrators in the negotiations process appears to be even less clear than the position of teachers. The demands of teachers certainly could be considered a threat to the traditional power position of administrators. However, Lieberman (1971) has postulated that this may not be the case. He has observed that school boards are delegating their decision-making powers for negotiations to the administrative staff.

It seemed apparent that an empirical investigation of both teacher and administrator attitudes toward negotiation issues and processes was needed and could well yield conclusions of considerable usefulness. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to predict and compare the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward the legitimacy of
including a variety of issues on the negotiation's agenda. The research question that guided the investigation was as follows: Are the demographic variables of age, sex, experience, and marital status and the attitudinal variables of primary life interests, satisfaction, voluntarism, aspiration, and teacher association support significantly related to teacher and administrator attitudes toward the scope of the negotiations process?

Rationale

In reviewing the literature several variables appeared to be potentially important in describing, explaining, or predicting attitudes toward negotiations. Several of these relationships will be developed in the following paragraphs.

**Demographic Variables**

Hellriegel, French, and Peterson (1970) have found that younger teachers are significantly more militant in supporting strikes. Lawler (1971) has found that younger workers place more emphasis on fringe benefits and salary than older workers. The findings of Miskel (1972) that younger educators desire better working conditions and greater autonomy in the classroom also supports the assertion that younger, less experienced educators will have different attitudes toward negotiations than older, more experienced educators.

Lawler (1971) has concluded that females are more satisfied with their salaries than males. Neff (1968) has posited that work orientations of the sexes differ because work is conceived of as a primary obligation for males, but a secondary activity for females. Empirically, Miskel (1972) has found that female teachers scored significantly lower than male teachers in (a) tolerance for work pressure, (b) competitiveness,
and (c) willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty. It seems logical to hypothesize that the sex of educators should explain a significant amount of variance in attitudes toward the scope of negotiations.

**Attitudinal Variables**

Voluntarism is the degree of freedom to act that an individual perceives in his job. For the present study, the level of two types of voluntarism were posited to be related to the attitudes toward negotiation issues. The first type was whether an individual can voluntarily choose to work. The second type was the perceived latitude in their work roles. It seems reasonable to expect that teachers who must work or perceive undue constraints in the job will have different attitudes toward the importance of some negotiation issues than those teachers who score high on voluntarism.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) have developed the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. Their theory indicates that some factors in the job are more closely related to satisfaction while other factors are more closely related to dissatisfaction. Consequently, teachers who are more satisfied should select different issues for negotiations than teachers who are dissatisfied.

Dubin (1968) has observed that most individuals have partial involvement in several institutional settings. As a result, the primary focus of a person's life may be the job, the home, or the community. Given the wide ranging areas of daily life, it appears reasonable to assume that a teacher selects only a few as primary life interests. Consequently, teachers who place their profession higher on their list of interests should seek different benefits from work than those who
place their profession lower. These differing attitudes should be reflected in the items they select as most important in the negotiations process.

The degree of identification that teachers express toward the professional association might be generalized to their attitudes toward negotiation issues. For example, individuals indicating a higher level of teachers' association support probably will have different or more intense preferences of what the legitimate items for negotiations are. More specifically, it is posited that the level of association support is related to the selection of items for inclusion in the negotiations process.

Hypothesis

Based on the foregoing assertions, three hypotheses were developed to guide the investigation.

H. 1. The aforementioned demographic and attitudinal variables are significant predictors of the legitimacy level that teachers assign to issues for negotiation.

H. 2. The aforementioned demographic variables and the attitudinal variables of primary life interests and satisfaction are significant predictors of the legitimacy level that administrators assign to issues for negotiation.

H. 3. Teachers will assign significantly different legitimacy levels to issues for negotiation than administrators.
Methodology

Instrumentation

The Collective Negotiations Index (CHI) was developed to measure the level of agreement that educators express toward specific bargaining issues. In developing this measure an item pool was formed by collecting issues and problems from teacher contracts and the negotiations literature. Using a panel method, this pool was reduced to 49 items.

A five category Likert-type response ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" was added to each. Data were collected and the categories assigned ascending values from 1 to 5. Item and varimax factor analysis procedures were used to select 39 items representing the following five factors: (a) Monetary Benefits -- 12 items, (b) Methods and Materials -- 10 items, (c) Assignments and Procedures -- 8 items, (d) Environment -- 5 items, and (e) Evaluation -- 4 items. In addition the alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) as estimates of reliability were .88, .85, .84, .69, and .65 respectively.

Additional research instruments with Likert-type response categories were developed to measure four additional variables. The measures are as follows: primary life interests - 13 items; satisfaction - 2 items; voluntarism as freedom in the work role - 10 items; and support of the negotiating unit - 9 items. The estimated reliabilities using the alpha coefficient are .84, .60, .95, and .95 respectively. Voluntarism as freedom to work or not to work was measured with five dichotomous items.

Sampling Procedures

From a numbered roster containing the names by districts of all Kansas certified employees, a random sample of 1075 educators was
selected. The measures were combined into a single questionnaire called the Collective Negotiations survey and were mailed to the selected subjects. With two follow-up mailings, analyzable returns were received from 771 teachers and 76 administrators for a total of 847 or 79.7%.

Data Analysis

To test hypotheses one and two, multiple stepwise regression analysis was used to predict the variance in responses to the CNI factors by teachers and administrators. An arbitrary cutoff point of adding one percent of explained variance and F ratios were used to determine significant predictor variables. For hypothesis three single classification analysis of variance was used to test for mean differences between teachers and administrators on the five CNI factors.

Findings

Hypothesis One

A summary of the stepwise regression analysis procedure predicting the variance in teacher attitudes toward the five CNI factors is presented in Table 1. Generally, support for hypothesis one is minimal with only 5.9 to 10.6% of the variance being explained by the predictor variables. Specifically, the only significant predictors of the CNI factor variance for teachers were Association Support for all five factors and age for Monetary Benefits, Environment, and Evaluation. All the variables were positively correlated except age and environment.

Table 1 about here
Hypothesis Two

Table 2 presents a data summary for testing the prediction level for administrator attitudes. A greater number and diversity of significant predictor variables were found for administrators but support for hypothesis two also must be considered minimal as only 8.8 to 10.9% of the variance was explained. Significant predictors for administrators are as follows: Monetary Benefits -- education, satisfaction and sex; Methods and materials -- satisfaction and experience; Assignments and Procedures -- sex, age, education; Environment -- primary life interests, experience, age, education, sex, and satisfaction; evaluation -- sex. Education level, primary life interests, and satisfaction were generally positively correlated with the CNI factors. Conversely, tenure and age were negatively correlated with the CNI factors.

Table 2 about here

Hypothesis Three

The mean scores of teachers were significantly higher on all five CNI factors than administrator scores. The large F values are indicative of the gross differences in factor means. The data summary for the analysis of variance procedures is presented in Table 3. The means and standard deviations for each factor are presented in Table 4.

Table 3 about here
Discussion and Implications

The findings that the demographic and attitudinal variables included in this investigation were poor predictors of the relative importance that educators place on bargaining issues contradicts much of the existing anecdotal, empirical, and conceptual knowledge. For example, the stereotypes of the militant young male teacher and the submissive older female teacher were not supported.

The differences between teachers and administrators across the five CNI factors assures continued conflict. Furthermore, if Lieberman (1971) is correct in his assessment of an increasingly important role for administrators in negotiations process, these basic attitudinal differences will probably become more apparent.

These findings must be tested in further theoretically based investigations by many additional researchers. Specifically, more research is needed not only to further test the importance of the variables measured in this study but also to expand the range of variables possibly having an influence on teacher attitudes toward the negotiations process. Finally, several research instruments with high reliabilities were developed or refined in this investigation for use in future investigations.
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## TABLE 1

Significant Predictors of Teacher Attitudes Using Step-wise Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables--CNI Subscales</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Variance Increase (Percent)</th>
<th>Variance Explained (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Benefits</td>
<td>Association Support</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Materials</td>
<td>Association Support</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments and Procedures</td>
<td>Association Support</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Association Support</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Association Support</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Significant Predictors of Administrator Attitudes Using Step-wise Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables - CNI Subscales</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Variance Increase (Percent)</th>
<th>Variance Explained (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Benefits</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Materials</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments and Procedures</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Central Life Interest</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

Single-Classification Analysis of Variance
For Attitudes of Administrators and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNI Subscale</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Benefits</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>833.79</td>
<td>17.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>47.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Materials</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>935.06</td>
<td>17.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>54.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments and Procedures</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1925.53</td>
<td>55.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>34.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.48</td>
<td>7.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206.11</td>
<td>24.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
### TABLE 4
Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers and Administrators on the Summed I Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNI Factor</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Benefits (12 items)</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Materials (10 items)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments and Procedures (8 items)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (5 items)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (4 items)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>