

UNION STATUS FOR TEACHERS:  
THE IMPACT OF THE FIRST COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT  
ON WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

by

Maureen Patricia Smiley

B.G.S., Simon Fraser University, 1990

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty  
of  
Education

© MAUREEN PATRICIA SMILEY 1993

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

June 1993

All rights reserved. This work may not be  
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy  
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Maureen Patricia Smiley  
Degree: Master of Arts  
Title of Thesis: Union Status for Teachers: The Impact of the  
First Collective Agreement on Working  
Relationships  
Examining Committee:  
Chair: Geoffrey Madoc-Jones

---

Norman Robinson  
Senior Supervisor

---

Mike Manley-Casimir  
Professor

---

Ian Housego  
Professor  
Department of Administrative, Adult and  
Higher Education  
The University of British Columbia  
External Examiner

Date Approved March 3 1993

## Partial Copyright License

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

**Union Status for Teachers: The Impact of the First Collective**

**Agreement on Working Relationships**

---

---

---

Author

(signature)

Maureen Patricia Smiley

(name)

March 3, 1993

(date)

## Abstract

The central problem of this study was to determine if there has been any significant change in perceptions of working relationships by teachers, administrators and central office staff following the implementation of the first collective agreement in the West Vancouver School District. The problem was analyzed in terms of issues bearing on teacher relationships in schools and within the district, teacher self-image, working conditions, relationships with students and parents and other related issues. A questionnaire was used to survey elementary and district staff prior to the signing of the collective agreement in June 1988. The same questionnaire was used again in March 1992.

The questionnaire developed for this study was distributed to all elementary school teachers, principals and vice-principals and central office administrators. The findings from this questionnaire reveal that teachers, school based administrators and central office staff in West Vancouver believe the most positive impact of the first collective agreement has been improved economic benefits and working conditions. Teachers and administrators concur that school decision-making processes are more collegial. Teachers also feel they play an expanded role on curriculum committees, experience greater academic freedom in the classroom and perceive themselves to be more professional. The central office staff was of the opinion that putting in place a more formal dispute mechanism for grievances was an important outcome of the collective agreement.

The data indicated that teachers, administrators and central office staff are concerned over the split between school-based administrators

and teachers. Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders. The results of this study clearly indicate that after four years the collective agreement has not impacted as negatively on working relationships in the district as previously predicted by respondents in 1988.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Mr. John Bowbrick, Principal, Caulfeild Elementary School, West Vancouver, whose questionnaire in 1988 made this study possible.

I would like also to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to Mr. Wayne Rowley and the West Vancouver Teachers' Association, Elementary Principals and Vice-Principals and Central Office Administrators for their cooperation and support for this study.

## Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgments .....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Tables.....	ix
CHAPTER 1. Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	4
Limitations of the Study.....	5
References.....	6
CHAPTER 2. Background to the Problem.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Growth of Teacher Unions and Collective Bargaining.....	7
Unionism and Collective Bargaining in British Columbia.....	9
Impact of Unionism and Collective Bargaining on Schools.....	12
Split Between Administrators and Teachers.....	16
Working Relationships.....	18
Summary.....	19
Concluding Statement.....	20
References.....	22
CHAPTER 3. Research Methodology.....	24
Introduction.....	24
Data Required.....	24
The Survey Instrument.....	24
Pilot Study.....	26

## Table of Contents (Continued)

Sample.....	26
Data Collection Procedures.....	27
Data Analysis.....	29
Summary.....	29
 CHAPTER 4. Results and Discussion.....	 30
Sub-Problem 1.0.....	30
Findings: Perceptions of Teachers.....	30
Discussion.....	31
Findings: Perceptions of Administrators.....	32
Discussion.....	33
Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration.....	34
Sub-Problem 2.0.....	34
Findings: Perceptions of Teachers.....	34
Discussion.....	35
Findings: Perceptions of Administrators.....	36
Discussion.....	36
Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration.....	37
Discussion.....	38
Sub-Problem 3.0.....	39
Findings: Perceptions of Teachers.....	39
Discussion.....	40
Findings: Perceptions of Administrators.....	41
Discussion.....	41
Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration.....	42
Discussion.....	42
Sub-Problem 4.0.....	43
Findings: Perceptions of Teachers .....	43
Discussion.....	44
Findings: Perceptions of Administrators.....	45
Discussion.....	46
Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration.....	47
Discussion.....	48
Sub-Problem 5.0.....	49
Findings: Perceptions of Teachers.....	49
Discussion.....	50



## Table of Contents (Continued)

Findings: Perceptions of Administrators.....	51
Discussion.....	52
Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration.....	52
Discussion.....	53
Sub-Problem 6.0.....	53
Findings: Perceptions of Teachers.....	53
Discussion.....	54
Findings: Perceptions of Administrators.....	56
Discussion.....	57
Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration.....	58
Discussion.....	59
Summary.....	60
CHAPTER 5. Conclusions.....	61
Summary.....	61
Conclusions.....	63
Implications for Practice in Educational Administration.....	65
References.....	67
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire.....	68
APPENDIX B. Covering Letter to Pilot Study Participants.....	75
APPENDIX C. Comment Sheet to Pilot Study.....	76
APPENDIX D. 1988 Authorization from West Vancouver Teachers' Association.....	77
APPENDIX E. 1992 Covering Letter to Questionnaire.....	78
APPENDIX F. 1992 Letter of Support from the West Vancouver Teachers' Association.....	79
APPENDIX G. Letter to all West Vancouver Teachers.....	80
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	81

## List of Tables

Table 1.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	31
Table 2.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	33
Table 3.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	35
Table 4.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	36
Table 5.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	38
Table 6.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	40
Table 7.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	41
Table 8.	T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	42

## List of Tables (Continued)

- Table 9. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....44
- Table 10. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....46
- Table 11. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....48
- Table 12. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....50
- Table 13. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....51
- Table 14. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....52
- Table 15. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....54
- Table 16. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....57

## List of Tables (Continued)

Table 17. T-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.....	59
---	----

# CHAPTER 1

## Introduction

In 1987 teachers in British Columbia were confronted with the enactment and passage into law of Bill 20 - the Teaching Profession Act. This law gave teachers full collective bargaining rights. Bill 20 also proposed a "College of Teachers" which would control certification, discipline and professional development of all British Columbia teachers. Membership in the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (B.C.T.F.) became voluntary for teachers. Principals and Vice-principals would now be referred to as "administrative officers" and were excluded from membership in local teachers' associations and the B.C.T.F.

The advent of collective bargaining on the teaching profession has had a varying impact on schools. Studies already concluded have found that school administrators have more responsibilities as a collective group but that the ultimate impact of the collective agreement is unknown (Perry and Wildman, 1966). By the 1970s further research demonstrated evidence of teacher concerns which focussed on classroom matters and teaching resources (Perry and Wildman, 1970). Researchers found that teachers to this date have not pressed hard for increased teacher decision making powers. Lortie (1975) concluded that concerns of teachers centered mainly on psychic rewards, salary benefits and economic well-being. Further research in the late 70s found that the largest impact of a collective agreement at the school level has been a curtailment of the decision-making powers of administrators. Studies in the early 1980s focussed on the impact of the collective agreement, changes in work responsibilities within schools and the authority available to

principals (Kerchner and Mitchell, 1981). They, too, concluded the collective bargaining process enhances teacher rights and curtails management "perogatives." Beginning in the mid-eighties researchers reported conflict between teachers and administrators was arising from unionization.

The impact of increased participation of British Columbia teachers in the collective bargaining process may prove to be problematic for all stakeholders in public education. Many fear that union status will increase conflict among teachers, administrators and the public. Balancing the professional status of their profession against the teachers' right to assert themselves collectively and win significant gains, will require all participants in the bargaining process to be aware of the impact of their decisions.

### Statement of the Problem

The central research problem was to assess whether there has been any significant change in work relationships in elementary schools as a result of the implementation of the collective agreement in the West Vancouver School District.

Prior to the official change in status, John Bowbrick, Principal of Caulfeild Elementary School in West Vancouver, designed a survey (see Appendix A) to study the *anticipated* impact of the impending collective agreement on working relationships in elementary schools. The survey was completed by central office administrators, principals, vice-principals and teachers.

The following sub-problems from the Bowbrick data and follow-up survey were examined from the viewpoint of three groups: teachers, site-based administrators and central office staff.

Sub-problem 1.0

To what extent have teacher relationships in your own school changed?

Sub-problem 2.0

To what extent have teacher relationships changed in the district?

Sub-problem 3.0

To what extent do teachers feel more professional?

Sub-problem 4.0

To what extent have working conditions within the school and district changed?

Sub-problem 5.0

To what extent have teacher relationships with students and parents changed?

Sub-problem 6.0

To what extent has unionism affected the district and elementary schools within the district?

## Significance of the study

Research in this area will provide insight into determining whether work relationships have changed significantly by the collective agreement. Information attained may be used by administrators and teachers to offset negative effects of the agreement on working relationships in our schools.

To date, much of the literature states that "collective bargaining is standardizing schooling, undermining principals' authority and diverting teacher loyalties" (Johnson, 1983). This study attempts to seek further clarification concerning the attitudes of teachers and administrators towards work relationships within the elementary school setting as a result of the institution of the collective agreement.

This study has significance for all members of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation as it examines the impact of the change of status for its teachers. Increased understanding of its members' feelings may benefit those who are involved in future contract negotiations.

Further insight into the attitudes and feelings of principals and vice-principals is a significant factor in this study. How school administrators are viewed by their staff may have an impact on the role of the contract and working relationships in schools. The extent the contract places restraints on administrators and how the site-based leader responds to these constraints, may also play a significant role on working relationships in the school. The administrator's leadership style may impact significantly on the prominence of the contract in schools.



Focussing on the problem from three viewpoints namely, teachers, administrators and central office staff should establish to what degree a general understanding of the problem has been achieved.

### Limitations of the Study

This study is descriptive of factors which may impact on working relationships in elementary schools. The sample is small in comparison with the teaching population of the province of British Columbia. West Vancouver is one school district out of 75 and is considered to be a politically conservative district. The findings here do not address all aspects of or factors related to the collective agreement. They do attempt, however, to focus on attitudes and perceptions of any changes which may have occurred during the past four years as a result of the implementation of the collective agreement. It is also important to note that the effects of collective bargaining are inextricable from many other factors which may influence responses to survey items.

## REFERENCES

- Berube, M. R. (1988). Teacher politics - The influence of unions. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Inc.
- Elam, S. M. (1981). The National Education Association: Political powerhouse or paper tiger? Phi Delta Kappan, (11),169-174.
- Johnson, S. M. (1984). Teacher unions in schools. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kerchner, C. T. (1986). Labor policy in school districts: Its diffusion and impact on work structures. Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.
- Lieberman, M. (1981). Teacher bargaining: An autopsy. Phi Delta Kappan, (12), 231-234
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). School-teacher. A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Robinson, N. (1987). The political punch of teachers. The Canadian Administrator, 26 (5).
- Selinger, A. D. (1980). Attitudes of Ontario secondary school teachers toward aspects of professional negotiations. Canadian Journal of Education, 5(3). 34-54.

## CHAPTER 2

### Introduction

This chapter examines the literature on the growth of teacher unions, collective bargaining in British Columbia, the impact of unions and collective bargaining on schools, the split between teachers and administrators and the impact of the collective agreement on working relationships.

#### Growth of Teacher Unions and Collective Bargaining in the United States

This century has witnessed the enormous growth of teacher unions and of collective bargaining. At the turn of the century, a mere 15 percent of public school teachers in the United States were members of unions (Lortie, 1975, p. 20). Some ninety years later union numbers have expanded to a startling 91% of teachers who either belong to the National Education Association (NEA) or to the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) (Cresswell and Murphy, 1980). By the mid-70s public school teachers in the United States comprised one of the largest unionized work forces. Teaching can thus be considered one of the most unionized occupations in society (Finn, 1985; Cresswell and Murphy, 1980). In comparison, this phenomenal growth occurred at a time when unions in the private sector were beginning to experience a decline in their membership due to technological and economic factors (Cresswell and Murphy, 1980; Lieberman, 1981).

During the 1960s, rising inflation and a shortage of teachers were both an incentive and a perceived opportunity in achieving higher wages (Lortie, 1975). Teachers regarded themselves not only as being severely underpaid, but perhaps equally importantly, as being undervalued.

Many teachers felt administrators and school boards treated them as less than the professionals they considered themselves to be (Bacharach and Shedd, 1988). Studies by Kratzman and Steele (cited in Munton, 1987) suggest teacher morale and lack of self-esteem were related to teachers' desiring a stronger voice in professional issues. Such unhappy suppositions were manifested in the teachers' choice of the industrial union model as a means to achieve collective power and a resounding voice.

The 1960s saw also the expansion of the Civil Rights movement. Cresswell and Murphy (1976) cite research by Corwin (1968) and Horvat (1968) concerning the political environment of this period, whereby, pressure was placed upon the school system to integrate education. Increasingly, society was becoming aware of pressing problems of inequality, poor housing, poverty and exacerbated racial tension. Schools were expected to deal with the deluge. Teachers, however, believed that neither their low salaries, nor their lack of professional recognition were congruent with these overwhelming responsibilities. Collective militant action was considered to be the only way in which to acquire greater professional status in addition to higher income.

During the 1970s the teachers' collective voice rejected the charge that their profession was in any sense responsible for the ills that were besetting society. As the Civil Rights conflicts reached their peak, teachers felt isolated from and criticised by their administrators. They began to perceive themselves as the scapegoats of society (Mitchell, 1988, p. 11). According to Greer and Brown (cited in Munton, 1987), low satisfaction with wages and working conditions and unfair treatment by school boards continued to be concomitant with feelings of low professional status.

As collective bargaining enters its third decade, teacher unions and collective bargaining are undergoing fundamental changes (Bacharach and Shedd, 1988). During the 1980s the reality of economic cut-backs to public education, general expectations of taxpayers for increased accountability and a plethora of reports calling for renewed labor-management relations served to underscore the need for reforms in the collective bargaining process (McDonnell and Pascal, 1988). Research which promotes collegiality and continuous improvement (Little, 1982) combined with increased teacher empowerment and school-based management (Bacharach and Shedd, 1988) will in large part be instrumental in shaping teacher unions in this decade.

### Unionism and Collective Bargaining in British Columbia

The 1980s represented a crucial time in collective bargaining in British Columbia. During this period the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (BCTF) endeavored to achieve full collective bargaining rights encompassing all facets related to the work place; including conditions of work, class size, preparation time and a host of other work related issues. In 1987, provincial legislation was enacted whereby British Columbia (B.C.) teachers were given a choice of full collective bargaining rights under the Industrial Relations Act or as an Association with limited bargaining rights under the School Act.

As in other parts of North America, the recession of the early 1980s precipitated the emergence of government restraint programs. In 1982, legislated restraint programs which caused serious concern to educators in B.C. included The Compensation Stabilization Program, The Education Interim Finance Act, The Public Sector Restraint Act (Bill 3) and the

infamous Bill 89 which would ultimately close schools for six days as a measure to balance budgets in B.C.'s 75 school districts.

The beginning of this decade commenced with government legislation which slashed \$65.8 million dollars from school board budgets (BCTF Members' Guide, 1991-92, p. 122). This Act alone entailed the loss of hundreds of teaching and non-teaching positions in the province.

Enacted into law in April 1982, The Compensation Stabilization Program, was designed to control public sector wages by basing salary increases in collective agreements on school boards' ability to pay. Teacher salary increases were, therefore, limited to 3.5 per cent. From the teachers' point of view, the subsequent reduction of monies allotted to school boards to pay salaries seriously undermined the collective bargaining process. Dramatically, 62 out of 68 district contracts went unresolved and were sent to binding arbitration (BCTF Members' Guide, 1991-92, p. 122).

The Education Interim Finance Act was passed as law on April 30, 1982. This legislation seriously eroded long-standing taxing powers of local boards and empowered the government to set limits on school board budgets (Munton, 1987). Under the act local school authorities no longer had the freedom to tax commercial and residential property.

Bill 89, introduced in September 1982, as a cost-cutting measure forced teachers to give up one day of pay in 1982 and an additional five days' pay was to be lost between January and June, 1983. Further provincial legislation, enacted in 1983, impacted significantly on all public sector employees. Of particular concern to teachers was The Public Sector Restraint Act (Bill 3), which removed teachers' tenure rights and permitted school boards to dismiss teachers without due process. During this period of fiscal restraint, class size coupled with learning and working

conditions became overriding issues in bargaining. Many of the gains of the 1970s had been forfeited and teachers were determined to recapture what they perceived to be as significant losses over the past few years. The British Columbia government's restraint program officially ended in 1986. School boards were once again given the right to set their own budgets. Gradually, improvements were noticed - class sizes, pupil - teacher ratios and ancillary services.

The Teaching Profession Act (Bill 20) was introduced and passed into law on April 30, 1987. This Bill gave teachers full collective bargaining rights. It allowed for direct negotiations covering learning and working conditions in 1988 contracts (BCTF Members' Guide, p.124). Under the new bargaining procedures, working conditions and smaller class sizes became the major focus. Although far from satisfactory for most teachers, 60 of the 75 school contracts contained a class size clause. Also included in Bill 20 was a designation to be known as The College of Teachers mandating compulsory membership for those holding a valid British Columbia teacher's certificate. As well, Principals and Vice-Principals were to be addressed as "administrative officers" and excluded from membership in local teachers' associations and the BCTF.

The imposition of compulsory membership for all educational personnel in The College of Teachers has drawn the ire of the BCTF (BCTF Members' Guide, 1991-92). The Federation puts forth the argument that the College is in reality superfluous; in other words the Federation should be the sole body dealing with all professional and economic issues pertaining to the teaching profession. Traditionally, the inclusion of all educational personnel in one organization permitted the BCTF to be free of control from administrators, school boards and the Department of Education. The BCTF takes the position that teaching is different from

other professions in that whilst teachers are employees, at the same time they are also autonomous decision-makers within their own classrooms.

Changes to the British Columbia School Act in 1989 removed the maximum number of hours a teacher is required to work. Thirty-three of the 75 contracts contained clauses restricting the number of hours of teacher instruction. With the first collective agreement now in place under the Industrial Relations Act, all elementary teachers were guaranteed a minimum of one hour per week preparation time and secondary teachers 12.5 per cent of a weekly teaching schedule. All contracts in B.C., state clearly that extra curricular activities provided by teachers is voluntary (BCTF Members' Guide, p. 124).

British Columbia teachers have vehemently protested sections of Bill 20. Concerns have focused on the divisive nature of the legislation; that is the separation of teachers and administrators, more managerial control, the potential for conflict in schools and the limiting of teachers' decision-making powers. For better or for worse legislation affecting education in B.C., is a fact of life and no doubt will, in the coming years, be a subject for in-depth argument and discussion.

### Impact of Unionism and Collective Bargaining on Schools

There is almost two decades of research in the United States which document the positive effects the process of collective bargaining has on teachers' organizations - increased salaries, more job security, increased professional decision making powers and reduced class sizes. (Cresswell and Murphy, 1976; Lortie, 1975; Johnson, 1984). Joining a union and participating in the negotiation of a collective agreement is the customary way for teachers to increase their authority in schools thereby, reducing the hierarchical system within their organizations (Cresswell and Murphy,



1967; Johnson, 1984). Generally, contract provisions reward teachers financially, protect their jobs and permit staff to spend more time on instruction.

Johnson (1983, 1984), however, reviewing empirical studies, suggests the organizational effects of collective bargaining are far less extreme than other researchers suggest. Johnson's research suggests that school based personnel are allies rather than adversaries and concludes that teachers' allegiance to their schools and to their principals take precedence over union activities. Stockman (1984) expresses the view that teachers' attitudes towards their school are more apt to influence school operations than collective bargaining. "Teachers who reflect positive attitudes and feelings towards their school will inevitably have a school which reflects the same" (Johnson, 1984, p.10). Conversely, other researchers assert that the onset of unionism in schools has only served to encourage conflict among teachers, administrators and the public (Lieberman, 1981).

Johnson (1984) posits the view that contract enforcement varies from school to school and district to district depending on the teacher's interpretation of the collective agreement (p. 165). Her research supports the establishment of more formal procedures and personnel practices by schools and districts, such as grievances and employee termination, which are seen by teachers and administrators as fairer processes.

McDonnell and Pascal (1988) conclude that the majority of teachers they interviewed regard the role of teacher organizations entirely in terms of material benefits obtained (p. 38). From their studies, McDonnell and Pascal state:

The extent to which the union can influence district policy or maintain a collaborative relationship with school officials most often depends on a combination of factors, including the length of the bargaining relationship, the strength of the contract, and the personal relationships between key union leaders and their counterparts in the district administration.

(p.39)

Not all researchers, however, promote the positive effects of collective bargaining. Finn's review of literature (1985) is at odds with the positions taken by other researchers; specifically a study by Goldschmidt (1983) which concludes that "the impact of collective bargaining is much greater than previously believed, especially on governance, school organization and administrative work, and student educational programs" (p. 338). Goldschmidt's study of 80 collective agreements across the United States, indicates a significant number of provisions within the agreement which affect curriculum and student placement. The extent to which these provisions impact positively or negatively is not specifically clear.

There is a need for teachers and administrators to be cautious in their thinking; an unquestioning acceptance of the potential for conflict of the industrial union model should not exist if we are to view negotiating relationships in a positive light (Wildman and Perry, 1967; p. 425). The authors question the extent to which conflict *actually exists* between teachers and administrators. They call for further research on the impact of collective bargaining on all aspects of the school system.

According to Nason (cited in Cresswell and Murphy, 1967) the imposition of compulsory membership in teacher unions was the single

most powerful influence allowing the collective bargaining process to determine teacher salaries and working conditions. Caution should be exercised, however, in interpreting the influence of collective bargaining on increased salaries for teachers; Wynn (1981) concludes that no measurable improvement in salaries develops as a result of collective bargaining. A caveat to Wynn's research is that not all relevant variables affecting teacher salaries were examined. An equally important point is that some school boards offer teachers higher salaries in exchange for larger classes. Some researchers equate the issues of class size and salaries as being critical to any economic gains for teachers, thus suggesting clearly that there exists a trade-off in bargaining (Hall and Carroll, 1973).

Johnson (1984) cites from research of Perry and Wildman, (1970); McDonnell and Pascal, (1979); Kerchner and Mitchell, (1981); all of which discuss the dominant effects of teacher unions. They conclude that collective bargaining increases the authority of teachers while restricting the authority of principals, centralizes and standardizes school practices, redefines and reduces teachers' work obligations and increases teachers' job protections.

Some studies discuss the negative effects of collective bargaining in public schools. Stockman (1984) concludes that collective bargaining erodes faith in the public school system. Militant behavior on the part of some public school personnel has been a major factor in alienating the public from the school system. Stockman states emphatically, "Teachers' organizations are far more concerned with teachers' rights than children's rights" (p. 10). He further comments that the transition from professional to union status has negatively affected the daily operations and the quality of instruction which students receive. Furthermore, research by

Lieberman (1981) suggests strongly that militant unionism by teachers has eroded public confidence in education. He posits the view that collective bargaining has served only to strengthen self-interest groups such as labor negotiators and union staff. He concludes that the process of collective bargaining is "antidemocratic, costly and unconstitutional" (p. 234).

Johnson's (1983) research on the overall impact of collective bargaining on schools does not support such negative conclusions. The reciprocal nature of the school setting, the interdependence of teachers and administrators and the day-to-day realities of school work suggest that schools, indeed, are not transformed into such "negative institutions" (p.326).

### Split Between Administrators and Teachers

A further significant impact of the industrial union model on schools has been the separation of administrators from teacher unions. According to Finn (1985) unionism has caused significant changes in the nature of relationships between teachers and administrators.

For administrators the split is significant. Bacharach and Shedd (1988) conclude that collective bargaining has provided administrators with their own base of power. They elaborate on this point stating that administrative decisions are frequently supported by the school board as a way of displaying a "united front." A positive outcome of this practice is that principals are increasingly more consistent with administrative directives as they are now in the position of having to rationalize their actions with staff members. Less attention, however, is paid to personal relationships with teachers. Although, principals expect loyalty and cooperation from their staff, union-management conflicts serve to

undermine this allegiance making it more difficult for a synergistic environment to exist between teachers and administrators (Mitchell, Kerchner, Erck, and Pryor, 1981).

There are those who refute the reports of increased administrative power. Mitchell, Kerchner, Erck, and Pryor (1981) cite many studies (e.g. Slichter, Healy, and Livernash, 1960; Wellington and Winter, 1971; Stanley, 1972; Stiber, 1973) which conclude that collective bargaining actually diminishes the scope of administrators' decision making powers (p. 151). Their research suggests that procedures and policies are now more formalized under the collective agreement which in turn reduces ad hoc decisions being implemented by administrators.

Unionized staff are also affected by the split between administrators and teachers. On the one hand teachers are expected to diligently work toward district goals and support the administrative organization; namely the superintendent and the principal. On the other hand, according to Mitchell and Kerchner (1983), the union which is usually guided by a staff colleague, expects teachers "to challenge the legitimacy of management directives" (p. 225) and be willing to undertake collective action in order to achieve the union goals.

Whilst teacher unions and administrators compete for teacher loyalty, teachers' and administrators' interests and concerns about school matters overlap. The very nature of their positions and the needs of the school cause each one to be dependent upon the other. Administrators need to utilize their power to control working conditions within their own schools in order to ensure effective discipline and to provide instructional leadership. Teachers, however, need to maintain control over instructional and classroom matters (Corwin and Borman, 1988).

The reality exists that schools are controlled by district policies and as such these policies may limit the control which administrators have over their own schools. To many teachers, administrators are perceived more as agents of the Board rather than as protectors of teachers' interests. Under the present model of collective bargaining, Mitchell and Kerchner (1984) worry that only occasionally, will cooperation and respect between teachers and administrators be achieved.

### Working Relationships

In the largest study investigating the impact of collective agreements on working relationships, some of the most important factors for teachers in labor relations focus on personal attitude, feelings and perceptions teacher manifest towards administrators and each other (Mitchell, Kerchner, Erck and Pryor, 1981). Mitchell et al. conclude that collective negotiations are redefining teachers work roles and the variety of services which schools provide to children. Conversely, contractual guidelines are putting pressure on school administrators to be more cautious in their relationships with teachers. Increasingly strong evidence is accruing which suggests that cooperative relationships between teachers and administrators are "politically hazardous for both parties" (p. 153).

Other studies support the notion that teacher unionism has not resulted in comfortable working relationships between teachers and administrators (Mitchell, 1988). Mitchell, Kerchner, Erch and Pryor (1981) cite research from Cooper (1978) who states that principals are feeling increasingly isolated in their jobs and therefore are less prone to effect a personal relationship with teachers. In addition to these unhappy feelings is the sense that principals are feeling less part of the administrative 'team' within their districts (p. 163). There is even dissension among

some union staff. Further research by these four authors state that the interests of specialist teachers do not generate support from their colleagues in the union. Classroom teachers tend to view specialists as having "less demanding and less productive jobs" (p. 157). Their research concludes that administrators are less likely to support the needs of specialized teachers due to the union stance that all teachers should receive the same benefits (p. 158).

McDonnell and Pascal (1988) cite the evidence of their own previous studies and that of other researchers Johnson (1984); Mitchell et al., (1981): personal relationships, effective leadership and rank-and-file preferences may have more impact on contract outcomes than any other measurable factors (p. 14).

### Summary

This chapter has discussed the growth of teacher unions and collective bargaining both in the United States and British Columbia and their subsequent impact on schools and working relationships. Although teachers in B.C. have achieved significant gains in their contracts dealing with learning and working conditions and increased salaries, continued controversy exists between the BCTF and the Government, over educational funding to schools. As of May 1990, school boards have enacted changes to the School Act, resulting in revisions to the system of financing education in the province. Under a new block funding scheme, the Cabinet determines budget levels for all school boards in addition to setting tax rates on all properties. If school districts are unable to meet their budget requirements, they have the option of proceeding to referendum. The beginning of the 1990's has begun with a new public school restraint program.

## Concluding Statement

Teacher unions are an integral part of public education in the United States. The preponderance of research on teacher unionism during the past two decades underscores the importance of collective bargaining in achieving economic benefits, reduction of student/teacher ratios, increased salaries, the protection of teachers' rights to due process and better working conditions, with teachers' professional interests being of secondary consideration.

However, many teacher unions in the United States are now reexamining their approach to collective bargaining after studying reports by McDonnell and Pascal (1988) and Kerchner (1988) who describe the changes which union leaders are experiencing; the issue being one of how to redefine teaching as a profession. Less than one third of teacher unions in their sample had achieved limits on class size or the establishment of instructional policy committees at each school.

Furthermore, teacher unions have made little progress in obtaining new contractual provisions since 1975: With relatively few exceptions, the improvements in working conditions teacher unions had attained by 1975 were not enhanced in the 1980 and 1985 contracts (McDonnell and Pascal, 1988, p.vi).

McDonnell and Pascal conclude their study by stressing the need for teacher unions to move beyond the traditional process of collective bargaining in order to attain the professional status which teachers desire (p. 52).

Teachers in British Columbia now find themselves in this position. At the time of writing, teachers in West Vancouver are involved in the process of negotiating their second contract. Collective bargaining in this province is now the new structure in place for decision-making, resolving



conflicts and providing a grievance procedure. It would appear that teachers in British Columbia are following closely on the heels of their American counterparts. It seems that now is the time to reexamine the direction of collective bargaining. Further examination of the roles of teachers and administrators and the collective bargaining process would be a step towards the establishment of positive working relationships.

## REFERENCES

- Berube, M.R. (1988). Teacher politics: The influence of unions. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Bacharach, S. B. & Shedd, J. B. (1988). Power and empowerment: The constraining myths and emerging structures of teacher unionism in an age of reform. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administration. London: Falmer, 139-160.
- Corwin, R. G. & Borman, K. M. (1988). School as workplace: Structural constraints on administration. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration. New York: Longman, (209-234).
- Cresswell, A. M., & Murphy, M. J. (1980). Education and collective bargaining. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Finn, C. E. Jr. (1985). Teacher unions and school quality: Potential allies or inevitable foes? Phi Delta Kappa, 66(5), 331-338.
- Johnson, S. M. (1984). Teacher unions in schools. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Johnson, S. M. (1983). Teacher unions in schools: Authority and Accommodation. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 309-326.
- Kerchner, C. T. (1988). A new generation of teacher unionism. The Education Digest, (5), 53-54.
- Kerchner, C. T. & Mitchell, Douglas E. (1986) Teaching reform and union reform. Elementary School Journal, 86(4). 449-470.
- Kerchner, C. T. (1986) Labor policy in school districts: Its diffusion and impact on work structures. Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.
- Lieberman, M. (1980). Teacher bargaining: An autopsy. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(4), 231-235.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). School-teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Members' Guide to the B.C.T.F (1991-1992).

Mitchell, D. E. (1988). Alternative approaches to labor-management relations for public school teachers and administrators. Politics of Education Association Yearbook, 161-181.

Mitchell, D. E., Kerchner, C. T., Erck, W., Pryor, G. (1981). The impact of collective bargaining on school management and policy. American Journal of Education, 89 (2), 147-186

Mitchell, C. T. & Kerchner, D. E. (1980). Labor relations and teacher policy. Chapter 9 Handbook of Teaching and Policy. Eds. Lee Shulman and Gary Sykes.

Munton, P. D. (1987). An analysis of teacher attitudes toward the 1983 British Columbia teachers' strike. Master of Education Project. Simon Fraser University.

McDonnell, L. M. & Pascal, A. (1988). Teacher unions and educational reform. The Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE). Rand Corporation. (1948 - 1988).

Stockman, W.R. (1984). The negative influence of teachers' unions. The Canadian School Executive (5) pp. 10-11

Taylor, G. (1976). Why they organize. In A. Cresswell & M. Murphy (Eds.), Education and Collective Bargaining, (pp. 12-21). Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Tuthill, D. (1990). Expanding the union contract: One teacher's perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, (6), 775-780.

Watts, G. D. & McClure, R. M. (1990). Expanding the contract to revolutionize school renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, (6), 765-774.

Wildman, W. A.; Perry C. R. (1967). Group Conflict and School Organization. In S. M. Elam, M. Lieberman, & M. H. Moskow (Eds.), Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education (pp. 412-425). Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Wynn, R. (1981). The relationship of collective bargaining and teacher salaries, 1960 to 1980. Phi Delta Kappan, (12), 237-242.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **Research Method**

#### **Introduction**

As stated in Chapter 1, the central research problem is to assess whether there has been any significant change in working relationships in elementary schools as a result of the implementation of the collective agreement in West Vancouver. The writer received authorization from the West Vancouver Teachers' Association (WVTA) to conduct a survey sample of its members. As well the study received ethics approval from Simon Fraser University in 1988. The same survey was used in 1988 and 1992 pre and post union status.

#### **Data Required**

In order to compare the anticipated and actual impact of the institution of the collective agreement on teachers, administrators and central office staff, it was necessary to collect data of personal opinions based on the following themes: teacher relationships in schools, teacher relationships in the district, teacher self-image, working conditions, teacher relationships with students and parents, trust relationships between teacher and principal.

#### **The Survey Instrument**

The instrument employed to collect the data for this study was a locally developed questionnaire (see Appendix A) comprised of 51 items and two open-ended questions relating to the areas outlined in the previous section. The questionnaire was developed in 1988 by Mr. John Bowbrick, Principal, Caulfeild Elementary School, West Vancouver in

consultation with Dr. Norman Robinson, Professor of Educational Administration at Simon Fraser University.

Teachers, Administrators and Central Office Staff of West Vancouver School District #45 were asked to respond to written statements related to their perceptions and beliefs about the anticipated and actual impact of the collective agreement. Section A was designed to measure perceptions of trust relationships among teachers, administrators and parents. Section B was designed to elicit responses to teacher relationships within the district. Statements in Section C were related to teacher self-image and issues regarding professional autonomy. Section D was designed to measure perceptions of benefits and working conditions. Section E dealt with issues surrounding student and parent relationships. Section F was comprised of eight statements pertaining to issues of collegiality and support for the West Vancouver Teachers' Association (WVTA) and the BCTF. The questionnaire was written in statement form to which respondents were asked to agree or disagree using a five point Likert scale. The final section entitled "Other Issues" was included at the end of the survey to provide respondents with the opportunity to include any personal comments pertaining to what they perceived were the most positive or negative outcomes of the collective agreement. A short demographic data section was also included at the end of the survey. The questionnaires were returned to Mr. Bowbrick in June 1988 and kept safely for future use.

The 1992 survey instrument was the same one used as in 1988. The statements were written in the present tense in order that respondents would assess the actual impact of the collective agreement after being in existence for four years.

### Pilot Study

Following the approval of the questionnaire by the WVTA a pilot study was conducted (see Appendices B and C). It was felt that feedback from teachers and administrators would assist in assessing the appropriateness of the statements to be used in the survey.

Five teachers and five administrators in West Vancouver were selected to complete the pilot questionnaire. The participants were given a copy of the draft questionnaire and a covering letter outlining the purpose of the study and an accompanying sheet with an explanation as to the kind of feedback being sought.

Specifically, the respondents were asked to indicate the length of time it took to complete the survey and to comment on the length, clarity and relevance of the questions, over-all appearance of the survey and whether the questions were understandable and interesting or redundant. Further input from the participants resulted in a number of the statements being reworded and the addition of two open-ended questions at the end of the survey. The questionnaire was then reproduced and prepared for distribution.

The questionnaires completed during the pilot study were not analyzed as part of the research study. The purpose of the pilot study proved beneficial in rewriting some of the statements.

### Sample

All elementary teachers, administrators and central office staff who were members of the BCTF in the Spring of 1988 and were currently practising in school district #45 - West Vancouver, were sampled. A total of 130 forms were distributed and 71 questionnaires or 55% were

Returned to Mr. Bowbrick and stored for future use (see Appendices C and G).

In 1992, a total of 180 questionnaires were mailed to elementary school personnel (teachers and administrators) and central office staff. Of a possible 156 elementary teachers, 17 administrators and 4 central office staff, the responses totalled 73 or 41%. Surveys returned represented both male and female teachers and administrators.

### Data Collection Procedures

In 1988 envelopes were addressed to all elementary teachers, elementary administrators and central office staff in West Vancouver. Questionnaires were sent via the inter-school delivery service on the school district delivery service. Each envelope contained:

1. a copy of the questionnaire which included a letter from the writer explaining the purpose of the study and ensuring the respondent's anonymity (Appendix D).
2. a letter from the President of the WVTA endorsing the Association's support for the research study (Appendix E).
3. a pre-addressed envelope in which to return the survey to the WVTA office.

The respondents were not asked to identify themselves and the envelopes were not marked for identification in any way. The first set of questionnaires were distributed in June of 1988 and the respondents were requested to return them within one week of their receipt.

There was only one mailing. No attempt was made at this time to analyse the results of the survey.

In February 1992, the identical instrument was used to resurvey the same population. As teachers and administrators were no longer part of the same organization, teachers were asked to send their completed questionnaire to the President of the WVTA at the local West Vancouver office. Administrators and Central Office staff mailed their surveys directly to Dr. Norman Robinson, senior advisor to this project, at Simon Fraser University.

In March 1992, the same procedure was followed and included a letter by this writer outlining the purpose of the study, a copy of the questionnaire and a letter from the current President of the WVTA endorsing support for the project (see Appendix F). A stamped pre-addressed envelope was included for administrators and central office staff to mail their completed questionnaire to Dr. Norm Robinson.

The first mailing of 180 surveys in February, 1992 did not yield the expected high return and a second mailing was initiated March 4, 1992. The same procedure was followed.

A third and final request for responses was sought March 29, 1992. A letter was sent to all teachers, endorsed by the WVTA President, requesting all individuals who had not replied to please consider doing so (see Appendix G). Six more responses were received.

Although the sample size was not as high as would have been desirable, the extent to which the responses match the research based literature on the impact of the collective agreement on working relationships is very similar.



## Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed statistically using a *t-test* for independent samples. Items were analyzed by *t-test* to determine the difference between responses to 1988 and 1992 surveys. In the results that are reported in Chapter 4 the following terms are used to describe the range of scores on the survey questionnaire.

<u>Term</u>	<u>Range of Scores</u>
Agree Strongly	4.6 - 5.0
Agree Somewhat	3.6 - 4.5
Undecided	2.6 - 3.5
Disagree Somewhat	1.6 - 2.5
Disagree Strongly	0 - 1.5

The meaning of the word *significant* is important. For the purposes of this study the difference between response means of 1988 and 1992 is significant at the .05 level or less.

## Summary

This chapter outlined the data required and collected for the study. The composition of the questionnaire and how the sample was determined as well as the method of data collection and treatment have been explained.

## CHAPTER 4

### Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the results of the study in descriptive and tabular form, and offers a brief analysis and discussion of each section.

The survey results were compiled and listed through by the computer using a statistical analysis program as outlined in the preceding chapter. The data were analyzed with reference the anticipated and actual perceptions of teachers, administrators and central office staff in the school district of West Vancouver. The attitudes of the three groups were analyzed in terms of six sub-problems as outlined in Chapter One.

Each table shows the survey results from 1988 and 1992 with respect to teachers, administrators and central office staff. The number of respondents in 1988 was as follows: teachers = 55, administrators = 13 and central office staff = 3. The number of respondents in 1992 was as follows: teachers = 55, administrators = 14 and central office staff = 4.

#### Sub-Problem 1.0

**To what extent have trust relationships improved among school staffs?**

Findings: Perceptions of Teachers. Table 1 shows there are statistically significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of teacher relationships in their own schools on three of the eight items. In 1988, teachers' perceptions about trust relationships between teachers and principals showed a mean response of disagree somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 2.27$ ) while in 1992 responses indicated that teachers were undecided as to whether trust relationships between teachers and

principals had improved ( $\bar{x} = 3.05$ ). In 1988, teachers disagreed somewhat that school decision-making processes would be more collegial ( $\bar{x} = 2.56$ ) but in 1992 teachers agree somewhat that decision-making processes are more collegial ( $\bar{x} = 3.51$ ). In 1988, teachers were undecided if peer supervision would increase significantly ( $\bar{x} = 2.96$ ). In 1992, teachers remain undecided as to whether peer supervision has increased ( $\bar{x} = 3.43$ ).

Table 1

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

<b>TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS IN YOUR OWN SCHOOL</b>		1988 teacher $\bar{x}$	1992 teacher $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Teachers are able to exercise more power.	3.27	3.62	-1.44	.15
2	Trust relationships have improved among teachers.	3.34	3.36	-.07	.94
3	Trust relationships have improved between teachers and principals.	2.27	3.05	-2.67	.00
4	Trust relationships have improved between teachers and parents.	2.70	3.05	-1.39	.16
5	Trust relationships have improved between teachers and students.	2.98	3.25	-1.04	.30
6	School decision-making processes are more collegial.	2.56	3.51	-3.27	.00
7	Staff committees play a more important role in the school.	3.43	3.81	-1.41	.16
8	Peer supervision has increased significantly.	2.96	3.43	-2.03	.04

1988 n = 55; 1992 n = 55

**Discussion.** The item, "Trust relations have improved between teachers and principals" elicited an undecided response in 1992 as opposed to disagree somewhat in 1988. The results in 1992 show a less negative attitude than had been anticipated four years previous.

Despite the formal nature of the collective agreement, responses to this item support the supposition that relationships between teachers and principals are not naturally antagonistic. This conclusion is due, in part, to the dependent nature of teachers' work (Johnson, 1984). That is teachers need to work together and although they are united in a union the nature of the teaching profession dictates the need for administrators and teachers to be collegial. This less negative response may also be due to the fact that teachers feel school decision-making processes are more collegial. Teachers feel also, that peer supervision has increased significantly under the union contract. Special working relationships among teachers and between teachers and principals appear to suggest that a spirit of co-operation continues to co-exist among teachers and principals. Although there is no significant difference between teacher responses of 1988 and 1992 to items one and seven, the data clearly indicate agreement that teachers perceive they are able to exercise more power and that staff committees play an increasingly important role in the school.

Findings: Perceptions of Administrators. Administrators' responses to Section A (shown in Table 2) showed no significant differences in responses between 1988 and 1992 on six of the eight items. In 1988, administrators disagreed strongly ( $\bar{x} = 1.84$ ) that trust relationships between teachers and parents would improve as a result of the collective agreement but in 1992, administrators were undecided ( $\bar{x} = 2.86$ ) as to the actual impact of this issue. In 1988, administrators disagreed somewhat that school decision-making processes would be more collegial ( $\bar{x} = 2.23$ ) but in 1992 administrators agreed somewhat that school decision-making processes had become more collegial ( $\bar{x} = 3.86$ ).

Table 2

t-test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS IN YOUR OWN SCHOOL		1988 admin. $\bar{x}$	1992 admin. $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Teachers are able to exercise more power.	3.92	3.66	.73	.48
2	Trust relationships have improved among teachers.	2.92	2.86	.15	.87
3	Trust relationships have improved between teachers and principals.	2.15	2.93	-1.45	.14
4	Trust relationships have improved between teachers and parents.	1.84	2.86	-1.95	.05
5	Trust relationships have improved between teachers and students.	2.46	3.06	-1.13	.25
6	School decision-making processes are more collegial.	2.23	3.86	-3.18	.00
7	Staff committees play a more important role in the school.	4.00	3.80	.36	.71
8	Peer supervision has increased significantly.	3.23	3.00	.37	.70

1988  $n = 13$ ; 1992  $n = 14$

**Discussion.** The findings in Table 2 indicate that administrators' perceptions are similar to those of teachers. The findings on the item, "Trust relationships have improved between teachers and principals," suggest that teachers and administrators, in 1992, remain undecided on this statement. In addition, administrators and teachers remain equally undecided as to whether peer supervision has increased significantly as a result of the collective agreement. The mean response for the statement indicating improvement in trust relationships between teachers and parents is not as negative as anticipated in 1988 (see table 2). In fact rather than disagreeing strongly with this statement as in 1988, administrators now are undecided as to the positiveness or negativeness of this statement ( $\bar{x} = 2.86$ ).

Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration. This section is not applicable to central office staff.

### Sub-Problem 2.0

**To what extent have teachers relationships changed in the district?**

Findings: Perceptions of Teachers. Survey data in Table 3 indicate a statistically significant difference in responses by teachers for six of the seven statements. In 1988, in response to the perception that there would be more control from district office, teachers agreed somewhat with this item in 1988 ( $\bar{x} = 3.96$ ) but were undecided in 1992 ( $\bar{x} = 3.20$ ). As a result of the collective agreement, in 1988, teachers were undecided ( $\bar{x} = 3.30$ ) as to whether evaluation would be a fairer process. In 1992, however, teachers agreed somewhat with this statement ( $\bar{x} = 4.15$ ). With respect to the existence of more formal supervision of teachers, teachers agreed somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 3.94$ ) in 1988 that this may be a likely result of the collective agreement, but in 1992, teachers were undecided on this statement ( $\bar{x} = 2.94$ ). From being undecided in 1988 ( $\bar{x} = 3.30$ ) teachers in 1992 agreed somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 4.29$ ) that they have more control over their own professional development. In 1988, teachers were undecided concerning their involvement with curriculum work and committees ( $\bar{x} = 3.27$ ). In 1992, teachers agreed somewhat that they are more involved with curriculum work and committees ( $\bar{x} = 3.98$ ). In 1988 teachers anticipated, by agreeing strongly, ( $\bar{x} = 4.54$ ) that principals would have more formally delegated managerial authority, but in 1992 teachers agreed somewhat in response to this statement ( $\bar{x} = 3.72$ ).

Table 3

**t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.**

<b>TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS IN THE DISTRICT</b>		1988 teacher X	1992 teacher X̄	t	p
1	Teachers are able to exercise more power.	3.20	3.51	-1.13	.26
2	There is more control from District office.	3.96	3.20	2.68	.00
3	Evaluation of teachers is a fairer process.	3.30	4.15	-3.52	.00
4	There is more formal supervision of teachers.	3.94	2.94	3.64	.00
5	Teachers have more control over their own professional development.	3.30	4.29	-4.50	.00
6	Teachers are more involved with curriculum work and committees.	3.27	3.98	-3.18	.00
7	Principals have more formally delegated managerial authority.	4.54	3.72	3.69	.00

1988 n = 55; 1992 n = 55

**Discussion.** The findings presented in Table 3 indicate that the institution of the collective agreement has not impacted on teacher relationships in this district as negatively as might have been anticipated. In fact, the findings indicate that teachers feel more empowered and independent. Teachers perceive evaluation as a fairer process, more likely due, in part, to the "Supervision For Growth" model instituted in the Fall of 1991. Although teachers are more involved with curriculum work and committees and have more control over professional development issues, they remain undecided as to whether there is more control from District office. This would seem to indicate that teachers may not have knowledge of this particular aspect of school life.

Findings: Perceptions of Administrators. Table 4 suggests statistically significant differences in responses in two of the seven items. Regarding the item, "There is more control from District office," in 1988 the data indicate administrators agreed somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 4.00$ ) with this statement. In 1992, the mean response to this item was undecided ( $\bar{x} = 2.53$ ). The 1988 responses by administrators to the statement that teachers have more control over their professional development changed from being undecided ( $\bar{x} = 3.46$ ) to agreeing somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 4.40$ ) in 1992.

Table 4

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS IN THE DISTRICT	1988	1992	t	p
	admin. $\bar{x}$	admin. $\bar{x}$		
1. Teachers are able to exercise more power.	4.53	3.86	1.53	.17
2. There is more control from District office.	4.00	2.53	4.69	.00
3. Evaluation of teachers is a fairer process.	3.30	3.86	-1.59	.11
4. There is more formal supervision of teachers.	3.46	2.93	1.22	.23
5. Teachers have more control over their own professional development.	3.46	4.40	-2.91	.00
6. Teachers are more involved with curriculum work and committees.	2.76	3.20	-1.12	.28
7. Principals have more formally delegated managerial authority	4.54	3.53	1.73	.00

1988  $n = 13$ ; 1992  $n = 14$

Discussion. There is concensus amongst teachers and administrators on three of the items in Section B. Both teachers and administrators are undecided as to whether or not there is more control from Central Office. This could be explained by the use of the word "control" which may be ambiguous.



It is interesting to note there is no mention of increased control from central office in response to the open ended questions at the conclusion of the questionnaire. Administrators and teachers tend to agree somewhat that teachers have greater control over their own professional development and also agree somewhat that principals have more formally delegated managerial authority (see tables 3 and 4). In fact, it is interesting to note that administrators agreed somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 3.86$ ) in 1992 that teachers are able to exercise more power. This statement is in accord with 1992 teachers' responses ( $\bar{x} = 3.51$ ) and central office responses ( $\bar{x} = 4.00$ ).

Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration. In Table 5, perceptions and attitudes of central office staff about the impact of the collective agreement on teacher relationships in the district show a statistically significant difference on one of the seven items. In 1988, central office anticipated that principals would have more formally delegated managerial authority ( $\bar{x} = 4.66$ ). In 1992, however, they remain undecided on this issue ( $\bar{x} = 3.00$ ).

Table 5

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

<b>TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS IN THE DISTRICT</b>		1988 central office $\bar{x}$	1992 central office $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Teachers are able to exercise more power.	3.66	4.00	-1.20	.42
2	There is more control from District office.	2.66	2.25	.40	.72
3	Evaluation of teachers is a fairer process.	2.66	3.00	-.38	.72
4	There is more formal supervision of teachers.	3.33	2.75	.63	.51
5	Teachers have more control over their own professional development.	3.66	4.50	-1.02	.44
6	Teachers are more involved with curriculum work and committees.	2.33	2.75	-1.02	.37
7	Principals have more formally delegated managerial authority.	4.66	3.00	2.26	.05

1988  $n = 3$ ; 1992  $n = 4$

**Discussion:** Although there is no significant difference in responses between 1988 and 1992, it is interesting to note that central office respondents in 1992, disagree somewhat to the statement, "There is more control from District office" ( $\bar{x} = 2.25$ ). This compares with teachers ( $\bar{x} = 3.20$ ) and administrators ( $\bar{x} = 2.53$ ) in 1992 who indicate that they are undecided on this item. In 1992, all three respondent groups agreed somewhat that teachers are able to exercise more power; teachers ( $\bar{x} = 3.51$ ), administrators ( $\bar{x} = 3.86$ ), and central office ( $\bar{x} = 4.00$ ). These results concur with the data in Section A and other items in Section B which suggest that teachers feel a heightened sense of empowerment as a result of school decision-making processes being more collegial, staff committees playing an expanded role in the school and teachers increased involvement with district curriculum work and committees.

### Sub-Problem 3.0

#### **To what extent do teachers feel more professional?**

Findings: Perceptions of Teachers. Table 6 reveals four out of the seven items with statistically significant differences in responses between 1988 and 1992. In 1988, of those elementary teachers surveyed, teachers were undecided as to whether the collective agreement would assist them in providing more effective instruction in the classroom ( $\bar{x} = 2.83$ ). The responses in 1992 indicate that teachers agree somewhat that they are, in fact, providing more effective instruction ( $\bar{x} = 3.55$ ). Significant positive differences were also noted in teachers' own perceptions that they continue to believe they are providing educational leadership in the school. In 1988, teachers were undecided as to whether the collective agreement impacted on their ability to provide more effective leadership ( $\bar{x} = 3.50$ ) but in 1992 they agree somewhat to this statement ( $\bar{x} = 4.20$ ). In 1988, teachers did not entirely believe that they would experience greater academic freedom in the classroom ( $\bar{x} = 2.23$ ). In 1992, teachers view this item more positively by partly agreeing to the statement ( $\bar{x} = 3.63$ ). Most teacher respondents were undecided in 1988 as to the effect of the agreement on teacher morale within the district ( $\bar{x} = 2.69$ ). In 1992, however, teachers agreed somewhat that morale has improved within the district ( $\bar{x} = 3.65$ ).

Table 6

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

TEACHER SELF IMAGE		1988 teacher $\bar{x}$	1992 teacher $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Teachers feel more professional.	2.96	3.29	-1.18	.24
2	Teachers have experienced increased job satisfaction.	2.72	3.08	-1.48	.14
3	Teachers have a better self-image.	2.72	3.17	-1.76	.08
4	Teachers are providing more effective instruction in the classroom.	2.83	3.55	-2.61	.01
5	Teachers are continuing to provide educational leadership in the school.	3.50	4.20	-3.10	.00
6	Teachers experience greater academic freedom in the classroom.	2.23	3.63	-5.73	.00
7	Teacher morale has improved in this district.	2.69	3.65	-3.10	.00

1988  $n = 55$ ; 1992  $n = 55$

**Discussion.** The positive response to items 5 and 6 concerning teachers continuing to provide educational leadership in the school and experiencing greater academic freedom in the classroom appears to emphasize the fact that teachers' formal authority has increased as a result of the collective agreement. This would account for the fact that those teachers responding to the survey concur that teacher morale has improved in the district. Teacher self-esteem is, in large measure, due to teachers' ability to have influence over practices which affect their classrooms, in other words, teachers experiencing psychic rewards (Lortie, 1975). If teachers are involved in more collegial decision-making processes in their schools and are experiencing greater academic freedom in the classroom the resulting increase in morale suggests increased feelings of professionalism. One teacher responded to the survey question on the positive outcome of the collective agreement by stating

that "there is more collaborative decision making by staff." Another teacher commented that "teachers operate from a position of greater power and now have control over their own professional development."

Findings: Perceptions of Administrators. In Table 7 one item out of seven revealed a statistically significant difference between 1988 and 1992 administrative results. In 1988, administrators predicted that teachers would not experience greater academic freedom in the classroom ( $\bar{x} = 1.84$ ). Results from the 1992 survey, however, reveal that administrators remain uncertain about this item ( $\bar{x} = 3.06$ ).

Table 7

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

TEACHER SELF IMAGE		1988 admin. $\bar{x}$	1992 admin. $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Teachers feel more professional.	2.38	2.86	-1.25	.21
2	Teachers have experienced increased job satisfaction.	2.46	3.00	-1.44	.17
3	Teachers have a better self-image.	2.46	2.93	-1.09	.29
4	Teachers are providing more effective instruction in the classroom.	2.53	2.73	-.53	.60
5	Teachers are continuing to provide educational leadership in the school.	3.61	3.93	-1.23	.23
6	Teachers experience greater academic freedom in the classroom.	1.84	3.06	-4.29	.00
7	Teacher morale has improved in this district.	2.38	3.06	-1.80	.08

1988 n = 13; 1992 n = 14

Discussion. The data in Table 7 show that administrators remain undecided about items related to teacher self-image. This may suggest that as a result of the separation between administrators and teachers, this new role precludes administrators from having a clear understanding

of how teachers perceive themselves professionally. In view of the separation, teachers may be reluctant to discuss openly with administrators issues related to teacher morale.

Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration. With regards to statements on teacher self-image, central office administrators' perceptions have remained the same with no statistically significant change in perceptions evident between the years 1988 and 1992 (see table 8).

Table 8  
t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

TEACHER SELF IMAGE		1988 central office. $\bar{x}$	1992 central office $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Teachers feel more professional.	2.33	2.25	.06	.95
2	Teachers have experienced increased job satisfaction.	1.33	2.25	-1.15	.26
3	Teachers have a better self-image.	2.00	2.25	-.22	.84
4	Teachers are providing more effective instruction in the classroom.	2.00	2.00	.00	1.00
5	Teachers are continuing to provide educational leadership in the school.	3.66	3.75	-.07	.95
6	Teachers experience greater academic freedom in the classroom.	1.00	1.50	-1.46	.18
7	Teacher morale has improved in this district.	1.33	2.00	-1.20	.26

*1988 n = 13; 1992 n = 14*

Discussion. Resulting from the institution of the collective agreement it is interesting to note that central office administration do not perceive that teachers feel more professional, have experienced increased job satisfaction, have a better self-image or are providing more effective instruction in the classroom. Furthermore, they do not think teachers are

experiencing greater academic freedom in the classroom or that teacher morale has improved in this district. In 1988 and 1992 central office staff feel that teachers continue to provide educational leadership in the school. This may also suggest that many factors other than the institution of a collective agreement must be considered important when discussing teachers' professional efficacy. The results may also suggest, according to central office, the collective agreement is not a factor when discussion issues relate to teacher self-image. These results contrast dramatically with those of teachers. As a result of the collective agreement, teachers appear to be experiencing more positive feelings of professionalism. There is a caveat, however, of which one requires to be aware. Other factors, as suggested above, play an important role in these perceptions. The ethos of the school site and teachers' relationships with other colleagues and the administration are important factors.

#### Sub-Problem 4.0.

**To what extent have working conditions changed?**

Findings: Perceptions of Teachers. In Table 9 seven of the items related to working conditions revealed statistically significant results. As a result of the collective agreement in 1992 teachers agree somewhat that they are required to do few supervisory duties ( $\bar{x} = 4.00$ ), receive increased prep time ( $\bar{x} = 3.98$ ) and contribute more voluntary time ( $\bar{x} = 3.67$ ). In 1988 teachers were undecided about the prospect of improved salaries ( $\bar{x} = 3.25$ ) but agree somewhat in 1992 that salaries of teachers in this district have improved ( $\bar{x} = 3.86$ ). The item, "Job security for teachers has improved" in 1988, revealed an undecided response but in 1992 teachers agree somewhat that this item has occurred ( $\bar{x} = 3.82$ ).

In 1988 teachers anticipated that they would more frequently grieve concerns under a new collective agreement ( $\bar{x} = 4.14$ ) but in 1992 teachers were undecided on this item ( $\bar{x} = 3.25$ ). Teachers were also unsure in 1988 about the issue of improved benefits ( $\bar{x} = 3.02$ ) but agreed somewhat in 1992 that they had improved ( $\bar{x} = 3.94$ ).

Table 9

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

WORKING CONDITIONS	1988	1992	t	p
	teacher $\bar{x}$	teacher $\bar{x}$		
1 Teachers are required to do fewer supervisory duties.	2.96	4.00	-4.00	.00
2 Teachers receive increased prep time.	2.90	3.98	-3.93	.00
3 Teachers are asked to spend more hours on the job.	3.56	3.22	1.28	.20
4 Teachers contribute more voluntary time.	2.78	3.67	-3.22	.00
5 Class sizes are smaller.	2.67	2.46	.76	.44
6 Assignments of teachers to classes and subjects are allocated more fairly.	2.8	3.05	-1.06	.29
7 Concerns or grievances are more fairly resolved.	3.34	3.50	-.67	.50
8 Teacher transfer policies are more equitable.	3.30	3.62	-1.40	.16
9 Hiring procedures are more stringent.	3.70	3.43	1.18	.23
10 Dismissal procedures are more reasonable and effective.	3.36	3.55	-.90	.37
11 The salaries of teachers have improved.	3.25	3.86	-2.64	.01
12 Job security for teachers has improved.	3.23	3.82	-2.15	.03
13 Teachers are more frequently grieving concerns.	4.14	3.25	2.81	.00
14 Teachers' benefits have improved.	3.02	3.94	-3.50	.00

1988  $n = 55$ ; 1992  $n = 55$

Discussion. According to teachers' perceptions, the most significant factor arising out of the collective agreement has been the impact on working conditions. Specifically, teachers agree that salaries, job security and benefits have improved. In 1988, when teachers were asked to



speculate on the most positive outcomes of the collective agreement, an overwhelming number of respondents spoke of issues related to working conditions. Most often mentioned were these comments: "fair established procedures versus subjectivity", "proper grievance procedures will be in place and rights and responsibilities will be spelled out, e.g. job description", "we'll probably have better working conditions", "a clear delineation of teacher responsibilities". In 1992, when considering positive outcomes of the collective agreement, many respondents referred to issues synonymous with working conditions. "Prep time and smaller classes." "Improved benefits." "Improved evaluation and supervision process." Although seven of the fourteen items revealed no significant difference in responses between the years 1988 and 1992, it is interesting to note that teachers, in 1992, perceive dismissal procedures as being more reasonable and effective ( $\bar{x} = 3.55$ ) and teacher transfer policies as more equitable ( $\bar{x} = 3.62$ ). Equally important, in 1992, teachers disagree that class sizes are smaller ( $\bar{x} = 2.46$ ).

Findings: Perceptions of Administrators. Table 10 indicates administrators' responses to the section on working conditions. Four out of fourteen items show a statistically significant difference in responses. From being undecided in 1988 ( $\bar{x} = 3.23$ ), administrators agree strongly in 1992 ( $\bar{x} = 4.66$ ) that teachers are required to do fewer supervisory duties. In 1988, administrators were undecided on the issue of teachers receiving increased prep time ( $\bar{x} = 3.30$ ). In 1992, the mean response to this item indicates strong agreement ( $\bar{x} = 4.66$ ). The item, "Teachers are asked to spend more hours on the job" showed undecided responses in 1988 ( $\bar{x} = 3.38$ ). In 1992, administrators disagreed somewhat with this item ( $\bar{x} = 2.06$ ). Four years ago administrators agreed in part teachers

would more frequently grieve concerns ( $\bar{x} = 3.92$ ). In 1992, administrators remain undecided on this item ( $\bar{x} = 2.93$ ). There are no other statements concerning working conditions which reveal statistically significant difference in responses between 1988 and 1992.

Table 10

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

WORKING CONDITIONS	1988	1992	t	p
	admin. $\bar{x}$	admin $\bar{x}$		
1 Teachers are required to do fewer supervisory duties.	3.23	4.66	-4.60	.00
2 Teachers receive increased prep time.	3.30	4.66	-4.56	.00
3 Teachers are asked to spend more hours on the job.	3.38	2.06	3.78	.00
4 Teachers contribute more voluntary time.	2.23	2.40	-.49	.63
5 Class sizes are smaller.	2.69	3.13	-1.25	.21
6 Assignments of teachers to classes and subjects are allocated more fairly.	2.53	2.86	-.96	.33
7 Concerns or grievances are more fairly resolved.	3.30	3.26	.12	.90
8 Teacher transfer policies are more equitable.	3.00	3.06	-.21	.84
9 Hiring procedures are more stringent.	3.69	3.66	.08	.93
10 Dismissal procedures are more reasonable and effective.	3.46	3.33	.40	.69
11 The salaries of teachers have improved.	3.84	3.53	.59	.57
12 Job security for teachers has improved.	2.76	3.26	-1.61	.12
13 Teachers are more frequently grieving concerns.	3.92	2.93	2.99	.00
14 Teachers' benefits have improved.	3.30	3.53	-.80	.45

1988  $n = 13$ ; 1992  $n = 14$

Discussion. The collective agreement has curtailed the number of hours of supervision per week. Elementary teachers in West Vancouver are required to do only 20 minutes per week. This may explain the strong positive response to item number one from all three groups.

Elementary teachers have only recently gained 80 minutes per week of preparation time through collective bargaining. In response to the open-ended questions at the conclusion of the survey, administrators' responses focussed on issues relating to working conditions. Replies reveal that in addition to increased benefits for teachers, administrators view supervision and evaluative procedures as more fair in 1992 as a result of the collective agreement. The findings on the survey show administrators agree somewhat that teachers contribute more voluntary time. There is disagreement, however, from some administrators on this item. Comments written by one administrator in response to the issue of the most negative outcome of the collective agreement relates to the issue of teachers' contribution of voluntary time. One administrator wrote, "teachers said that if they were treated as 'professionals' they would 'volunteer' more services to kids. This hasn't happened. The same teachers are giving of their own time as in the past - the majority use the collective agreement as an excuse to do less." A number of items revealed indecisive responses on numerous statements related to working conditions. This may be explained by the uncertainty of the immediate impact of the collective agreement.

Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration. For central office staff responses, statistical differences were revealed on two out of the fourteen items. Table 11 reveals in 1988 central office administration agreed in part that teachers would be required to do fewer supervisory duties ( $\bar{x} = 3.66$ ) and in 1992 agree strongly that this has occurred ( $\bar{x} = 5.00$ ). In 1988, they disagreed emphatically that teachers would contribute more voluntary time ( $\bar{x} = 1.00$ ) and in 1992, continue to disagree with this item ( $\bar{x} = 1.75$ ).

Table 11

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

WORKING CONDITIONS		1988	1992	t	p
		central office $\bar{x}$	central office $\bar{x}$		
1	Teachers are required to do fewer supervisory duties.	3.66	5.00	-4.78	.05
2	Teachers receive increased prep time.	3.00	5.00	-4.14	.07
3	Teachers are asked to spend more hours on the job.	3.33	1.75	1.37	.31
4	Teachers contribute more voluntary time.	1.00	1.75	-2.54	.05
5	Class sizes are smaller.	1.66	2.50	-1.02	.31
6	Assignments of teachers to classes and subjects are allocated more fairly.	1.66	2.50	-1.89	.12
7	Concerns or grievances are more fairly resolved.	3.00	3.25	-.25	.83
8	Teacher transfer policies are more equitable.	2.33	3.00	-.66	.56
9	Hiring procedures are more stringent.	3.66	4.25	-1.43	.23
10	Dismissal procedures are more reasonable and effective.	3.33	3.00	.60	.55
11	The salaries of teachers have improved.	3.33	3.75	-.45	.67
12	Job security for teachers has improved.	2.66	4.25	-2.51	.12
13	Teachers are more frequently grieving concerns.	4.33	3.25	1.36	.25
14	Teachers' benefits have improved.	3.66	3.75	-1.0	.91

1988  $n = 3$ ; 1992  $n = 4$

**Discussion.** The results in Table 11 are not surprising. As a result of the collective agreement teachers have benefitted in terms of working conditions specifically, fewer supervisory duties, increased prep time and increased job security. Interestingly enough, in the 1992 survey, central office staff agree strongly that hiring procedures are more stringent. This compares with the undecided response of teachers to this item who may not have knowledge of hiring policies at the board office level. In 1992, when asked to comment on the most positive outcome of the collective

agreement, central office staff focussed on the new teacher supervision for growth model, prep time for teachers, more effective personnel practices and a more formal dispute mechanism for gievances.

### Sub-problem 5.0

**To what extent have relationships with students and parents changed?**

Findings: Perceptions of Teachers. In Table 12 a statistically significant change in responses exists for five out of the seven items. 1988, in response to the item, "Students are receiving more individual after-hours assistance," teachers disagreed somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 2.36$ ). In 1992, teachers were undecided on this item ( $\bar{x} = 3.10$ ). In 1988 in responses to the item, "More extra- curricular activities are offered by teachers," teachers disagreed somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 2.27$ ). In 1992, teachers were undecided on this item ( $\bar{x} = 3.32$ ). In 1988, in response to the item of increased contact time with parents, teachers disagreed somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 2.49$ ) but in 1992, agreed somewhat with this item ( $\bar{x} = 3.96$ ). Teachers were unable to reach concensus in 1988 that there would be more parent help in schools ( $\bar{x} = 2.60$ ) and in 1992 remained undecided on this item ( $\bar{x} = 3.34$ ). In 1988, teachers agreed somewhat that more parents would seek alternatives to public schools ( $\bar{x} = 3.72$ ) but in 1992 teachers were undecided on this issue ( $\bar{x} = 3.20$ ).

Table 12

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

<b>RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS AND PARENTS</b>		1988 teacher $\bar{x}$	1992 teacher $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Students are receiving more individual after-hours assistance.	2.36	3.10	-2.93	.00
2	More extra-curricular activities are offered by teachers.	2.27	3.32	-3.86	.00
3	Teachers have a better image in the community.	2.43	2.84	-1.57	.12
4	The quality of special education services to students has improved.	2.63	2.98	-1.46	.14
5	Contact time with parents has increased.	2.49	3.96	-5.90	.00
6	More parent volunteers help in schools.	2.60	3.34	-2.69	.00
7	More parents are seeking alternatives to public schools.	3.72	3.20	2.16	.03

1988  $n = 55$ ; 1992  $n = 55$

Discussion. As a result of the collective agreement, teachers remain undecided on two items. Do they have a better image in the community? Has the quality of special education services to students improved? When asked to comment on the most negative outcome of the collective agreement, some teachers expressed the opinion that teachers would be viewed by the public as "union workers" rather than as professionals. A similar viewpoint was raised in 1992 with such comments as, "loss of professional image - now more than ever." One teacher wrote, "Salary increases are held up to the public as reason for reduced services - usually by the media." When describing quality of special education services, concerns raised related to class size and dysfunctional students. As one teacher wrote, "No specific requirements are in place before integrating special needs students into classrooms."

Despite teachers' perceptions that contact time with parents has increased, it may be difficult to relate consensus on this item as a result of the collective agreement. It may have more to do with the Year 2000 mandate which has increased the number of formal reporting procedures. It is important to note that many teacher respondents remain undecided on many issues related to parent and student relationships.

Findings: Perceptions of Administrators. Table 13 show significant changes in administrator responses on one out of seven items pertain to relationships with students and parents. In 1988, administrators agreed somewhat that more parents would seek alternatives to public schools ( $\bar{x} = 3.92$ ) but in 1992, administrators were undecided on this issue ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ).

Table 13

**t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.**

<b>RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS AND PARENTS</b>		1988 admin. $\bar{x}$	1992 admin $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Students are receiving more individual after-hours assistance.	2.30	2.13	.72	.47
2	More extra-curricular activities are offered by teachers.	1.92	2.06	-.62	.53
3	Teachers have a better image in the community.	1.84	2.06	-.84	.40
4	The quality of special education services to students has improved.	2.53	2.60	-.20	.83
5	Contact time with parents has increased.	2.23	2.73	-1.54	.12
6	More parent volunteers help in schools.	2.38	2.40	-.05	.96
7	More parents are seeking alternatives to public schools.	3.92	3.33	2.10	.04

1988  $n = 13$ ; 1992  $n = 14$

Discussion. Responses to the survey items in Table 13 show no statistical change from four years ago. In 1988 and 1992 administrators disagree somewhat with six of seven items relating to relationships with students and parents. This would appear to suggest that administrators do not view the collective agreement as having any positive impact on these items.

Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration. In Table 14 perceptions of central office administrators show no statistical difference of opinion between the years 1988 and 1992.

Table 14

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

<b>RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS AND PARENTS</b>		1988 central office $\bar{x}$	1992 central office $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	Students are receiving more individual after-hours assistance.	1.33	2.25	.225	.09
2	More extra-curricular activities are offered by teachers.	1.33	2.00	-1.20	.26
3	Teachers have a better image in the community.	1.33	1.50	-.38	.72
4	The quality of special education services to students has improved.	1.66	2.25	-.63	.55
5	Contact time with parents has increased.	1.33	3.00	-1.89	.09
6	More parent volunteers help in schools.	2.33	2.50	-.20	.87
7	More parents are seeking alternatives to public schools.	4.00	3.00	1.46	.23

1988 n = 3; 1992 n = 4



Discussion. Central office staff opinion concur with that of the school-based administrators. They either disagree or remain undecided on all of the items in this section (see table 14).

### Sub-Problem 6.0

**To what extent has unionism effected the district and elementary schools within the district?**

Findings: Perceptions of Teachers. Table 15 shows statistically significant differences between 1988 and 1992 responses on seven of the eight statements. In 1988 teachers anticipated stronger support for union status by agreeing somewhat to this statement ( $\bar{x} = 3.96$ ). Results of responses in 1992, however, show a decline toward being more undecided as to whether, in fact, there is stronger support for union status ( $\bar{x} = 3.27$ ). Similarly, in 1988, teachers agreed somewhat there would be stronger support for the BCTF. In 1992, teachers who responded to the survey are undecided on this statement ( $\bar{x} = 3.06$ ). In 1988 respondents agreed somewhat on teacher support for the WVTA ( $\bar{x} = 4.32$ ) but in 1992 the mean response declined ( $\bar{x} = 3.74$ ). Four years ago, teachers agreed strongly that they would view principal and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders ( $\bar{x} = 4.83$ ) as a result of the implementation of the collective agreement, but this number declined in 1992 ( $\bar{x} = 3.78$ ). Similarly, in 1988, teachers agreed somewhat that they would view principals and vice-principals more as board representatives rather than as fellow professionals in education ( $\bar{x} = 3.89$ ). But in 1992, this number declined significantly ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ) to an undecided response. Furthermore, teachers in 1988, perceived that job action would be more frequent in the district ( $\bar{x} = 3.65$ ). In 1992,

however, in reference to West Vancouver district, teachers disagreed with this statement ( $\bar{x} = 2.24$ ). In 1988, teachers agreed somewhat that job action in the province was more frequent ( $\bar{x} = 3.94$ ) but were undecided on this item in 1992 ( $x = 3.46$ ).

Table 15

**t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 teachers on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.**

OTHER ISSUES		1988 teacher $\bar{x}$	1992 teacher $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	In this district, there is stronger support from teachers for union status among teachers.	3.96	3.27	3.01	.00
2	In this district, school staffs operate in a more collegial manner.	3.36	3.53	-.66	.51
3	In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the B.C.T.F.	3.87	3.06	3.28	.00
4	In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the W.V.T.A.	4.32	3.74	2.95	.00
5	Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders.	4.83	3.78	3.71	.00
6	In this district, job action has been more frequent.	3.65	2.24	6.31	.00
7	In this province, job action has been more frequent.	3.94	3.46	2.31	.02
8	Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as board representatives than as fellow professionals in education.	3.89	3.36	2.05	.04

1988 n = 55; 1992 n = 55

Discussion. Items in this section produced the strongest feelings among teachers. Four years ago teachers anticipated support for union status by agreeing somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 3.96$ ). In 1992, however, teachers were undecided on this item. These results would appear to suggest that teachers are now less concerned about unionism. Perhaps changes to teaching practices as a result of the collective agreement are not as great as had been anticipated prior to the collective agreement. Similarly,

while teachers are undecided about their alliance with the BCTF, they continue to demonstrate support for the local teachers' association (WVTA). In 1992, teachers agree somewhat that administrators are perceived more as managers rather than as educational leaders and are undecided as to whether they view administrators more as board reps than as fellow professionals. These results are somewhat less strong than had been anticipated in 1988 and supports prior research which suggests that school based administrators may be paying more attention to teacher interests by encouraging a cooperative work environment (Johnson, 1984). This would also be in accord with teachers' perceptions in 1992 that decision-making processes are more collegial (see Table 2) and their perceptions that school staffs operate in a more collegial manner (see Table 15). These factors may account for teachers' perceptions that the school environment is more important to teachers than membership in the union.

In 1988, teachers had anticipated, by agreeing strongly on the survey, that unionism and the resulting split between administrators and teachers would have a negative impact on schools. In response to the question, "What do you think will be the most negative outcome of the new collective agreement?" respondents in 1988 expressed fears about the separation of teachers and administrators. Some of these comments were: "principals and vice-principals will gradually lose that closeness that they once enjoyed with their staffs", "principals and board office versus teachers - a polarized situation - them versus us syndrome", "loss of trust relationship promoting an atmosphere that children will pick up on", " I am saddened by the managerial role thrust on principals", and finally "difficulty maintaining 'teachers working together' relationship with principals and vice-principals." In 1992, many of the comments

reflected the same concerns related to the division between administrators and teachers. Teachers continue to perceive this division as being the most negative impact of the collective agreement and the split between teachers and administrators and is mentioned most frequently on the survey. Comments such as "us against them feeling", the division of 'them versus us'; too many teachers maintain a negative attitude toward 'management' initiatives - this 'slams' positive educational change', and "administrators have divided loyalties" serve to underscore the frustration that is felt by teachers. It is interesting to note, however, that such unhappy feelings are not evident in the survey results (see Table 15). For example, the item, "Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders" prompted a response of agree somewhat in 1992 ( $\bar{x} = 3.78$ ) as compared to agree strongly in 1988 ( $\bar{x} = 4.83$ ). Furthermore, teachers in 1992 are undecided ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ) if administrators are more board reps than fellow professionals in education as compared with agreeing somewhat in 1988 ( $\bar{x} = 3.89$ ). These results would further suggest the impact of the collective agreement has not been as negative as may have been thought originally .

Findings: Perceptions of Administrators. Table 16 reveals responses from administrators concerning other issues, and shows only one item with a statistically significant change in response between the years 1988 and 1992. In 1988, administrators anticipated more frequent job action in this district ( $\bar{x} = 3.69$ ). In 1992, however, most administrators disagreed strongly with this statement ( $\bar{x} = 1.66$ ).

Table 16

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 administrators on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

<b>OTHER ISSUES</b>		1988 admin. $\bar{x}$	1992 admin $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	In this district, there is stronger support from teachers for union status among teachers	3.30	3.06	.62	.54
2	In this district, school staffs operate in a more collegial manner.	3.00	3.46	-1.24	.23
3	In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the B.C.T.F.	3.07	2.73	.99	.33
4	In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the W.V.T.A.	3.46	3.06	1.18	.24
5	Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders	4.07	3.53	1.05	.32
6	In this district, job action has been more frequent.	3.69	1.66	6.79	.00
7	In this province, job action has been more frequent.	4.07	3.66	1.17	.23
8	Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as board representatives than as fellow professionals in education.	4.38	3.46	1.61	.12

1988 n = 55; 1992 n = 55

Discussion. Administrators in this district are aware that teachers perceive them to be more managers than as educational leaders, but the actual effects of this perception are not as great as had previously been anticipated. It appears from the results in Table 16 that administrators in this district continue to remain undecided on the issues in this section. In 1992, comments written in response to the issues surrounding the most negative impact of the collective agreement reflect the same concerns as teachers. Most comments relate to the split between administrators and teachers. Comments were: "us versus them syndrome which can strain relationships", "we/they attitudes impact on public

confidence in education", "teachers do not hear both sides of an issue", and "a placing of teachers and administrators in different camps for a variety of issues." Other comments by administrators suggest there has, in fact, been very little change in practices within schools. Comments such as, "very little change - a strong effective contract over-all", "the same teachers are giving of their own time as in the past", and "very few negative implications" support the previous statement.

Findings: Perceptions of Central Office Administration. Table 17 shows statistically significant differences in responses for two statements. In 1988, Central office administrators agreed somewhat there would be stronger support among teachers for union status in this district ( $\bar{x} = 4.33$ ). The results in 1992, however, show that central office administrators disagree somewhat with this statement ( $\bar{x} = 2.25$ ). The second item with a statistically different response between 1988 and 1992 is the view that principals and vice-principals are regarded more as board representatives than as fellow professionals. In 1988 the mean response was strong agreement ( $\bar{x} = 5.00$ ) while in 1992 the response was less enthusiastic with central office agreeing somewhat ( $\bar{x} = 4.25$ ).

Table 17

t test of significant differences between 1988 and 1992 central office on their perceptions of the effect of the collective agreement on working relationships in schools.

OTHER ISSUES		1988 central office $\bar{x}$	1992 central office $\bar{x}$	t	p
1	In this district, there is stronger support from teachers for union status among teachers	4.33	2.25	2.62	.03
2	In this district, school staffs operate in a more collegial manner.	2.33	3.00	-.51	.68
3	In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the B.C.T.F.	3.66	1.75	2.41	.15
4	In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the W.V.T.A.	4.33	3.25	1.16	.25
5	Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders	4.66	4.25	1.02	.37
6	In this district, job action has been more frequent.	4.00	1.25	3.10	.10
7	In this province, job action has been more frequent.	4.00	4.00	.00	1.00
8	Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as board representatives than as fellow professionals in education.	5.00	4.25	2.54	.05

1988  $n = 3$ ; 1992  $n = 4$

Discussion. Central office staff concur with teachers and administrators on their perceptions of the most negative aspect of the collective agreement. The split between administrators and teachers continues to be an overriding concern of all three survey groups. The comments by central office at the conclusion of the survey reflect these concerns: "them/us mentality", "adversarial relationship" and "principals viewed as managers, not educators, by both teachers and the board." Other concerns expressed by central office staff centered on the loss of professional status by teachers and the fact that "teachers now do little

playground supervision and are losing concern for and sight of this side of their students."

### Summary

Results from this survey suggest that the unionization of teachers in West Vancouver has not impacted as negatively on working relationships as much as had been anticipated prior to the agreement. Although the attainment of certain economic contract provisions such as prep time, less supervision, increased benefits and higher salaries at the outset of the contract have been important to teachers, results of the survey indicate that the focus in the future will be on other professional issues. Of increasing concern to teachers, administrators and central office staff are the issues of building a cohesive and collaborative working relationships among school staffs, administrators and district office staff. It is important to recognize that West Vancouver School District is still very much in the infant stages of collective bargaining. Teacher unions and administration will need to seek alternate models of negotiating contracts if working relationships are to be harmonious.



## CHAPTER 5

### Summary, Conclusions and Implications

#### Summary

This study was conducted in an effort to assess whether the institution of a collective agreement has resulted in significant changes in work relationships in West Vancouver elementary schools. This study has examined the literature on the growth of teacher unions, the birth of collective bargaining in British Columbia and the impact of collective bargaining on schools. A questionnaire was distributed in the Spring of 1988 to West Vancouver elementary teachers, administrators and central office administration. The same questionnaire was used to survey the population in the Spring of 1992. The survey items were designed to ascertain perceptions on the following factors: trust relationships among teachers, administrators and parents, teacher relationships among colleagues and administrators, teachers relationships within the district, benefits and working conditions and student and parent relationships. The data were then analyzed for response variation between the two survey periods. Specifically, the purpose of the questionnaire was to compare 1988 responses of teachers with those of 1992 responses and to analyse them for significant differences. By comparing attitudes prior to and after the institution of the collective agreement, it was hoped to determine if perceptions of teachers and administrators toward collective bargaining impacted on their working relationships.

The findings of this study concur with research findings of Johnson (1984), Kerchner (1981), Eberts and Stone (1984) and Perry (1979) (cited in Johnson (1984); all of whom conclude that the greatest impact of collective agreements on schools is one of improved teacher benefits,

working conditions, and enhancing the rights of teachers while curtailing the authority available to administrators.

The findings of this study reveal that the effect of collective bargaining on working relationships is not as extreme as had been predicted by teachers and administrators in 1988. The data indicate that teacher unionism has not polarized teachers and administrators, although in response to questions on the most positive or most negative outcome of the collective agreement, some teachers and administrators express fear that the new managerial role of administrators has alienated administrators and teachers to some degree. The data obtained indicate that trust relationships among school staffs have not been impacted as negatively as previously thought prior to the collective agreement. According to teachers surveyed in 1992, they feel that school decision-making processes are, in fact, more collegial and teacher evaluation is a more fair process. Teachers further state that the most significant benefit of the collective agreement has been improved salaries, job security and benefits, in other words, items related to working conditions.

Administrators feel that school decision-making processes are now more collegial and that teachers are experiencing greater academic freedom in the classroom. Administrators also perceive that the most important benefit of the collective agreement has been in terms of increased salaries, fewer supervisory duties for teachers and increased prep time.

According to central office personnel, the most positive outcome of the collective agreement has been the putting in place of a more formal dispute mechanism for grievances along with increased economic benefits. The data obtained show that teachers feel they are experiencing

greater academic freedom in the classroom and are continuing to provide educational leadership within their schools.

### Conclusions

The results of this study concur with the findings of a similar study conducted in the school district of Surrey in April, 1992 by Gavin Connor. Ten items from the Bowbrick survey were used to survey elementary teachers. Of 100 surveys distributed 61 were returned. The majority of respondents consider that teachers are able to exercise more power and decision making processes in schools are more collegial. Surrey teachers feel more professional as members of a union. They view, also, principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders.

Although the findings of this study concur generally with prior research in the United States, caution must be exercised when analyzing the results. Results must be considered in terms of an overall perception of the whole district. Not all elementary teachers responded to the survey. As well, due to the anonymity of the survey, there was no attempt made to analyze the data in terms of individual schools. Hence, no conclusions can be drawn as to the *individual* school site relationships between administration and staff. Collective bargaining is just one of many factors which impacts on public education. No attempt was made to disentangle the myriad of factors which may have impacted on individuals' responses to survey items. Furthermore, no attempt was made to match individual response items in 1992 with those in 1988.

By comparing attitudes prior to and after the institution of the collective agreement, we are able to make some conclusions. Some general conclusions which can be drawn from the results of the survey are:

1. Trust relationships among school staffs have not deteriorated as negatively as had been predicted by teachers and administrators in 1988. In fact, teachers and administrators who responded to the survey feel they are able to exercise more power and that school decision-making processes are more collegial.

2. Teachers feel they have more control over their own professional development as they play an expanded role on curriculum committees.

3. Teachers believe that teacher morale has improved in this district. They also feel that they are continuing to provide educational leadership in the schools. Both teachers and administrators concur that teachers are experiencing greater academic freedom in the classroom. These results would support the supposition that teachers are feeling more professional.

4. According to teachers, working conditions have improved in this district. Specifically, the advantages of the collective agreement have more to do with fewer supervisory duties, increased prep time, job security and increased salaries and benefits. Teachers, administrators and central office staff agree on the existence of a more formal dispute mechanism for grieving concerns.

5. Teacher relationships with students and parents have not been effected as negatively as predicted in 1988 by teachers and administrators. Many respondents, however, remain undecided on items related to this issue.

6. Teachers in this district are undecided if there is stronger support for the B.C.T.F. They remain, however, supportive of their local association, the W.V.T.A. Teachers continue to view principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders.

#### Implications for Practice in Educational Administration

This study makes a contribution to the already existing body of research on the topic of teacher unions. In order to further clarify the findings of this study it would be valuable to have a larger study encompassing other districts and secondary schools which may provide confirmation of the results.

In examining the impact of the collective agreement on working relationships in elementary schools, it would be useful to know for further contract negotiations, to what extent the union contract is enforced at individual school sites and the impact this may have on working relationships in schools. Collaboration and collegiality, parent involvement and the restructuring of decision making processes at school sites are all factors which have implications for future bargaining negotiations.

Future research on teacher unions in B.C. may focus on the BCTF's struggle to make teaching a profession by demanding that teachers be granted more decision making powers over instructional practices. The creation of the College of Teachers dealing solely with professional issues is at odds with the BCTF position that the Federation should deal with both economic and professional issues on behalf of teachers. Teachers are often caught in the middle in terms of divided loyalties between administration and the teachers' union. Teachers prefer to maintain an image of professionalism and to work cooperatively with school

administrators rather than engaging in adversarial practices which they may perceive to be in contravention of professional standards. The dilemma for the BCTF is to balance the economic needs of teachers with the Federation's desire to increase teacher professionalism. Future research on the various levels of loyalty may alter the way collective bargaining takes place.

Collective bargaining is still very much in a traditional mode in British Columbia. Salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions are important aspects of negotiations. Teachers and administrators are, however, beginning to move into other areas such as recognizing the professional values and rights of teachers and the autonomy of teachers to determine appropriate methods and resources to use in their classrooms. Consequently, it may be assumed that new models of negotiating such as "cooperative bargaining" (Johnson, 1984) and "win-win bargaining" (Moriarty, 1984, cited in Sharp, 1993) will become increasingly prevalent modes of bargaining.

## REFERENCES

- Bowbrick, J. (1988). Questionnaire on the impact of union status on working relationships in elementary schools.
- Connor, G. (1992). Questionnaire on the impact of the first collective agreement on working relationships in Surrey schools.
- Johnson, S. M. (1984). Teacher unions in schools. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sharp, W. L. (1993). Collective bargaining in the public schools. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Communications, Inc.

UNION STATUS  
FOR TEACHERS:

THE IMPACT OF THE FIRST  
COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT  
ON  
WORKING RELATIONSHIPS



AN OPINION SURVEY



**SECTION A: TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS IN YOUR OWN SCHOOL**

Circle the response that best indicates how you feel about the statement.

**In your own school**, as a result of the collective agreement:

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Undecided	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
1. Teachers are able to exercise more power.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Trust relationships have improved among teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Trust relationships have improved between teachers and principals.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Trust relationships have improved between teachers and parents.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Trust relationships have improved between teachers and students.	5	4	3	2	1
6. School decision-making processes are more collegial.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Staff committees play a more important role in the school.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Peer supervision has increased significantly.	5	4	3	2	1

**SECTION B: TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS IN THE DISTRICT.**

**In the district**, as a result of the collective agreement:

1. Teachers are able to exercise more power.	5	4	3	2	1
2. There is more control from District office.	5	4	3	2	1

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Undecided	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
3. Evaluation of teachers is a fairer process.	5	4	3	2	1
4. There is more formal supervision of teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Teachers have more control over their own professional development.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Teachers are more involved with curriculum work and committees.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Principals have more formally delegated managerial authority.	5	4	3	2	1

### SECTION C: TEACHER SELF IMAGE

As a result of the collective agreement:

1. Teachers feel more professional.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Teachers have experienced increased job satisfaction.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Teachers have a better self-image.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Teachers are providing more effective instruction in the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Teachers are continuing to provide educational leadership in the school.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Teachers experience greater academic freedom in the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Undecided	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
7. Teacher morale has improved in this district.	5	4	3	2	1

### SECTION D: WORKING CONDITIONS.

As a result of the new collective agreement:

1. Teachers are required to do fewer supervisory duties.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Teachers receive increased prep time.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Teachers are asked to spend more hours on the job.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Teachers contribute more voluntary time.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Class sizes are smaller.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Assignments of teachers to classes and subjects are allocated more fairly.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Concerns or grievances are more fairly resolved.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Teacher transfer policies are more equitable.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Hiring procedures are more stringent.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Dismissal procedures are more reasonable and effective.	5	4	3	2	1
11. The salaries of teachers have improved.	5	4	3	2	1

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Undecided	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
12. Job security for teachers has improved.	5	4	3	2	1
13. Teachers are more frequently grieving concerns.	5	4	3	2	1
14. Teachers benefits have improved.	5	4	3	2	1

**SECTION E: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS AND PARENTS:**

**As a result of the collective agreement:**

1. Students are receiving more individual after-hours assistance.	5	4	3	2	1
2. More extra-curricular activities are offered by teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Teachers have a better image in the community.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The quality of special education services to students has improved.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Contact time with parents has increased.	5	4	3	2	1
6. More parent volunteers help in schools.	5	4	3	2	1
7. More parents are seeking alternatives to public schools.	5	4	3	2	1

**SECTION F: OTHER ISSUES:**

As a result of the collective agreement:

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Undecided	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
1. In this district, there is stronger support from teachers for union status among teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
2. In this district, school staffs operate in a more collegial manner.	5	4	3	2	1
3. In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the B.C.T.F.	5	4	3	2	1
4. In this district, there is stronger support by teachers for the W.V.T.A.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as managers than as educational leaders.	5	4	3	2	1
6. In this district, job action has been more frequent.	5	4	3	2	1
7. In this province, job action has been more frequent.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Teachers view principals and vice-principals more as board representatives than as fellow professionals in education.	5	4	3	2	1

**SECTION G:**

1. What do you think has been the most positive outcome(s) of the new collective agreement?

---

---

---

2. What do you think has been the most negative outcome(s) of the new collective agreement?

---

---

---

**SECTION H: GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Please circle the appropriate number.

- |           |                      |   |
|-----------|----------------------|---|
| 1. Gender | Male                 | 1 |
|           | Female               | 2 |
| 2. Role   | Teacher              | 1 |
|           | Principal            | 2 |
|           | Vice-Principal       | 3 |
|           | Central Office Staff | 4 |

Dear Colleague,

In the spring of 1987, the British Columbia Provincial Government passed legislation which gave teachers the right to seek union status, and excluded principals and vice principals from the bargaining unit.

Teachers in West Vancouver opted for union status.

As a result of these significant changes there is a great deal of uncertainty as to how work relationships will be affected.

The purpose of this survey is to study the impact of the collective agreement, anticipated and actual, on work relationships in West Vancouver elementary schools.

This spring you are being asked in the initial survey to indicate how you anticipate the collective agreement will impact work relationships. Next spring, in a subsequent survey, you will be asked to indicate what the actual impact on work relationships has been.

This study has the approval of the W.V.T.A. and is being distributed to all elementary teachers and administrators in West Vancouver. You are not being asked to place your name or any other identification mark on the survey. You and your staff are assured of complete anonymity.

After completing the survey, simply return it to your staff representative who will forward it to the President of the W.V.T.A. who will in turn forward it to me.

May I take this opportunity in advance to thank you for your interest and co-operation. I know that this is an extremely busy time of year.

Yours truly,

John Bowbrick

Dear

Thank you for agreeing to pilot this survey on the anticipated impact of the new collective agreement on work relationships in West Vancouver Elementary Schools.

I ask that you please:

1. Complete the survey

2. After completion, comment on the following areas:

a) Length \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b) Clarity \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c) Relevance \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

d) Appearance \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

e) Understandable \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

f) Interesting \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

g) Other Critical Areas \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

h) Redundancy \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

i) Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your time.

John Bowbrick



## west vancouver teachers' association



## M E M O

1988-06-13

TO: all WVTa members (Elementary)

FROM: Kit Krieger

SUBJECT: Questionnaire on the impact of union status on working relationships in elementary schools.

John Bowbrick, Principal of Caulfeild, is doing graduate work at Simon Fraser University. His thesis topic is a timely one. John has developed an instrument to assess the impact of certification on working relationships in West Vancouver elementary schools.

At the June 9th WVTa Representative Assembly, the WVTa endorsed cooperation and support for John's efforts. The results, which will be shared with the WVTa, should provide some valuable insights into the impact of the change in status we have experienced over the past year.

I appreciate that this is a very busy time for all teachers. However, the structure of the project requires a pre-survey that must be completed before the new contract comes into effect. I would be very grateful if you would complete the questionnaire attached. The process provides guarantees of confidentiality.

Thank you,

Kit Krieger,  
President



1250 MATHERS AVENUE

922-0125

1992-02-20

Dear Colleague,

Re: The Anticipated and Actual Impact on Working Relationships as a Result of the Institution of the First Collective Agreement

In June, 1988 many of you completed a survey in which you indicated the anticipated impact of the first collective agreement on working relationships in elementary schools. The survey was written and distributed by John Bowbrick, Principal of Caulfeild Elementary School. Thank you to all who took the time to complete this questionnaire. The results of the initial survey were not released pending a second follow-up questionnaire.

I would appreciate if you would take the time to respond anonymously to this second survey on the actual impact of the collective agreement. The importance of research in this area will provide insight into determining whether work relationships have been changed significantly by the implementation of the collective agreement.

This survey is being distributed to all Teachers, Principals and Vice-Principals in elementary schools and Central Office Staff. Teachers are asked to return the completed questionnaire **WITHIN ONE WEEK** to my senior supervisor, Dr. Norman Robinson, at the W.V.T.A. office. Administrative Officers and Central Office Staff are asked to mail the questionnaire directly to Dr. Norman Robinson c/o Simon Fraser University. Enclosed please find a stamped addressed envelope for your convenience.

I take this opportunity in advance to thank you for your interest and sincerely appreciate your cooperation at this busy time of year.

Sincerely,

Maureen Smiley



APPENDIX F

**DATE:** 1992-03-04

**TO:** ALL WVTA MEMBERS (ELEMENTARY)

**FROM:** WAYNE ROWLEY

**SUBJECT:** Questionnaire on the impact of union status on working relationships in elementary schools.

Maureen Smiley, Vice-Principal of Ridgeview, is doing graduate work at Simon Fraser University. Her thesis topic is a timely one. Maureen is doing her project report on the impact of certification on working relationships in West Vancouver elementary schools. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of you who took the time to respond to the survey.

At the February 13th WVTA Representative Assembly, the WVTA endorsed cooperation and support for Maureen's efforts. The results which will be shared with the WVTA should provide some valuable insights into the impact of the change in status we have experienced over the past four years.

I appreciate that this is a very busy time for all teachers. A high response rate from teachers is very important to the completion of the study and your participation is highly valued. I would be very grateful if you could complete the questionnaire if you haven't already. The process provides guarantees of confidentiality.

If you need additional copies of the survey, please do not hesitate to call me at the WVTA office. They may be returned to me at this office.

Thank you,

Wayne Rowley  
President



## APPENDIX G

DATE: 1992-03-29

TO: All Staff Reps (Elementary)

FROM: WAYNE ROWLEY

SUBJECT: Questionnaire on the impact of union status on working relationships in elementary schools.

I am asking once again for your support with regard to completion of the enclosed questionnaire.

I urge you to encourage those staff members who have not yet filled out the survey to spend a few minutes to complete the questions. Confidentiality of the respondents is ensured. Teachers who were not employed in the District four years ago are encouraged also to complete as many of the questions as possible, relating the questions to their own perceptions of the current situation within the district.

The Association is looking forward with great interest to the results of this study. A high response rate from teachers will lend more credibility to the results of the project.

If you need additional copies of the survey, please do not hesitate to call me at the WVTA office. They may be returned to me at this office.

Thank you,

Wayne Rowley  
President

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Bacharach, S. B. & Shedd, J. B. (1988). Power and empowerment: The constraining myths and emerging structures of teacher unionism in an age of reform. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administration. London: Falmer, 139-160.
- Berube, Maurice R. (1988). Teacher politics - The influence of unions. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Inc.
- Bowbrick, J. (1988). Questionnaire on the impact of union status on working relationships in elementary schools.
- Connor, G. (1992). Questionnaire on the impact of the first collective agreement on working relationships in Surrey schools.
- Corwin, R. G. & Borman, K. M. (1988). School as workplace: Structural constraints on administration. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration. New York: Longman, (209-234).
- Cresswell, A. M., & Murphy, M. J. (1980). Education and collective bargaining. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Elam, S.M. (1981). The National Education Association: Political powerhouse or paper tiger? Phi Delta Kappan, (11), 69-74.
- Finn, C. E. Jr. (1985). Teacher unions and school quality: Potential allies or inevitable foes? Phi Delta Kappa, 66(5), 331-338.
- Johnson, S. M. (1983). Teacher unions in schools: Authority and Accommodation. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 309-326.
- Johnson, Susan Moore (1984). Teacher unions in schools. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kerchner, C. T. & Mitchell, Douglas E. (1986) Teaching reform and union reform. Elementary School Journal, 86(4). 449-470.

- Kerchner, C. T. (1986) Labor policy in school districts: Its diffusion and impact on work structures. Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.
- Kerchner, C. T. (1988). A new generation of teacher unionism. The Education Digest, (5), 53-54.
- Lieberman, M. (1980). Teacher bargaining: An autopsy. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(4), 231-235.
- Lieberman, Myron (1981). Teacher bargaining: An autopsy. Phi Delta Kappa, (12), 231-234.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). School-teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Members' Guide to the BCTF. (1992-93).
- Mitchell, D. E. (1988). Alternative approaches to labor-management relations for public school teachers and administrators. Politics of Education Association Yearbook, 161-181.
- Mitchell, D. E., Kerchner, C. T., Erck, W., Pryor, G. (1981). The impact of collective bargaining on school management and policy. American Journal of Education, 89 (2), 147-186
- Mitchell, C. T. & Kerchner, D. E. (1980). Labor relations and teacher policy. Chapter 9 Handbook of Teaching and Policy. Eds. Lee Shulman and Gary Sykes.
- Munton, P. D. (1987). An analysis of teacher attitudes toward the 1983 British Columbia teachers' strike. Master of Education Project. Simon Fraser University.
- McDonnell, L. M. & Pascal, A. (1988). Teacher unions and educational reform. The Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE). Rand Corporation. (1948 - 1988).
- Robinson, Norman (1987). The political punch of teachers. The Canadian Administrator, 26 (5).

- Selinger, A. D. (1980). Attitudes of Ontario secondary school teachers toward aspects of professional negotiations. Canadian Journal of Education, 5(3), 34-54.
- Sharp, W. L. (1993). Collective bargaining in the public schools. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Communications, Inc.
- Stockman, W.R. (1984). The negative influence of teachers' unions. The Canadian School Executive (5) pp. 10-11
- Taylor, G. (1976). Why they organize. In A. Cresswell & M. Murphy (Eds.), Education and collective bargaining, (pp. 12-21). Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Tuthill, D. (1990). Expanding the union contract: One teacher's perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, (6), 775-780.
- Watts, G. D. & McClure, R. M. (1990). Expanding the contract to revolutionize school renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, (6), 765-774.
- Wildman, W. A.; Perry C. R. (1967). Group conflict and school organization. In S. M. Elam, M. Lieberman, & M. H. Moskow (Eds.), Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education (pp. 412-425). Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Wynn, R. (1981). The relationship of collective bargaining and teacher salaries, 1960 to 1980. Phi Delta Kappan, (12), 237-242.