

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 416

EA 009 339

AUTHOR Nighswander, James K.
 TITLE The Perceived Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining on Schools and Colleges--A Survey of North Central Association Administrators. Final Report.
 INSTITUTION North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Chicago, Ill. Commission on Research and Service.
 PUB DATE Apr 77
 NOTE 105p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Collective Bargaining; Community Colleges; Educational Problems; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; High Schools; Junior Colleges; *Principals; *School Superintendents; *Surveys; Tables (Data)

IDENTIFIERS *Community College Presidents; *North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

This investigation focused on two basic areas: (1) administrators' ratings of their institutions, job roles, and educational problems and issues, and (2) the perceived effects of collective bargaining on schools and colleges. The study sample included high school principals, school superintendents, and community college presidents within the 19-state North Central Association region. The results showed that administrators on all three levels highly rated their schools and colleges on important quality variables. Collective bargaining has apparently had minimal impact on students or instructional programs. But administrators perceived far more negative rather than positive effects associated with collective bargaining. In fact, the only positive effects of collective bargaining, in the opinion of these administrators, have accrued to teachers in the form of salary increases, fringe benefits, and improved working conditions. The author concludes that the collective bargaining process has had either a neutral or, in some cases, a negative effect on the education enterprise, but not a positive one. (Author)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED 136416

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:

EA

SP
HE

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

**THE PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF TEACHER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
ON SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES —
A SURVEY OF NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION ADMINISTRATORS**

Final Report of a Survey Study Conducted by
The Committee on Administrative Roles
of the
NCA Council on Research and Service

Prepared by
James K. Nighswander, Ph.D.
Committee Co-Chairperson

April, 1977

EA 009 339

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
INTRODUCTION	1
Method.....	1- 3
Sample.....	1- 2
Instrumentation.....	2
Data Collection.....	2- 3
Analysis.....	3
RESULTS	3-16
Background Information -- Part I.....	3- 4
General Impressions -- Part II.....	5
Institutional Quality Ratings -- Part III.....	5- 9
Quality Ratings.....	5- 6
Effects of Collective Bargaining.....	7
Organizational Variables.....	8- 9
Administrative Roles and Functions -- Part IV.....	9-12
Importance Ratings.....	9-10
Effects of Collective Bargaining.....	10-11
Organizational Variables.....	11-12
Problems and Issues in Education -- Part V.....	12-16
Severity Ratings.....	12-13
Effects of Collective Bargaining.....	13-14
Organizational Variables.....	14-16
DISCUSSION	16-20
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE STUDY	20-22
A Congruence of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining.....	20-21
A Contrast of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining.....	21-22
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	22-24
APPENDIX	25-74
Superintendent/Principal Survey Instrument.....	26-29
Community College President Survey Instrument.....	30-33
Tables 1 through 126.....	34-74

INTRODUCTION

A phenomenon of the past two decades has been the advent of collective bargaining in the public sector. A paucity of research about this important issue exists. In fact, since the early 1970's the apparent quantity of research into the effects of collective bargaining has diminished, and yet collective bargaining continues to increase as a function of the desire of public employees. There has been a steady growth to influence their "world of work" with bargaining agreements within the public sector. Some states have passed legislation mandating collective bargaining and there has been a dramatic increase in the number of public employee strikes across the country.

In view of the impact of collective bargaining and the absence of concrete information on the effects of teacher bargaining on schools and colleges, the North Central Association Commission on Research and Service appointed a study committee to conduct an investigation. The Committee on Administrative Roles was formed for the purpose of studying the perceived effects of collective bargaining on significant educational, institutional and administrative variables by those who are in, perhaps, the best position to assess the effects — front line administrators. The reality of collective bargaining may have import for the concept of accreditation.

The Committee on Administrative Roles was appointed by the Commission on Research and Service in the summer of 1975. Representatives from all levels of NCA membership — schools, community and junior colleges and universities — were included on the committee. A study proposal was submitted to the Commission at its annual meeting held in Bloomington, Indiana in September, 1975. With several minor modifications, the study proposal was accepted and financial support was provided.

During the fall and winter of 1975 and early 1976 the Committee developed the survey instruments and made plans for the collection and analysis of survey data. The university representative resigned from the committee during the instrument development stage. Because of a tight schedule for conducting the study, no replacement was sought and the university portion of the study was dropped.

Method

Sample

The study sample included high school principals, school superintendents and community college presidents. Survey instruments were mailed to 300 principals, 300 superintendents and 250 community college presidents within the nineteen state North Central Association region.

A systematic sampling procedure was used. The first subject was selected at random and every i th member of the population, as necessary to obtain the desired sample size, was selected. This procedure guaranteed representativeness by state. The 1975 NCA Membership Roster was used as the population source.

Instrumentation

Two five-part survey instruments were developed by the study committee. The instruments, containing many identical items, were developed for (a) principals and superintendents and (b) community college presidents.

Part I of the survey instrument was designed to obtain important background information on the individual respondent and his/her school, district or college. Part II, entitled "General Impressions," contained statements about collective bargaining to which respondents indicated agreement or disagreement on a six-point Likert-type scale. The principals/superintendents instrument contained seven items in Part II and the community college presidents instrument contained six items.

Part III was a rating scale used by respondents to rate their respective schools/districts/colleges on thirteen Institutional Quality variables. Administrators from institutions with collective bargaining were to complete additional ratings on the perceived "effects of collective bargaining" on the institutional quality variables. A four-point scale was used in rating the variables on quality (outstanding, good, fair, poor) and a three point scale was used for specifying the effects of teacher bargaining (strengthened, no effect, weakened).

Part IV of the instruments provided for importance ratings on various Administrative Roles and Functions. Respondents were asked to rate the roles and functions, in terms of perceived importance, using a five-point scale. Administrators working in schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining were instructed to indicate whether collective bargaining had "strengthened," "weakened" or had "no effect" on each of the roles and functions.

Part V of the survey instrument dealt with Problems and Issues in Education. Administrators rated each problem or issue on "present severity" and their prediction of "future severity." Five-point scales were used for both ratings. Administrators from organizations with collective bargaining rated "positive," "detrimental" or "no effects" of collective bargaining on each problem and issue.

Data Collection

Survey instruments were mailed to the sample during the first three weeks of March, 1976. Each survey was accompanied by a cover letter describing the intent of the study and potential value of the results. A stamped envelope was enclosed for the return of the completed instrument.

The surveys were not coded in any way. Respondents were advised that confidentiality was assured. In an effort to follow-up on subjects who failed to complete and return the instrument, the entire sample was mailed a post card reminder two weeks after the initial mailing.

Analysis

Analyses consisted of computing (a) numbers and percentages responding to each response option and (b) comparative analyses within and among groups using the Chi Square (χ^2) test for independent samples. In all cases of reported statistical significance, a $p < .05$ applies.

Parts III, IV and V of the instrument required completion of the perceived "effects of collective bargaining" on each of the variables listed. Only those from schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining completed the "effects" ratings. These "effects" analyses are, therefore, based on a smaller number of subjects and on basically different groups than the quality, importance and severity ratings of Parts III, IV and V.

The analyses reported here include among-groups comparisons on all quality, importance and severity ratings and corresponding perceptions of the "effects of collective bargaining." Also included are within-groups analyses using size of organization, control of organization (public-non-public), collective bargaining (with and without) and years engaged in collective bargaining on the quality, importance, and severity ratings and the perceptions of the "effects of collective bargaining" on all variables under investigation.

RESULTS

Background Information -- Part I

Principals returned the highest percentage of usable survey instruments. Of the 300 mailed to high school principals, 224 were completed and returned, one came back marked undeliverable and 17 were in unusable form due to failure to follow instructions. The net return for principals was a 75% total with 69% returned in usable form (Table I). The superintendents group returned a total of 165 completed instruments and five undeliverable. The total return accounted for was 70% with 63% returned in usable form. Community college presidents returned 184 instruments out of 300 mailed for a 61% return figure. Seven of the 184 were not usable for data analysis purposes.

Most of the principals (see Table I) were from 9-12 (59%) and 10-12 schools (30%). The majority represented public schools (95%). Seventy-one percent of the principals came from mid-sized schools (400-2000 enrollments) with the remainder about evenly split between small and large schools (under 400 and over 2000).

Three-fourths of the principals who responded to the survey were from schools which provide collective bargaining for teachers and over half of those have had teacher bargaining for over six years. The vast majority of principals work in schools whose teachers who are affiliated with the National Education Association (84%) with some associated with the American Federation of Teachers (9%). Where there is principal involvement in the negotiations process, 40% have an active role and 36% a passive role. The remaining 24% serve in some other capacity in negotiations.

Table 2 shows the background information for superintendents. Nearly all superintendents worked in K-12 districts (94%) and all but one came from publicly funded districts (over 99%). The distribution among types of communities served was 13% urban, 24% suburban, 30% town and 34% rural. Three-fourths of the respondents came from districts in the 400-5000 enrollment classification. Another 17% were in larger districts with 5000-15000 enrollments and only 8% came from very small or very large school districts.

Nearly the same proportion of superintendents as principals were from districts with collective bargaining for teachers (76% yes vs 24% no). Sixty percent of those responding "yes," had engaged in collective bargaining for over six years. As with principals, in those districts with teacher bargaining, the local teacher groups tended to affiliate with the NEA (89%). Eight percent were associated with the AFT.

Slightly less than half (46%) of the superintendents work in districts which permit principal participation in teacher negotiations. Where participation does exist, 42% play an active role versus 27% who serve a passive role. Thirty-one percent reportedly do neither.

Background information on community college presidents may be found in Table 3. Among those presidents responding to the survey, 23% were from urban colleges, 27% suburban, 13% town and 37% from rural colleges. Most of the colleges represented were in the 1000-over 5000 enrollment classifications.

Two-thirds of the colleges represented (67%) were locally controlled, one-fourth state controlled and the remainder (9%) were non-public institutions.

Unlike the principals' and superintendents' results, less than half of the colleges have teacher collective bargaining (41% yes vs 50% no). Of those colleges which have collective bargaining, 46% have negotiated 6 or more years, 28% 4-6 years and 26% 0-3 years. Most (52%) of the college collective bargaining units are affiliated with NEA, but a substantial proportion (27%) have AFT affiliation.

About half (48%) of the colleges represented permit administrator or board member involvement in the teacher negotiations process and over three-fourths of those provide for active participation.

General Impressions — Part II

Part II of the Survey Instrument contained general statements about the collective bargaining issue to which respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement on a six-point scale. A summary of the results, which are found in Table 4, follow:

- a) There was strong agreement among all groups that *collective bargaining is becoming more prevalent in schools and colleges.*
- b) There was general agreement that professional education associations and organizations understand the issue; however, community college presidents are less inclined to agree to the awareness of the issue than principals and superintendents.
- c) The three groups agreed that *national professional associations and organizations (NCA and others) are doing a good job of keeping their members current on bargaining issues;* however, community college presidents are in less agreement than principals and superintendents.
- d) Approximately two-thirds of the administrators agreed that *the administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations.* Community college presidents were less certain of this, however, than principals and superintendents.
- e) Superintendents and principals were asked whether they agreed or disagreed that principals should be actively involved in negotiations. Most agreed that they should, but superintendents were in less agreement with the concept than were principals.
- f) There was general agreement to the statement that *collective bargaining has forced administrators to share administrative decision making with teachers.* As observed with other statements, community college presidents agreed to a significant lesser extent than did principals and superintendents.
- g) To the statement that *collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to the administrator,* a slight majority of superintendents and principals indicated their agreement. Community college presidents were almost evenly divided, with slightly more disagreeing to the statement than agreeing.

Institutional Quality Ratings — Part III

Quality Ratings

On Part III of the instrument, respondents were asked to rate the schools/districts/colleges on the following 13 institutional quality variables:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Instructional program | 8. Intra-staff communications |
| 2. Extra-curricular programs | 9. Public relations |
| 3. Community support of education | 10. Professional staff salaries |
| 4. Staff morale | 11. Fringe benefits for professional staff |
| 5. Inservice programs | 12. Physical facilities |
| 6. Student academic achievement | 13. Fiscal condition |
| 7. Student morale | |

A four-point rating scale from "outstanding" to "poor" was used. Administrators from organizations which engaged in collective bargaining with teachers were asked to indicate the "effects of negotiations" on each of the institutional variables using a three-point scale — "strengthened," "no effect" and "weakened."

The results of Part III may be found in Table 5 and Tables 8 through 53. There was a general tendency to rate the school/district/college/ as "outstanding" or "good." Over two-thirds of all three groups gave these ratings to their (a) *instructional program*, (b) *extra curricular activities*, (c) *staff morale*, (d) *academic achievement*, (e) *student morale*, (f) *professional staff salaries* and (g) *fringe benefits*. *Community support of education*, *intra-staff communications* and *public relations* were rated as good or outstanding by a majority of respondents but were not as highly rated by all three groups as those items listed above. Just over half of the principals rated *community support*, *public relations* and *staff communications* as "outstanding" or "good" in their schools. Superintendents and community college presidents gave slightly better rating to their organizations on these three variables. Over three-fourths of the community college presidents rated their *physical facilities* as "outstanding" or "good." Lower ratings were given by principals and superintendents. Those variables receiving the lowest ratings were (a) *inservice programs* and (b) *fiscal condition*. *Inservice programs* were rated as "fair" or "poor" by over half of each group. Over half the principals rated their schools' *fiscal condition* as "fair" or "poor" with superintendents and community college presidents giving slightly better *fiscal condition* ratings to their organizations.

Statistically significant among-groups differences in quality ratings were common. Of the thirteen quality variables rated, nine produced significant differences among the three administrator groups. Community college presidents were responsible for most of the differences in ratings. They tended to give higher (outstanding and good) ratings to their colleges than either principals or superintendents gave to their respective schools/districts. Those quality variables rated significantly higher by college presidents were: (a) *instructional programs*, (b) *community support of education*, (c) *staff morale*, (d) *student academic achievement*, (e) *student morale*, (f) *public relations*, (g) *fringe benefits*, (h) *physical facilities* and (i) *fiscal condition* (Tables 8 through 16). Community college presidents gave a significantly lower rating, relative to principals and superintendents, to *extra curricular programs* (Table 17).

Effects of Collective Bargaining

Administrators working in institutions with collective bargaining were asked to rate the effects of collective bargaining on the thirteen school/district/college quality variables. Respondents were to indicate whether they thought collective bargaining had "strengthened," "weakened," or caused "no effect" on each variable.

Five of the thirteen variables were rated by large proportions from each group as having been "weakened" by collective bargaining. *Fiscal condition* received the greatest overall proportion of "weakened" responses, with over half of all three groups perceiving a "weakened" effect (Table 5). Other variables rated as "weakened" by collective bargaining were *community support of education*, *staff morale*, *intra-staff communications* and *public relations*. For each of these institutional variables, the "weakened" response was the most frequently selected of the three response options.

Two items, *professional staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff*, were rated by a majority of respondents as "strengthened" by collective bargaining. Well over two-thirds of all groups perceived strengthening effects on these two variables.

The other variables were perceived as having been largely unaffected by collective bargaining. Those considered least affected by approximately four-fifths of each group were *student academic achievement*, *student morale* and *physical facilities*.

The three survey groups differed from one another on six of the thirteen effects ratings. Community college presidents accounted for three of those differences. Greater proportions of college presidents than principals and superintendents reported "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *instructional programs* and *inservice programs* (Tables 18 and 19). Although a large majority of all three groups reported that *professional staff salaries* had been "strengthened" by collective bargaining, that feeling was shared by a significantly smaller proportion of community college presidents (Table 20).

Superintendents responded in a significantly different manner on two of the institutional variables — *extra curricular activities* and *community support of education* (Tables 21 and 22). A much higher proportion of superintendents reported "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *community support of education*, while a smaller proportion of superintendents perceived "weakened" effects on *extra-curricular activities*.

Principals were significantly different from superintendents and community college presidents on a single variable — *intra-staff communications* (Table 23). Nearly half of the superintendents and college administrators reported "weakened" effects on *intra-staff communications* as compared to less than one-third of the principals' group.

Organizational Variables

Size. Statistically different response patterns within-groups on size of institution were observed for three of the institutional quality variables. Principals and community college presidents were different (within-groups) on ratings of (a) *instructional programs*, (b) *professional staff salaries* and (c) *fringe benefits for professional staff* (Tables 24, 25 and 26). In all cases, principals and community college presidents from the larger schools and colleges gave higher (outstanding, good) ratings to their institutions on these variables.

No statistically significant differences existed within-groups for superintendents or within any of the three administrator groups on "effects of collective bargaining" based on size of school/district/college.

Control of organization. Within-groups analyses on control of organization were possible only for principals and community college presidents. No non-public superintendents responded to the survey. The "effects of collective bargaining" analyses included only one group — community college presidents. No principals from non-public schools, who responded to the survey, worked in institutions with collective bargaining for teachers.

The quality ratings produced five within-groups differences. Principals from public funded and controlled schools rated *professional staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff* (Tables 27 and 28) more highly (outstanding or good) than did non-public principals. However, non-public principals gave higher ratings to *instructional programs* and *intra-staff communications* than their public school counterparts (Tables 29 and 30).

Community college presidents differed significantly on only one quality variable — *community support of education* (Table 31). Non-public presidents rated their colleges lower in *community support* than did presidents from state or locally controlled colleges. No differences within-groups were observed on the "effects of collective bargaining" ratings.

Years engaged in collective bargaining. The only within-groups differences on years engaged in collective bargaining were attributable to principals. Two quality variables were rated in significantly different ways — *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits* (Tables 32 and 33). In both cases, the longer the school district had provided collective bargaining, the more "outstanding" the salary and fringe benefits ratings by principals.

The significant "effects of collective bargaining" ratings included the two above (*salaries*, *fringe benefits*) plus another — *staff morale* (Tables 34, 35 and 36). The longer the school/district engaged in collective bargaining, the higher the "strengthened" ratings of collective bargaining effects on *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits*. The fewer the years engaged in collective bargaining, the more "weakened" were the perceived effects of teacher bargaining on *staff morale*.

Collective bargaining – with and without. Analyses were performed on within-groups differences between administrators from districts with and those without collective bargaining for teachers. These analyses were on the quality ratings exclusively since only those with collective bargaining completed the effects of negotiations ratings.

Eleven of the thirteen variables showed significant within-groups differences. The principals' group was different on ten institutional quality ratings. In eight of the ten significant differences for principals, principals from districts without collective bargaining gave higher quality ratings (outstanding, good) for their schools. Following are the eight variables so rated: (a) *staff morale*, (b) *fiscal condition*, (c) *community support of education*, (d) *intra-staff communications*, (e) *instructional programs*, (f) *extra curricular programs*, (g) *student achievement* and (h) *student morale* (Tables 37 through 44).

Two variables – *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff* – were rated more highly (outstanding) by principals from districts with collective bargaining (Tables 45 and 46).

Significant differences between superintendents from districts with and those without collective bargaining were observed on three institutional quality variable ratings – *professional staff salaries*, *fringe benefits for professional staff* and *physical facilities* (Tables 47, 48 and 49). In all three cases, superintendents from districts with collective bargaining gave significantly higher (outstanding) ratings.

Community college presidents from colleges with and without teacher bargaining were different on four of the quality variables. Presidents from colleges with bargaining gave significantly higher ratings to *professional staff salaries* and *physical facilities* (Tables 50 and 51) than presidents from colleges without bargaining. The reverse was true for *community support of education* and *student morale* (Tables 52 and 53). Those from colleges without negotiations rated their colleges higher (outstanding) on these two variables.

Administrative Roles and Functions – Part IV

Importance Ratings

The following thirteen (13) administrative roles and functions were rated in terms of importance on a 5-point scale from "very important" to "unimportant":

1. General decision making
2. Building management
3. Business management
4. Establishment of educational goals
5. Budgeting
6. Personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion
7. Staff evaluation
8. Curriculum planning
9. Stimulating innovation and change
10. Supervision of instruction
11. Coordinating school activities
12. Policy development and implementation
13. Student discipline

Administrators from schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining were also to report the effects of staff negotiations on a three-point scale — “strengthened,” “no effect” and “weakened” ratings.

The results of the importance ratings show wide variations between the three groups on the perceived importance of various administrative roles and functions (Table 6). These differences tended to correlate with the traditional responsibilities associated with the positions.

The administrative role or function with consistent responses across groups was *personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion*. Nearly all respondents rated this item as “very important” or “relatively important.” All other items showed a significant disparity between one group and the other two. Typically, the principal or community college president groups deviated from the others. Superintendents tended to respond like one of the other groups on nearly all items.

Virtually all roles and functions were rated, by a large majority within each group, as being either “very important” or “relatively important.” The differences arose in the respondents’ ratings within these two categories.

Principals rated as less important (relative to the other two groups) (a) *general decision making*, (b) *business management*, (c) *budgeting* and (d) *policy development and implementation*. They (principals) rated as more important (a) *staff evaluation*, (b) *curriculum planning* and (c) *supervision of instruction* (Tables 54 through 60).

Community college presidents rated less important (relative to principals and superintendents) *building management, supervision of instruction* and *building management* (Tables 60 and 61). They rated as more important *establishing goals and priorities* and *stimulating innovation and change* (Tables 62 and 63).

Except for *business management* (Table 55), which was rated more highly, superintendents’ responses were in the range between principals’ and community college presidents’ responses. On one item, *student discipline*, (which only principals and superintendents rated) superintendents rated the function as being of less importance than that perceived by principals (Table 6).

Effects of Collective Bargaining

The survey groups were instructed to report the effects of collective bargaining on each of the thirteen administrative roles and functions. The same three response options — “strengthened,” “no effect” and “weakened” — as provided for rating the institutional variables — were used in this section of the survey instruments.

Majorities of each of the three groups perceived either "weakened" or "no effects" on the roles and functions. None of the thirteen roles and functions was viewed by anything close to a majority as having been "strengthened" by teacher collective bargaining.

Those roles and functions perceived by the largest proportions of all three groups as "weakened" by teacher bargaining were *general decision making, personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion* and *budgeting* (Table 6). The other ten roles and functions were considered by most respondents as having been largely unaffected by collective bargaining.

There were some large differences between the three groups in their "effects" responses. Statistically significant response patterns were observed for eight of the thirteen administrative roles and functions. Community college presidents were responsible for all but one of the among-groups differences. Significantly smaller proportions of community college presidents reported "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *general decision-making* and *building management* (Tables 64 and 65). They (community college presidents) perceived much more "weakened" effects, however, on *establishing educational goals and priorities, staff evaluation, curriculum planning, stimulating innovation and change* and *supervision of instruction* (Tables 66 through 70).

Principals responded in a statistically different way on only one role and function — *business management* (Table 71). A smaller proportion of principals than superintendents and college presidents perceived "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on this variable.

Organizational Variables

Size. Organizational size was not a major influencing variable in the importance ratings of administrative roles and functions. Only three variables were rated in significantly different ways and in all cases the differences were within the principals' group. Principals from large schools rated (a) *supervision of instruction*, (b) *stimulating innovation and change* and (c) *establishment of educational goals and priorities* significantly higher (important) than those from smaller schools (Tables 72 through 74).

On one variable the "effects of negotiations" rating was different among schools of varying size. Superintendents from large districts perceived more "weakened" effects of teacher bargaining on *stimulating innovation and change* than superintendents from small districts (Table 75).

Control of organization. The control (public vs non-public) of the organization apparently had little influence on perceptions of the importance of administrative roles and functions or the effects of collective bargaining on administrative roles and functions. One variable — *building management* — was rated differently by public and non-public principals. The public school group gave a significantly higher (important) rating to this role and function than the non-public sample.

No significant differences in the "effects of collective bargaining" ratings on the organizational control variable were observed for any of the administrative roles and functions.

Years engaged in collective bargaining. A single administrative role and function was rated differently on the basis of years engaged in collective bargaining. Community college presidents from colleges which had provided teacher bargaining for over six years, perceived more "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *stimulating innovation and change* than presidents from colleges with less experience in negotiations (Table 77).

Collective bargaining — with and without. The only significant difference between administrators from organizations with and those without teacher bargaining was for the administrative role or function — *supervision of instruction* (Table 78). Community college presidents from colleges with bargaining rated this role or function more highly (important) than presidents from colleges without teacher negotiations.

Problems and Issues — Part V

Severity Ratings

Part V of the instrument surveyed the perceptions of administrators toward Problems and Issues in Education. Three areas were investigated: (a) severity or magnitude of the problems and issues, (b) the future projection of severity of the problems and issues and (c) the effects of collective bargaining on the problems and issues. The severity or magnitude of the following 19 problems and issues were rated on a five-point scale from "very critical" to "not a problem or issue":

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. School/community relations | 11. Job security |
| 2. Excessive paperwork | 12. Declining enrollments |
| 3. Problems of teacher personnel | 13. Loss of local control |
| 4. Developing and enforcing policies | 14. Implementing affirmative action |
| 5. Desegregation—integration | 15. Student attendance |
| 6. Problems of pupil personnel | 16. Problems related to controlling board |
| 7. Student discipline control | 17. Increasing educational costs |
| 8. Drug and alcohol abuse | 18. Decreasing revenues |
| 9. Teacher militancy | 19. Working conditions for professional staff |
| 10. Accountability demands | |

Future projection of severity ratings also used a five-point scale extending from "become much more critical" to "become much less critical."

Those problems and issues viewed as most serious were (a) *school community relations*, (b) *problems of teacher personnel*, (c) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations*,

(d) *accountability demands*, (e) *student attendance* (by principals only), (f) *increasing costs* and (g) *decreasing revenues*. The last two, *increasing costs* and *decreasing revenues*, were rated by more respondents as being "very critical" than any of the other 17 items (Table 7).

Larger proportions of superintendents and principals rated the problems and issues as more "serious" and "important" than community college presidents. Those problems and issues receiving the least serious ratings by the three groups were (a) *declining enrollments*, (b) *implementing affirmative action*, (c) *staff communications*, (d) *working conditions*, (e) *desegregation-integration* and (f) *problems of pupil personnel* (Table 7).

The future projection of severity of the problems and issues tended to correlate positively with the present severity ratings. The problems and issues were generally perceived as becoming more serious than they are at present. Those problems and issues projected as becoming "much more critical" were (a) *school community relations*, (b) *paper work*, (c) *problems of teacher personnel*, (d) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations*, (e) *teacher militancy*, (f) *accountability demands*, (g) *salaries and fringe benefits*, (h) *extra curricular programs*, (i) *problems related to the controlling board* and (j) *working conditions*. Leading the list as most critical in the future were the same two that were rated as presently most serious — (a) *increasing educational costs* and (b) *decreasing revenues* (Table 7).

Minor changes from present to future ratings were noted on the following educational problems and issues: (a) *desegregation-integration*, (b) *problems of pupil personnel*, (c) *student discipline*, (d) *drug and alcohol abuse*, (e) *affirmative action*, (f) *student attendance*, (g) *staff communications*, (h) *problems related to the controlling board* and (i) *working conditions* (Table 7). It should be repeated, however, that in nearly every case, these problems and issues were seen as becoming more serious than they are perceived at present.

Effects of Collective Bargaining

The nineteen problems and issues common to schools and community colleges were rated by respondents as having been positively, detrimentally or not affected by teacher collective bargaining. Eight of the 19 problems and issues were rated by a majority or near majority of subjects in all three groups as having been detrimentally affected by collective bargaining. In the order of the highest proportions responding in the "detrimental effect" column were *increasing educational costs*, *teacher militancy*, *problems of teacher personnel*, *school/community relations*, *decreasing revenues*, *developing and enforcing policies and regulations*, *loss of local control* and *problems related to controlling board* (Table 7).

One issue — *working conditions for professional staff* — received a "positive effect" rating by the survey groups. The remaining ten problems and issues were generally perceived as unaffected by teacher collective bargaining. Those considered least affected were *drug and*

alcohol abuse, problems of pupil personnel, desegregation-integration, student discipline control, declining enrollments, implementing affirmative action and student attendance (Table 7). A majority of respondents in each of the three survey groups gave "no effects" ratings to these items.

The analyses of differences among the survey groups produced six statistically different response patterns. Community college presidents were responsible for two of the differences, principals for two, and superintendents accounted for the other two. Larger proportions of community college presidents than principals and superintendents reported "detrimental effects" of teacher bargaining on *excessive paperwork* and *implementing affirmative action* (Tables 79 and 80).

Although most principals perceived detrimental effects of collective bargaining on *increasing educational costs* (69%), the proportion was significantly lower than those of superintendents and community college presidents (Table 81). Principals were also significantly different on their ratings of the effects of teacher bargaining on *working conditions for professional staff* (Table 82). Exactly half of the principals' group rated positive effects of collective bargaining on this variable as compared to 33% and 40% respectively for superintendents and community college presidents.

None of the groups was in close agreement on two of the problems and issues — *job security* and *loss of local control* (Tables 83 and 84). Larger proportions of superintendents rated both variables as detrimentally affected by collective bargaining.

Organizational Variables

Size. Size of organization produced nine significant within-groups differences on six educational problems and issues variables. Principals accounted for one difference. Those from large schools rated *desegregation-integration* as a more serious problem than did principals from small schools (Table 85).

Superintendents responded differently, on the basis of size of organization, on six variables. Four of the six differences were on severity ratings, with large district superintendents perceiving the educational problems and issues as more serious than their small district counterparts. The four variables were (a) *student discipline control*, (b) *teacher militancy*, (c) *declining enrollments* and (d) *desegregation-integration* (Tables 86 through 89). Superintendents from large districts perceived significantly more problems in the future for *desegregation-integration* and *problems of pupil personnel* than those from small districts (Tables 90 and 91).

Superintendents from various sized districts rated the "effects of negotiations" differently on one educational problem and issue — *accountability demands* (Table 92). Large district superintendents perceived more "detrimental effects" of collective bargaining on this issue than did small district superintendents.

Community college presidents differed on the size variable on one severity rating — *declining enrollments* (Table 93). Small college presidents perceived *declining enrollments* as a significantly more serious problem than presidents from large colleges.

Control of organization. In the analyses of within-groups differences on the control of organization variable, superintendents were not included because only one non-public superintendent responded to the survey. No "effects of negotiations" on collective bargaining analyses were performed on the principals' group because none of the non-public principals worked in schools with teacher bargaining.

Principals in public and non-public schools accounted for eight significant differences in severity and projected future severity ratings of problems and issues in education. *Student attendance, loss of local control* and *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* were rated by public school principals as (a) presently more serious and (b) projected in the future to be more serious problems and issues than did non-public principals (Tables 94 through 99). *Drug and alcohol abuse* and *teacher militancy* were also rated as significantly more serious problems or issues at present by public school principals than by non-public principals (Tables 100 and 101).

Community college presidents from state, local and private schools differed in their ratings of problems and issues in education on five variables. Private college presidents rated as significantly less serious, relative to state and local presidents, *loss of local control* and *problems of teacher personnel* (Tables 102 and 103). Presidents from locally controlled colleges perceived a more serious threat to local control in the future than state and private college presidents.

The "effects of collective bargaining" were viewed differently by community college presidents on two variables — *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* and *problems related to board of education* (Tables 104 and 105). In both cases, presidents from locally controlled colleges perceived more "detrimental effects" of teacher bargaining than did presidents from state and privately controlled colleges.

Years engaged in collective bargaining. Four problems and issues in education received significantly different ratings from administrator groups on the basis of years engaged in collective bargaining. Principals differed on one variable — *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* (Table 106). Principals from schools with less experience perceived the problem as becoming more serious in the future and also rated more "detrimental" effects of collective bargaining than those principals from districts with more years of involvement in bargaining (Table 107).

Superintendents and community college presidents working in institutions with six or more years of collective bargaining for teachers rated three problems and issues as more serious than their counterparts in colleges and districts with less experience in negotiations. The more years engaged in bargaining, the more serious the ratings of *problems of pupil personnel* and *school/community relations* by superintendents (Tables 108 and 109). *Job security* was rated as a more severe problem by community college presidents in colleges with six or more years of bargaining than by presidents from schools with fewer years of bargaining (Table 110).

Collective bargaining -- with and without. Nearly all of the significant differences in ratings for those who have collective bargaining and those who do not were within the principals group. Principals from schools with teacher bargaining rated the following problems and issues as more severe than those from schools without collective bargaining: (a) *problems of pupil personnel*, (b) *job security*, (c) *drug and alcohol abuse*, (d) *declining enrollments*, (e) *problems related to board of education*, (f) *loss of local control*, (g) *student discipline control*, (h) *teacher militancy*, (i) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* (Tables 111 through 119).

Five problems and issues were rated as significantly different in terms of future severity. Principals working in schools with teacher bargaining rated projected severity significantly higher (more severe) than principals from schools without teacher bargaining on the following: (a) *student discipline control*, (b) *teacher militancy*, (c) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations*, (d) *implementing affirmative action*, (e) *accountability demands* (Tables 120 through 124).

Two significant differences in severity ratings existed within the community college presidents group. Those presidents from colleges with bargaining gave higher severity ratings to *job security* and *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* than did presidents from colleges without teacher bargaining (Tables 125 and 126).

DISCUSSION

The questions in the General Impressions section of the survey produced an interesting response pattern. Principals and superintendents tended to respond in a like manner. Community college presidents, on the other hand, responded differently. On all items, the presidents agreed less strongly than the other two groups. Perhaps this response pattern can be partially attributed to the prevalence of collective bargaining among the three samples. Three-fourths of the principals and superintendents responding to the survey were from schools or districts with collective bargaining while only one-half of the community college presidents were from colleges with teacher bargaining.

The results of Part II indicate rather clearly that all three groups perceived a significant impact of collective bargaining on education and on administrative roles. That impact was typically viewed as negative and detrimental to the administrator, regardless of level. There was general consensus on the role of professional associations and organizations in the collective bargaining issue. All three groups tended to agree that their associations were sensitive to the implications of collective bargaining and were keeping their members current on collective bargaining issues.

The results of Part III also showed some significant variations between groups on both institutional quality ratings and the effects of collective bargaining on the institutional variables. Once again, community college presidents tended to differ from the principal and superintendent groups. Their ratings were higher than those made by the other two groups. In general, however, the administrative groups rated their respective institutions fairly high on all 13 institutional quality variables. On only one variable — *inservice programs* — did a majority of all three groups rate their schools/districts/colleges as fair or poor.

The perceptions of effects of collective bargaining revealed a rather negative view of the impact of collective bargaining on the institutional variables. Collective bargaining was seen by a majority of respondents as having a positive (strengthening) effect on *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits* only. The typical result was either "no effect" or "weakening" effects. On *community support, staff morale, public relations* and *fiscal condition* collective bargaining was perceived by most respondents as having had a "weakened" effect. The importance of these variables to an educational institution cannot be over emphasized. If the effects of collective bargaining are as profound as reported, educational institutions will experience increasingly serious problems as collective bargaining with teachers becomes more prevalent throughout the country.

Minimal effects of collective bargaining were perceived for *instructional programs, student achievement* and *student morale*. The respondents tended to see "no effects" of collective bargaining on these variables. This suggests that the differences between teacher organizations and boards of control may not be affecting teaching performance or student learning to any appreciable degree. If there are significant strengthening or weakening effects on these variables, they are not apparent to a majority of administrators.

The organizational variables of size, control, years engaged in collective bargaining and bargaining versus no-bargaining resulted in some meaningful differences on the institutional quality and effects ratings. The two quality variables — *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff* — were rated differently on all institutional variables by at least one of the three administrator groups. Administrators from large, public institutions, which have provided collective bargaining for a long period of time, rated salaries and fringe benefits as more "outstanding" or "good" than administrators from institutions with opposite characteristics.

The only significant differences in ratings of the effects of collective bargaining for the institutional quality variables were on the years engaged in collective bargaining. Two of the three differences were *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits*. Not surprisingly, the longer the organization was involved in collective bargaining, the more "strengthened" the perceived effects of bargaining. *Staff morale*, however, was seen as more "weakened" by principals from schools with less experience in bargaining.

Administrators working in schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining rated their respective institutions significantly different on several quality variables. Except for *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits* (which those with bargaining rated higher), administrators without bargaining tended to provide significantly higher (outstanding) institutional quality ratings. For some undiscernible reason, principals differed most frequently.

The importance ratings of the thirteen Administrative Roles and Functions produced no unusual results. All roles and functions were rated as important by a majority of respondents with some slight variations in degrees of importance. The three groups varied significantly in their ratings and generally these differences correlated with the frequency with which administrators perform the roles and functions.

The effects of collective bargaining on administrative roles and functions were rather distressing. No "strengthening" effects were seen by a majority of respondents on any of the roles and functions. Administrators in all three groups either saw "no effects" or "weakening" effects of collective bargaining. As with the importance ratings, the groups varied markedly in their effects ratings. Usually, the more important the rating assigned to a role or function by a given group, the greater the perceived "weakening effects" of collective bargaining.

Size, organization control, and years engaged in collective bargaining variables resulted in few significant within-groups differences for the thirteen administrative roles and functions. Principals accounted for the size and control of organization differences, with large public school principals rating several roles and functions as more important than small school principals.

The only differences in "effects of collective bargaining" ratings were on size and years engaged in bargaining. Large school principals saw significantly more "weakened" effects of bargaining on *stimulating innovation and change* than principals from small schools. Presidents from community colleges with long experience in bargaining rated the same role or function — *stimulating innovation and change* — as more "weakened" by collective bargaining than presidents in colleges with less experience. No explanations for these differences in "effects of collective bargaining" ratings are offered.

Administrators from institutions with and those without bargaining were in surprising agreement on the importance ratings of administrative roles and functions. Only one difference was observed — *supervision of instruction*. College presidents from colleges with bargaining rated *supervision of instruction* higher (more important) than those presidents without bargaining in their colleges.

Problems and Issues in Education were rated relative to present severity, projected severity (5-10 years in the future) and effects of negotiations. The typical response pattern was one in which administrators rated problems as becoming more serious five to ten years from now. Problems related to school financial support were seen as most "detrimentally" affected by collective bargaining. The number of current problems seen as being aggravated by collective bargaining were numerous. A few problems and issues were perceived as being neither positively nor negatively effected by collective bargaining. Only one — *salaries and fringe benefits* — was seen as having been "positively" effected by bargaining.

The results of Part V — Problems and Issues in Education — were significant in several ways. Administrators have a pessimistic view of the future with respect to the problems and issues of major concern to them today. Very few respondents in any of the three groups saw possibilities for improvement in the magnitude of the problems. The second area of concern is the prevailing negativism associated with collective bargaining. Whether their perceptions are accurate or not, administrators see many more ill-effects resulting from collective bargaining than good. This comes at a time when collective bargaining is becoming more prevalent at all levels of education and when teacher organizations are more vocal and demanding than ever before.

The organizational variables (size, control, years in collective bargaining, bargaining-with and without) analyses produced numerous differences on the problems and issues ratings. Large school/district/college administrators tended to perceive the problems and issues as more severe, becoming more severe in the future and more detrimentally affected by teacher bargaining than administrators from small institutions. One exception was the severity rating on *declining enrollments* by community college presidents. Presidents of small colleges saw this as a more serious problem than presidents from large colleges.

The control of organization analyses among principals resulted in eight significant differences. In all cases, public school principals rated the problems or issues as more severe or becoming more severe in the future than non-public school principals.

There was a tendency for administrators from institutions with more experience in collective bargaining to rate the problems and issues as more severe than those from schools/districts and colleges with little experience in bargaining.

Principals from schools with and without bargaining were different on most of the educational problems and issues. In virtually every case, principals from schools with teacher bargaining rated the problems or issues as presently more severe or projected to become more severe in the future.

Although fewer in number, the differences within the community college presidents group were the same as for principals. Presidents from colleges with bargaining gave higher severity ratings to the educational problems and issues than those from colleges without bargaining.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE STUDY

A Congruence of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining

The most encouraging findings of this study were the perceived minimal effects of collective bargaining on students and programs. There was general consensus among the survey groups that teacher bargaining had "no effect" on *instructional programs, student achievement, extra-curricular programs* and *student morale*.

Several of the serious student-related problems in education have apparently not been affected to any significant degree by collective bargaining. Most respondents reported "no effects" of bargaining on *student discipline control* (principals and superintendents only completed this item), *student attendance, drug and alcohol abuse* (principals and superintendents only), and other student-related problems.

The positive or beneficial effects of collective bargaining appear to have accrued to teachers. Majorities of respondents from all three groups agreed that collective bargaining has improved teacher salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions.

While these improvements in working conditions and economic issues are acknowledged as substantial, most administrators feel that a heavy price has been paid for these gains. The most serious negative consequences of collective bargaining were seen in the matters related to community, staff and finance. Collective bargaining has weakened *staff morale*, increased *problems of teacher personnel* and promoted *teacher militancy*. *School/community relations* and *community support of education* were seen as seriously affected by teacher bargaining.

Collective bargaining was perceived as having its greatest negative impact on variables related to finance. Four items of the survey addressed the finance issue — *fiscal condition, budgeting, decreasing revenues* and *increasing costs*.

Of the 13 Institutional Quality variables rated by respondents, *fiscal condition* was considered by the largest proportions of administrators to have been "weakened" by collective bargaining. Majorities of superintendents and community college presidents perceived "weakened" effects on the *budgeting* function. Principals, whose role in budgeting is minimal in comparison to superintendents and community college presidents, tended to view "no effects."

In the opinion of school administrators, the problems most detrimentally affected by collective bargaining were *increasing costs* and *decreasing revenues*. Overall, between two-thirds and four-fifths of all administrators perceived "detrimental" effects of collective bargaining on these two finance-related variables.

A Contrast of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining

There was a sizable number of statistically significant differences in response patterns among the three survey groups. These differences did not, however, change the general conclusions of this study.

Only five of the differences observed produced response patterns in which less than a majority of at least one group and a majority of at least one other group selected the same response option, e.g., less than half of group A perceived "weakened" effects while more than half of groups B and C perceived "weakened" effects. The five items to receive these significantly different response patterns were (a) *staff evaluation*, (b) *stimulating innovation and change*, (c) *supervision of instruction*, (d) *job security*, and (e) *loss of local control*.

The first three items — *staff evaluation*, *stimulating innovation and change* and *supervision of instruction* — were rated by less than half of the principals and superintendents, but by more than half of the community college presidents as "weakened" by collective bargaining. *Job security* was perceived as detrimentally affected by a majority of superintendents, but by less than a majority of principals and community college presidents. The fifth item — *loss of local control* — was rated as detrimentally affected by less than half of the principals group but by majorities of superintendents and community college presidents.

The differences involving community college presidents are difficult to interpret. College presidents are probably less involved in direct *staff evaluation* and *supervision of instruction* than either principals or superintendents and yet they perceived far greater "weakened" effects than either of these two groups. *Stimulating innovation and change*, an administrative role of equal importance to all three groups, was also perceived by a much larger proportion of community college presidents as "weakened" by teacher bargaining. No explanations for these differences are offered.

A majority of superintendents rated *job security* as detrimentally affected by collective bargaining, but less than half of either of the other groups responded in this way. This finding might be explained by the fact that, in general, *job security* is a more pressing problem for superintendents. Collective bargaining is one of the more important issues superintendents must deal with and would, therefore, pose a threat to *job security* if not handled to the satisfaction of the controlling body.

Loss of local control, perceived by less than half the principals' group as a problem detrimentally affected by collective bargaining, may be explained by the limited roles and responsibilities of the principal. His/her involvement with controlling boards and knowledge of threats to their control would be minimal. The principal's basic responsibility is the day-to-day operation of a school and he/she may not be cognizant of infringements on local control by special interest groups, state and federal agencies or teacher unions.

As mentioned previously, these differences do not change the substantive results of the study. There were no differences in perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining on issues related to finance, staff salaries, fringe benefits, working conditions, school/community relations, students, and instructional programs.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This investigation focused on two basic areas: (a) administrators' ratings of their institutions, job roles and functions and the salient problems and issues in education now and in the future; (b) the perceived effects of collective bargaining on schools and colleges, administrative roles and functions and educational problems and issues.

The results of the study were at the same time both encouraging and distressing. Administrators at all three levels gave high marks to their schools and colleges on important quality variables. Collective bargaining, while perceived as having profound negative effects on many facets of the educational enterprise, has apparently had minimal impact on students or instructional programs.

Administrators perceive far more negative effects associated with collective bargaining than positive. The only positive effects of collective bargaining, in the opinion of administrators, have accrued to teachers in the form of staff salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions.

The perceived negative/detrimental effects of collective bargaining were most strongly felt in areas related to school finance, school/community relations and staff morale.

A rather disturbing finding of the study was with respect to the perceptions of problems and issues now and in the future. Administrators have a pessimistic view of the future in that they see the problems in education as becoming much more serious five to ten years from now.

Below is a summary of the ratings of institutional quality, administrative roles and functions and problems and issues in education:

- * All groups tended to rate their institutions high on quality variables with community college presidents giving higher quality ratings to their institutions than either principals or superintendents.
- * Inservice programs was the only quality variable rated by more than half of all groups as "fair" or "poor." All other variables were rated by majorities as "excellent" or "good."
- * Large, public funded schools with long experience in collective bargaining are perceived as having better salaries and fringe benefits.
- * Except for the two variables — salaries and fringe benefits — administrators from schools and colleges without teacher bargaining gave better ratings on the quality variables than those with bargaining.
- * Administrators from large, public funded schools and colleges with long years of experience in collective bargaining tended to perceive problems and issues as more serious now and becoming more serious in the future than small, private schools and colleges with less experience in bargaining.
- * Principals and community college presidents from schools and colleges with teacher bargaining rated problems and issues as presently more severe and projected to become more severe than their counterparts in schools/colleges without teacher bargaining.

The following results and conclusions are drawn from the ratings of the effects of collective bargaining on institutional quality variables, administrative roles and functions and problems and issues in education:

- * Teacher collective bargaining has had a perceived positive effect on three variables only — *staff salaries*, *fringe benefits* and *working conditions*. All other variables were felt to be either unaffected or "weakened" by collective bargaining.

- * Collective bargaining was perceived as having only minimal impact on *student achievement, instructional programs, and student morale*.
- * In the opinion of school and community college administrators, the conflicts involving teacher organizations and board of control have apparently not affected teaching performance or student-teacher relations to any appreciable degree.
- * No administrative roles and functions were believed to be strengthened by collective bargaining. Typically, the more important the administrative role or function the greater the reported "weakened effects" of collective bargaining.
- * The most serious and detrimental effects of collective bargaining were related to financial issues — *increasing costs, decreasing revenues, budgeting and fiscal condition*.
- * Administrators believe there has been a deterioration of school/community relations as the public becomes disenchanted with a perceived "higher cost, lower return" on the dollar spent for education.

The results of this investigation suggest that an "is-ought" dichotomy exists in the arena of collective bargaining. Proponents of collective bargaining claim that the process improves the educational enterprise and its absence has a negative effect. Apparently the process has either a neutral or, in some instances, a deleterious effect on the enterprise. These data are of a "threshold" nature as it relates to the substance of bargaining. If bargaining demands are such that they affect the quality of public support and/or the educational process, then these elements are germane to the elements of negotiations. To make demands to demonstrate "teaching power" is a step away from the intellectual and humanistic character of education as it has been perceived in the past.

APPENDIX

**COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SURVEY
NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS**

Part I -- Background Information

1. Check which of the following describes your present position:

(a) Superintendent _____ (b) Principal of a Secondary School _____
2. Number of years in your present position (including this year): _____
3. Grade level organization:

(a) If superintendent, district organization --

K-12 _____	9-12 _____	9-14 _____
K-6 _____	7-12 _____	7-14 _____
K-14 _____	Other _____	

(b) If principal, school organization --

9-12 _____	9-10 _____	10-12 _____
11-12 _____	9-14 _____	10-14 _____
Other _____		
4. Control of district or school: Public _____ Non-Public _____
5. General type of district or school: Urban _____ Suburban _____ Town _____ Rural _____
6. Size of school or district (student enrollment):

(a) Superintendents -- Under 400 _____
400-5000 _____
5000-15000 _____
over 15000 _____

(b) Principals -- Under 400 _____
400-1000 _____
1000-2000 _____
over 2000 _____
7. Does your district engage in collective bargaining with teachers? Yes _____ No _____

(a) If "yes" to 7 above, number of years (including this year). _____

(b) If "yes" to 7 above, indicate the national affiliation of your local bargaining group.

National Education Association _____ American Federation of Teachers (AFL/CIO) _____

Other (please list) _____
8. Do secondary school principals in your district participate in the collective bargaining process?

Yes _____ No _____

(a) If "yes" to 8 above, what is their role in negotiations?

Active involvement _____ Silent observers _____

Other (please list) _____

Part II -- General Impressions

Directions: For questions 9-15, please circle the number after each item which correlates to your response

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree that:	Agree Strongly	Agree	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
9. Collective bargaining with teachers is becoming more prevalent in the schools.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. National professional education associations and organizations are aware of the implications of collective bargaining on the administration of schools (e.g., North Central Association, Phi Delta Kappa, American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Secondary School Principals, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
11. National professional education associations and organizations are doing a good job of keeping their members abreast of collective bargaining issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. The school administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. The superintendent/principal (respond for your position only) should be <u>actively</u> involved in the teacher negotiations process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Collective bargaining has forced administrators to share administrative decision-making with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to superintendents/principals (respond for your position only).	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part III – Institutional Ratings

Please rate your school or district on the following variables. If your district provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on each of the variables listed.

	Rating				Effects of Staff Negotiations*		
	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
16. Instructional program	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
17. Extra-curricular programs	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
18. Community support of education	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
19. Staff morale	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
20. Inservice programs	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
21. Student academic achievement	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
22. Student morale	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
23. Intra-staff communications	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
24. Public relations	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
25. Professional staff salaries	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
26. Fringe benefits for professional staff	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
27. Physical facilities	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
28. Fiscal condition	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)

*Complete only if your school provides for collective bargaining.

Part IV – Administrative Roles and Functions

INSTRUCTION: Below are listed some of the major roles and functions of school administrators. Please rate these roles and functions in terms of perceived **IMPORTANCE**. If your district provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on your ability to perform each of the administrative roles or functions.

	Importance Rating					Effects of Staff Negotiations*		
	Very Important	Relatively Important	Neutral	Relatively Unimportant	Unimportant	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
29. General decision making	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
30. Building management	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
31. Business management	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
32. Establishment of educational goals and priorities	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
33. Budgeting	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
34. Personnel selection, assignment, retention & promotion	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
35. Staff evaluation	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
36. Curriculum planning	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
37. Stimulating innovation & change	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
38. Supervision of instruction	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
39. Coordinating school activities	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
40. Policy development & implementation	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
41. Student discipline	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)

*Complete only if your school provides for collective bargaining.

Part V – Problems and Issues in Education

Below are listed some issues and problems confronting educational administrators. Please rate in terms of (a) severity or magnitude, (b) estimate of severity or magnitude in the future (five to ten years hence). If your district engages in collective bargaining with teachers, please indicate the effects of staff negotiations on each of the issues and problems listed.

	Severity or Magnitude					Future Projection					Negotiations*		
	Very Critical Problem or Issue	Important Problem or Issue	Occasional Problem or Issue	Minor Problem or Issue	Not a Present Problem or Issue	Become Much More Critical	Become Slightly More Critical	No Change	Become Slightly Less Critical	Become Much Less Critical	Positive Effect	No Effect	Detrimental Effect
42. School/community relations	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
43. Excessive paper work	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
44. Problems of teacher personnel	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
45. Developing and enforcing policies & regulations	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)

	Severity or Magnitude					Future Projection					Negotiations*		
	Very Critical Problem or Issue	Important Problem or Issue	Occasional Problem or Issue	Minor Problem or Issue	Not a Present Problem or Issue	Become Much More Critical	Become Slightly More Critical	No Change	Become Slightly Less Critical	Become Much Less Critical	Positive Effect	No Effect	Detrimental Effect
46. Desegregation — integration	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
47. Problems of pupil personnel	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
48. Student discipline control	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
49. Drug and alcohol abuse	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
50. Teacher militancy	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
51. Accountability demands	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
52. Job security	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
53. Professional staff salaries	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
54. Declining enrollments	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
55. Loss of local control	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
56. Implementing affirmative action	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
57. Extra-curricular programs	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
58. Student attendance	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
59. Intra-staff communications	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
60. Problems related to board of education	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
61. Increasing educational costs	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
62. Decreasing revenues	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
63. Working conditions for professional staff	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SURVEY – NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Part I – Background Information

1. Control of your college: State _____ State/Local _____ Non-public _____
2. General type(s) of area served: Urban _____ Suburban _____ Town _____ Rural _____
3. Size of your college (student enrollment):
 - under 500 _____
 - 500–1000 _____
 - 1000–3000 _____
 - 3000–5000 _____
 - over 5000 _____
4. Do you have a collective bargaining agreement with your instructional staff? Yes _____ No _____
 - (a) If "yes" to 4 above, number of years (including this year). _____
 - (b) If "yes" to 4 above, indicate the national affiliation of your local bargaining group.
 - National Education Association _____
 - American Federation of Teachers (AFL/CIO) _____
 - American Association of University Professors _____
 - Other (please list) _____
5. Do administrators or Board Members at your college participate in collective bargaining sessions?
 - Yes _____ No _____
 - (a) If "yes" to 5 above, what is their role in negotiations?
 - Active involvement _____ Silent observers _____
 - Other (please list) _____

Part II – General Impressions

Directions: For questions 6-11 please circle the number after each item which correlates to your response.

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
6. Collective bargaining with teachers is becoming more prevalent in community and junior colleges.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. National professional education associations and organizations are aware of the implications of collective bargaining on the administration of colleges (e.g., North Central Association, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, American Council on Education, Phi Delta Kappa, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. National professional education associations and organizations are doing a good job of keeping their members abreast of collective bargaining issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The college administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Collective bargaining has forced community and junior college presidents to share administrative decision making with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to community and junior college presidents.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part III – Institutional Ratings

Please rate your college on the following variables. If your college provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on each of the variables listed.

	RATING				EFFECTS OF STAFF NEGOTIATIONS*		
	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
12. Instructional program	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
13. Extra-curricular programs	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
14. Community support of education	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
15. Staff morale	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
16. Inservice programs	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
17. Student academic achievement	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
18. Student morale	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
19. Intra-staff communications	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
20. Public relations	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
21. Professional staff salaries	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
22. Fringe benefits for professional staff	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
23. Physical facilities	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)
24. Fiscal condition	(1	2	3	4)	(1	2	3)

*Complete only if your college provides for collective bargaining.

Part IV – Administrative Roles and Functions

INSTRUCTION: Below are listed some of the major roles and functions of college administrators. Please rate in terms of perceived IMPORTANCE of each role or function. If your college provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on your ability to perform each of the administrative roles or functions.

	IMPORTANCE RATING					EFFECTS OF STAFF NEGOTIATIONS*		
	Very Important	Relatively Important	Neutral	Relatively Unimportant	Unimportant	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
25. General decision making	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
26. Building management	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
27. Business management	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
28. Establishment of educational goals and priorities	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)

	IMPORTANCE RATING					EFFECTS OF STAFF NEGOTIATIONS*		
	Very Important	Relatively Important	Neutral	Relatively Unimportant	Unimportant	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
29. Budgeting	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
30. Personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
31. Staff evaluation	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
32. Curriculum planning	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
33. Stimulating innovation and change	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
34. Supervision of instruction	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
35. Coordinating school activities	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
36. Policy development and implementation	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)

*Complete only if your college provides for collective bargaining.

Part V – Problems and Issues in Education

Below are listed some issues and problems confronting college administrators. Please rate in terms of (a) severity or magnitude, (b) estimate of magnitude or severity in the future (five to ten years hence). If your college engages in collective bargaining with teachers, please indicate the effects of staff negotiations on each of the issues and problems listed.

	SEVERITY OR MAGNITUDE					FUTURE PROJECTION					NEGOTIATIONS*		
	Very Critical Problem or Issue	Important Problem or Issue	Occasional Problem or Issue	Minor Problem or Issue	Not a Present Problem or Issue	Become Much More Critical	Become Slightly More Critical	No Change	Become Slightly Less Critical	Become Much Less Critical	Positive Effect	No Effect	Detrimental Effect
37. School/community relations	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
38. Excessive paperwork	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
39. Problems of teacher personnel	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
40. Developing and enforcing policies and regulations	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
41. Problems of pupil personnel	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
42. Teacher militancy	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
43. Accountability demands	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
44. Job security	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
45. Professional staff salaries and fringe benefits	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
46. Declining enrollments	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)

	SEVERITY OR MAGNITUDE					FUTURE PROJECTION					NEGOTIATIONS*		
	Very Critical Problem or Issue	Important Problem or Issue	Occasional Problem or Issue	Minor Problem or Issue	Not a Present Problem or Issue	Become Much More Critical	Become Slightly More Critical	No Change	Become Slightly Less Critical	Become Much Less Critical	Positive Effect	No Effect	Detrimental Effect
47. Loss of local control	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
48. Implementing affirmative action	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
49. Extra-curricular programs	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
50. Intra-staff communications	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
51. Problems related to the controlling board	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
52. Increasing educational costs	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
53. Decreasing revenues	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)
54. Working conditions for professional staff	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3	4	5)	(1	2	3)

*Complete only if your college provides for collective bargaining.

TABLE 1

PART I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

SURVEY GROUP: PRINCIPALS

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
1. School level organization:					
9-12	120	59	10-12	61	30
11-12	1	.5	10-14	0	0
9-10	0	0	other	23	11
9-14	0	0			
2. Control of school		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
Public		196		95	
Non-Public		11		5	
3. Type of community served:		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
Urban		46		24	
Suburban		50		26	
Town		48		25	
Rural		47		25	
4. School enrollment:		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
Under 400		27		15	
400-1000		65		37	
1000-2000		60		34	
over 2000		24		14	
5. Engage in collective bargaining:		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
Yes		155		75	
No		22		25	
6. Number of years engaged in collective bargaining:		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
0-3		33		25	
4-6		34		25	
over 6		64		50	
7. National affiliation of local bargaining unit:		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
NEA		124		84	
AFT		13		9	
other		10		7	
8. Principal participation in collective bargaining:		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
Yes		91		46	
No		107		54	
9. Role of principal if participation in collective bargaining:		<u>n</u>		<u>%</u>	
Active		35		40	
Passive (observer)		32		36	
Other		21		24	

TABLE 2

PART I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

SURVEY GROUP: SUPERINTENDENTS

1. District grade level organization:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
K-12	145	94	7-12	1	.6
K-6	1	.6	9-14	0	0
K-14	2	1.3	7-14	0	0
9-12	1	.6	other	4	2.5

2. Control of district:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Public	156	99
Non-public	1	1

3. Type of community served:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Urban	17	13
Suburban	32	24
Town	40	30
Rural	45	34

4. District enrollment:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Under 400	3	2
400-5000	114	75
5000-15000	26	17
over 15000	10	6

5. Engage in collective bargaining

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	119	76
No	37	24

6. Number of years engaged in collective bargaining:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
0-3	18	16
4-6	27	24
over 6	66	60

7. National affiliation of local bargaining unit:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
NEA	94	89
AFT	9	8
other	3	3

8. Principal participation in collective bargaining:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	63	46
No	73	54

9. Role of principal if participation in collective bargaining:

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Active	26	42
Passive (observer)	17	27
Other	19	31

TABLE 3

PART I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

SURVEY GROUP: COMMUNITY & JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Type of area or community served:		
Urban	28	23
Suburban	33	27
Town	16	13
Rural	45	37
2. Student enrollment		
Under 500	10	6
500-1000	29	17
1000-3000	55	32
3000-5000	20	12
over 5000	59	34
3. Engage in collective bargaining:		
Yes	72	41
No	102	59
4. Number of years engaged in collective bargaining:		
0-3	18	26
4-6	19	28
over 6	31	46
5. National affiliation of local bargaining unit:		
NEA	38	52
AFT	20	27
AAUP	1	1
other	14	19
5. Administrator or Board Member involvement in collective bargaining:		
Yes	65	48
No	70	52
7. Role of administrator(s) or Board Member(s) in collective bargaining:		
Active	43	77
Passive	3	3
other	10	18
8. Control of college		
State	42	24
Local	118	67
Non-Public	15	9

TABLE 4

PART II -- GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
1. Collective bargaining with teachers is becoming more prevalent in schools and community colleges.						
Principals	60	36	4	0	0	0
Superintendents	77	19	3	0	1	0
Community College Presidents	49	43	6	1	1	0
2. National professional education associations and organizations are aware of the implications of collective bargaining on the administration of schools/colleges.						
Principals	23	55	12	5	4	1
Superintendents	31	46	15	2	5	1
Community College Presidents	12	42	21	11	13	1
3. National professional education associations are doing a good job of keeping their members abreast of collective bargaining issues.						
Principals	8	50	29	9	3	1
Superintendents	12	47	26	5	8	2
Community College Presidents	3	24	41	14	16	2
4. The school/college administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations.						
Principals	19	36	23	10	11	1
Superintendents	17	32	21	12	16	3
Community College Presidents	9	23	27	14	21	6
5. The superintendent/principal should be <u>actively</u> involved in the teacher negotiations process.						
Principals	18	35	17	6	16	8
Superintendents	20	32	8	5	22	12

TABLE 4 (cont.)

PART II -- GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
6. Collective bargaining has forced administrators to share administrative decision-making with teachers.						
Principals	10	45	30	6	8	0
Superintendents	17	46	25	7	5	1
Community College Presidents	8	34	28	10	16	4
7. Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to superintendents/principals/community college presidents.						
Principals	9	30	22	14	22	4
Superintendents	16	37	12	12	18	5
Community College Presidents	6	25	15	16	31	8

TABLE 5

PART III -- INSTITUTIONAL RATINGS

		Rating				Effects of Staff Negotiations		
		Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
1.	Instructional program							
	Principals	21	58	17	3	19	57	24
	Superintendents	17	68	10	5	9	63	29
2.	Community College Presidents	41	53	3	3	10	47	44
	Extra-curricular programs							
	Principals	15	56	21	8	12	48	40
3.	Superintendents	18	63	17	3	12	63	25
	Community College Presidents	8	50	33	9	0	57	43
	Community support of education							
4.	Principals	15	41	30	14	1	41	58
	Superintendents	15	51	24	10	3	32	65
	Community College Presidents	34	43	17	6	4	54	42
5.	Staff morale							
	Principals	12	59	21	9	23	28	49
	Superintendents	8	65	26	1	14	24	62
6.	Community College Presidents	16	65	18	2	24	21	55
	Inservice programs							
	Principals	3	29	49	19	21	59	20
7.	Superintendents	4	41	51	4	21	51	28
	Community College Presidents	3	30	51	17	10	44	47
	Student academic achievement							
8.	Principals	8	62	26	4	3	79	18
	Superintendents	7	70	20	4	1	87	12
	Community College Presidents	14	75	10	2	1	83	15
9.	Student morale							
	Principals	7	68	22	4	3	78	20
	Superintendents	6	75	16	4	0	82	18
10.	Community College Presidents	19	70	10	1	0	81	19
	Intra-staff communications							
	Principals	3	56	35	6	22	47	31
11.	Superintendents	5	60	32	3	24	31	44
	Community College Presidents	5	56	35	5	22	31	47
	Public relations							
12.	Principals	5	46	37	13	5	43	53
	Superintendents	6	60	25	9	2	35	63
	Community College Presidents	23	52	19	5	4	50	46

TABLE 5 (cont.)

PART III -- INSTITUTIONAL RATINGS

	Rating				Effects of Staff Negotiations		
	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
10. Professional staff salaries							
Principals	14	56	27	3	85	13	2
Superintendents	11	67	21	2	81	14	5
Community College Presidents	27	48	21	4	71	26	3
11. Fringe benefits for professional staff							
Principals	16	52	28	4	84	15	1
Superintendents	14	57	21	8	80	16	3
Community College Presidents	36	51	12	1	74	24	3
12. Physical facilities							
Principals	17	40	32	11	8	81	11
Superintendents	18	49	24	8	2	82	17
Community College Presidents	34	44	17	6	3	92	6
13. Fiscal condition							
Principals	7	40	37	17	3	43	55
Superintendents	10	47	30	13	2	37	62
Community College Presidents	14	52	25	9	1	42	57

TABLE 6

PART IV - ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

	Importance Rating					Effects of Staff Negotiations		
	Very Important	Relatively Important	Neutral	Relatively Unimportant	Unimportant	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
1. General decision making								
Principals	64	31	3	2	0	8	36	56
Superintendents	86	13	1	0	0	9	29	62
Comm. College Presidents	80	19	1	0	0	24	23	53
2. Building management								
Principals	53	41	4	2	1	6	49	45
Superintendents	50	38	10	1	1	4	48	48
Comm. College Presidents	23	62	10	6	0	3	86	11
3. Business management								
Principals	28	54	14	4	1	3	71	26
Superintendents	70	27	3	0	0	8	57	36
Comm. College Presidents	61	36	2	1	0	11	58	31
4. Establishment of educational goals and priorities								
Principals	68	27	3	2	0	23	47	30
Superintendents	67	27	6	1	0	9	56	35
Comm. College Presidents	82	16	1	1	0	16	37	48
5. Budgeting								
Principals	37	43	17	4	0	11	52	38
Superintendents	82	17	1	0	0	8	39	54
Comm. College Presidents	86	12	1	1	0	10	38	52
6. Personnel selection, assignment retention & promotion								
Principals	74	21	5	1	0	9	37	54
Superintendents	70	27	4	0	0	11	40	50
Comm. College Presidents	69	27	4	0	0	13	35	52
7. Staff evaluation								
Principals	65	30	4	1	1	26	36	38
Superintendents	56	38	6	0	0	34	37	29
Comm. College Presidents	49	40	11	1	0	20	20	61
8. Curriculum planning								
Principals	63	32	4	1	1	18	64	18
Superintendents	45	46	9	0	0	12	62	27
Comm. College Presidents	47	43	8	1	1	9	51	41

TABLE 6 (cont.)

PART IV - ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

	Importance Rating					Effects of Staff Negotiations		
	Very Important	Relatively Important	Neutral	Relatively Unimportant	Unimportant	Strengthened	No Effect	Weakened
9. Stimulating innovation & change								
Principals	31	55	10	2	2	8	63	29
Superintendents	33	55	9	2	0	5	55	40
Comm. College Presidents	45	48	7	0	0	6	30	64
10. Supervision of instruction								
Principals	58	34	5	1	2	11	53	36
Superintendents	45	42	12	1	0	16	48	36
Comm. College Presidents	34	44	19	3	0	16	28	56
1. Coordinating school activities								
Principals	33	54	11	2	1	3	77	20
Superintendents	21	55	19	4	1	2	82	16
Comm. College Presidents	18	55	21	6	0	3	69	28
2. Policy development and implementation								
Principals	40	51	8	2	0	18	39	43
Superintendents	59	33	6	1	1	15	41	44
Comm. College Presidents	74	25	1	1	0	21	38	41
3. Student Discipline								
Principals	60	31	7	1	2	7	60	33
Superintendents	35	44	16	5	0	7	73	20

TABLE 7

PART V -- PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN EDUCATION

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

	Severity or Magnitude					Future Projection					Negotiations		
	Very Critical Problem or Issue	Important Problem or Issue	Occasional Problem or Issue	Minor Problem or Issue	Not a Present Problem or Issue	Become Much More Critical	Become Slightly More Critical	No Change	Become Slightly Less Critical	Become Much Less Critical	Positive Effect	No Effect	Detrimental Effect
1. School/community relations													
Principals	27	47	15	4	5	49	33	13	6	0	8	27	66
Superintendents	30	42	17	5	6	52	30	15	2	1	6	21	73
Comm. College Pres.	17	42	22	7	12	32	36	29	3	0	4	35	61
2. Excessive paperwork													
Principals	23	35	32	9	1	39	39	22	1	0	5	52	43
Superintendents	22	41	30	7	1	37	44	19	1	0	1	50	49
Comm. College Pres.	16	48	29	6	1	37	42	17	3	1	0	43	57
3. Problems of teacher personnel													
Principals	20	41	29	6	4	40	39	19	2	1	9	19	73
Superintendents	21	42	25	8	3	43	40	15	1	1	10	17	72
Comm. College Pres.	15	40	33	6	6	28	37	33	1	1	11	26	63
4. Developing & enforcing policies & regulations													
Principals	23	45	22	5	5	39	39	20	1	1	9	29	62
Superintendents	26	37	25	9	3	36	37	26	1	0	17	28	55
Comm. College Pres.	13	41	34	7	5	22	34	41	1	1	17	33	50
5. Desegregation -- integration													
Principals	11	16	14	14	45	17	17	54	5	6	6	84	10
Superintendents	11	11	13	11	55	13	19	53	3	11	4	87	9
6. Problems of pupil personnel													
Principals	8	33	40	13	6	12	41	42	5	1	9	69	23
Superintendents	8	29	37	19	8	17	37	44	2	1	9	71	21
Comm. College Pres.	3	17	40	21	19	5	24	61	6	5	4	78	17
7. Student discipline control													
Principals	26	32	28	12	3	27	40	26	6	2	11	51	38
Superintendents	18	34	30	13	6	28	33	36	3	1	14	61	25
8. Drug and alcohol abuse													
Principals	19	39	25	12	4	18	44	28	9	1	4	87	9
Superintendents	14	35	38	11	3	24	35	38	3	1	9	83	8

TABLE 7 (cont.)

PART V -- PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN EDUCATION

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

	Severity or Magnitude					Future Projection					Negotiations		
	Very Critical Problem or Issue	Important Problem or Issue	Occasional Problem or Issue	Minor Problem or Issue	Not a Present Problem or Issue	Become Much More Critical	Become Slightly More Critical	No Change	Become Slightly Less Critical	Become Much Less Critical	Positive Effect	No Effect	Detrimental Effect
9. Teacher militancy													
Principals	16	29	25	18	12	32	39	24	3	3	14	9	77
Superintendents	26	32	26	13	3	45	41	12	2	0	11	7	82
Comm. College Pres.	12	27	32	17	14	28	44	23	5	1	15	15	69
0. Accountability demands													
Principals	22	43	20	12	3	31	47	20	2	1	23	35	42
Superintendents	20	38	27	12	3	35	43	20	2	0	13	38	49
Comm. College Pres.	25	45	17	6	7	41	43	15	1	0	22	28	50
1. Job security													
Principals	16	32	23	14	15	23	41	33	2	1	33	31	35
Superintendents	22	23	30	17	8	33	39	26	3	0	23	18	59
Comm. College Pres.	11	36	24	18	12	23	34	38	3	3	36	22	42
2. Declining enrollments													
Principals	20	31	20	12	17	35	34	26	4	2	9	60	31
Superintendents	22	28	21	16	13	28	31	31	5	4	7	57	36
Comm. College Pres.	14	22	17	15	32	29	32	31	3	5	4	57	39
3. Loss of local control													
Principals	23	30	23	11	12	35	33	30	2	1	7	52	41
Superintendents	36	39	17	6	2	55	30	12	2	1	6	25	69
Comm. College Pres.	29	43	7	11	10	50	31	18	1	0	13	35	52
4. Implementing affirmative action													
Principals	8	28	34	15	15	13	36	46	3	2	15	60	25
Superintendents	9	24	38	17	13	16	39	41	3	1	12	64	25
Comm. College Pres.	11	42	30	11	6	24	39	31	7	1	14	39	47

TABLE 7 (cont.)

PART V -- PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN EDUCATION

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

	Severity or Magnitude					Future Projection					Negotiations		
	Very Critical Problem or Issue	Important Problem or Issue	Occasional Problem or Issue	Minor Problem or Issue	Not a Present Problem or Issue	Become Much More Critical	Become Slightly More Critical	No Change	Become Slightly Less Critical	Become Much Less Critical	Positive Effect	No Effect	Detrimental Effect
15. Student attendance													
Principals	32	34	22	9	3	34	31	29	5	1	8	80	12
Superintendents	10	24	35	23	8	15	24	57	4	1	3	91	6
16. Problems related to controlling board													
Principals	13	34	28	15	10	18	39	39	3	2	12	36	52
Superintendents	15	27	29	16	13	22	32	40	4	1	8	33	59
Comm. College Pres.	9	28	33	16	14	16	34	43	5	2	11	36	53
17. Increasing educational costs													
Principals	50	40	6	2	2	63	28	9	0	0	13	18	69
Superintendents	64	32	3	1	0	70	23	6	1	0	11	4	84
Comm. College Pres.	52	35	8	4	1	64	25	10	0	1	4	13	83
18. Decreasing revenues													
Principals	42	37	12	5	3	54	33	13	1	0	9	34	58
Superintendents	55	26	10	5	5	57	24	18	1	0	7	28	65
Comm. College Pres.	40	37	10	7	6	55	31	13	1	0	4	31	65
19. Working conditions for professionals staff													
Principals	12	26	30	21	11	14	34	43	6	3	50	30	20
Superintendents	7	23	43	19	8	14	40	42	4	1	33	29	39
Comm. College Pres.	4	32	35	18	11	14	31	49	5	2	40	25	35

TABLE 8

POSTN BY VAR020

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR020				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	23	93	14	7	137 27.0
		16.8	67.9	10.2	5.1	
		17.7	31.8	26.4	38.9	
		4.7	18.9	2.8	1.4	
PRINCIPALS	2.	43	117	35	6	201 40.8
		21.4	58.2	17.4	3.0	
		33.1	40.1	66.3	33.3	
		8.7	23.7	7.1	1.2	
J.C.PRESIDENTS	3.	64	82	4	5	155 31.4
		41.3	52.9	2.6	3.2	
		49.2	28.1	7.5	27.8	
		13.5	16.6	0.8	1.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		130	292	53	18	493 100.0
		26.4	59.2	10.8	3.7	

CHI SQUARE = 41.63602 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 9

POSTN BY VAR024

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR024				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	29	71	33	14	138 27.9
		14.5	51.4	23.9	10.1	
		19.6	32.3	27.5	26.9	
		4.0	14.4	6.7	2.8	
PRINCIPALS	2.	30	82	60	29	201 40.7
		14.9	40.8	29.9	14.4	
		29.4	37.3	50.0	55.8	
		6.1	16.6	12.1	5.9	
J.C.PRESIDENTS	3.	52	67	27	9	155 31.4
		33.5	43.2	17.4	5.8	
		51.0	30.5	22.5	17.3	
		10.5	13.6	5.5	1.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		102	220	120	52	494 100.0
		20.6	44.5	24.3	10.5	

CHI SQUARE = 32.16994 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 45

TABLE 10

POSTN BY VAR026

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR026				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	11	89	37	1	138 28.0
		8.0	64.5	26.6	0.7	
		19.8	29.1	34.6	4.8	
		2.2	18.1	7.5	0.2	
PRINCIPALS	2.	24	117	42	17	200 40.6
		12.0	58.5	21.9	8.5	
		40.7	39.2	39.3	81.0	
		4.9	23.7	8.5	3.4	
J.C.PRESIDENTS	3.	24	100	38	3	155 31.4
		15.5	64.5	18.1	1.9	
		40.7	32.7	26.2	14.3	
		4.9	20.3	5.7	0.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		59	306	107	21	493 100.0
		12.0	62.1	21.7	4.3	

CHI SQUARE = 21.24065 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0017
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 11

POSTN BY VAR030

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR030				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	9	94	27	5	135 27.6
		6.7	69.6	20.0	3.7	
		19.8	28.1	28.7	31.3	
		1.8	14.2	5.5	1.0	
PRINCIPALS	2.	16	124	52	6	200 40.8
		8.0	62.0	26.0	4.0	
		39.8	37.1	55.3	59.0	
		3.3	25.3	10.6	1.6	
J.C.PRESIDENTS	3.	21	116	15	3	155 31.6
		13.5	74.8	9.7	1.9	
		45.7	34.7	16.0	18.8	
		4.3	23.7	3.1	0.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		46	336	94	16	490 100.0
		9.4	68.2	19.2	3.3	

CHI SQUARE = 19.94563 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0028
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 49

TABLE 12

PCSTN BY VAR032

POSTN	VAR032					ROW TOTAL
	CCLMT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	8 6.0 15.7 1.6	100 74.6 29.2 35.5	21 15.7 26.6 4.3	5 3.7 -35.7 1.0	134 27.5	
2. PRINCIPALS	14 7.1 27.5 2.9	134 67.7 39.1 27.5	43 21.7 54.4 8.6	7 3.5 50.0 1.6	198 40.7	
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	29 16.7 56.9 6.3	109 70.3 31.8 22.4	15 9.7 19.0 3.1	2 1.3 14.3 0.4	155 31.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	51 13.5	343 75.4	79 16.2	14 2.9	487 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 25.17241 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0003
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 13

PCSTN BY VAR036

POSTN	VAR036					ROW TOTAL
	CCLMT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	8 5.8 14.3 1.6	83 60.1 32.5 16.8	34 24.6 24.6 6.9	13 9.4 26.3 2.6	138 28.0	
2. PRINCIPALS	10 5.0 18.5 2.0	91 45.5 35.7 18.5	74 37.0 53.6 15.0	25 12.5 34.3 5.1	200 40.6	
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	36 23.2 66.7 7.3	81 52.3 31.8 16.4	30 19.4 21.7 6.1	6 5.2 17.4 1.6	155 31.4	
COLUMN TOTAL	54 11.0	255 51.7	138 26.0	46 9.3	493 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 50.05792 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 14

PCSTN BY VAR040

POSTN	VAR040					ROW TOTAL
	CCLMT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	19 14.0 17.8 3.9	73 57.4 29.8 15.8	29 20.6 26.9 5.7	11 8.1 55.0 2.2	136 27.6	
2. PRINCIPALS	33 16.3 30.3 5.7	105 52.0 40.1 21.3	57 28.2 54.8 11.6	7 3.5 35.0 1.4	202 41.0	
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	55 39.5 51.4 11.2	79 51.0 30.2 16.0	19 12.3 18.3 3.9	2 1.3 10.0 0.4	155 31.4	
COLUMN TOTAL	107 21.7	262 53.1	104 21.1	20 4.1	493 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 39.79135 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 15

PCSTN BY VAR042

POSTN	VAR042					ROW TOTAL
	CCLMT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	25 18.4 22.5 5.1	67 49.3 31.3 13.7	33 24.3 26.8 6.7	11 8.1 26.9 2.2	136 27.6	
2. PRINCIPALS	34 17.1 30.6 7.0	80 40.2 37.4 16.4	21 10.0 10.0 4.3	21 10.0 10.0 4.3	199 40.7	
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	52 33.5 46.8 10.5	67 43.5 31.3 13.7	26 16.9 21.1 5.3	9 5.8 22.3 1.3	154 31.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	111 22.7	214 43.8	123 25.2	41 8.4	489 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 24.13907 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 50

TABLE 16

POSTN BY VAR044

POSTN	VAR044				ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR		POOR
	RCW PCT CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.		4.
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	13	54	40	18	135	
	9.6	47.4	29.6	13.3	27.6	
	26.5	24.7	26.3	27.7		
	2.7	13.1	8.2	3.7		
2. PRINCIPALS	14	79	74	33	200	
	7.0	39.5	37.0	16.5	40.9	
	28.5	35.4	45.7	50.8		
	2.9	16.2	15.1	6.7		
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	22	23	32	14	154	
	14.3	51.9	24.7	9.1	31.5	
	44.9	35.9	25.3	21.5		
	4.5	16.4	7.8	2.9		
COLUMN TOTAL	49	223	152	65	489	
	13.0	45.8	31.1	13.3	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 15.69276 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0155
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 50

TABLE 17

POSTN BY VAR022

POSTN	VAR022				ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR		POOR
	RCW PCT CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.		4.
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	24	86	23	4	137	
	17.5	62.8	16.8	2.9	27.8	
	35.3	31.3	14.8	11.8		
	4.9	17.4	4.7	0.8		
2. PRINCIPALS	31	112	42	16	201	
	15.4	55.7	20.9	8.0	40.8	
	45.6	40.7	36.2	47.1		
	6.3	22.7	8.5	3.2		
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	13	77	51	14	155	
	8.4	49.7	32.9	9.0	31.4	
	19.1	28.0	44.0	41.2		
	2.5	15.5	10.3	2.8		
COLUMN TOTAL	68	275	116	34	493	
	13.8	55.8	23.5	6.9	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 20.80917 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0020
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 18

POSTN BY VAR021

POSTN	VAR021			ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
	RCW PCT CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.		3.
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	10	72	33	115	
	8.7	62.6	28.7	34.3	
	22.2	37.9	33.0		
	3.3	21.5	9.9		
2. PRINCIPALS	28	85	36	149	
	15.8	57.0	24.2	44.5	
	52.2	44.7	16.3		
	8.4	25.4	10.7		
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	7	33	31	71	
	9.9	46.5	43.7	21.2	
	15.6	17.4	31.0		
	2.1	9.9	9.3		
COLUMN TOTAL	45	190	100	335	
	13.4	56.7	29.9	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 14.00304 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0073
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 204

TABLE 19

POSTN BY VAR029

POSTN	VAR029			ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
	RCW PCT CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.		3.
1. SUPERINTENDENTS	24	59	32	115	
	20.9	51.3	27.8	34.1	
	36.1	33.0	33.7		
	7.1	17.5	9.5		
2. PRINCIPALS	32	89	30	151	
	21.2	59.9	19.9	44.8	
	50.8	49.7	31.6		
	9.5	26.4	8.9		
3. J.C. PRESIDENTS	7	31	33	71	
	9.9	43.7	46.5	21.1	
	11.1	17.3	34.7		
	2.1	9.2	9.9		
COLUMN TOTAL	63	179	95	337	
	16.7	53.1	28.2	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 18.12975 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0012
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 202

TABLE 20

POSTN		BY VAR039						
		VAR039						
POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	STRENGTH			NO EFFEC WEAKENED			ROW TOTAL
		ENED	T		T	T		
			1.	2.		3.	1.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	91	15	6	113			113
		80.5	14.2	5.3	33.7			33.7
		33.7	29.6	54.5				
		27.2	4.8	1.8				
PRINCIPALS	2.	125	19	3	150			150
		85.3	12.7	2.0	44.8			44.8
		47.4	35.2	27.3				
		31.2	5.7	0.9				
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	51	19	2	72			72
		70.8	28.4	2.8	21.5			21.5
		15.9	35.2	18.2				
		15.2	5.7	0.5				
COLUMN TOTAL		270	54	11	335			335
		63.6	16.1	3.3	100.0			100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.58002 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0481
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 234

TABLE 21

POSTN		BY VAR023						
		VAR023						
POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	STRENGTH			NO EFFEC WEAKENED			ROW TOTAL
		ENED	T		T	T		
			1.	2.		3.	1.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	14	72	29	115			115
		12.2	62.5	25.2	34.3			34.3
		43.8	33.7	24.2				
		4.1	21.3	8.8				
PRINCIPALS	2.	18	73	60	151			151
		11.9	46.3	39.7	44.7			44.7
		56.3	39.2	50.0				
		5.3	21.6	17.8				
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	0	41	31	72			72
		0.0	55.9	43.1	21.3			21.3
		0.0	22.0	25.8				
		0.0	12.1	9.2				
COLUMN TOTAL		32	166	120	338			338
		9.5	55.0	35.5	100.0			100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.48622 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0024
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 201

TABLE 22

POSTN		BY VAR025						
		VAR025						
POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	STRENGTH			NO EFFEC WEAKENED			ROW TOTAL
		ENED	T		T	T		
			1.	2.		3.	1.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	3	37	75	115			115
		2.6	32.2	65.2	34.1			34.1
		37.5	27.0	39.1				
		0.9	11.9	12.3				
PRINCIPALS	2.	2	62	37	151			151
		1.3	41.1	57.6	44.8			44.8
		25.3	45.5	43.3				
		0.5	13.4	25.8				
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	3	38	30	71			71
		4.2	53.5	42.3	21.1			21.1
		37.5	27.7	19.8				
		0.9	11.3	8.9				
COLUMN TOTAL		8	137	192	337			337
		2.4	40.7	57.0	100.0			100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.76732 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0293
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 202

TABLE 23

POSTN		BY VAR035						
		VAR035						
POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	STRENGTH			NO EFFEC WEAKENED			ROW TOTAL
		ENED	T		T	T		
			1.	2.		3.	1.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	28	36	51	115			115
		24.3	31.3	44.3	34.0			34.0
		36.4	27.9	38.6				
		5.3	10.7	15.1				
PRINCIPALS	2.	33	71	47	151			151
		21.9	47.0	31.1	44.7			44.7
		42.9	55.0	35.8				
		9.3	21.3	15.9				
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	16	22	34	72			72
		22.2	30.6	47.3	21.3			21.3
		20.8	17.1	25.3				
		4.7	4.5	10.1				
COLUMN TOTAL		77	129	132	338			338
		22.9	38.2	39.1	100.0			100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.28916 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0359
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 201



TABLE 24

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR020

VAR007	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR020				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND ING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
PRIV-UNDER 500	5.	6	17	3	0	26
		23.1	65.4	11.5	0.0	15.3
		15.4	17.2	11.1	0.0	
		3.5	10.3	1.8	0.0	
PRIV-400-1000	5.	7	44	8	3	62
		11.3	71.0	12.9	4.8	36.5
		17.9	44.4	29.6	60.0	
		4.1	25.9	4.7	1.8	
PRIV-1000-2000	7.	16	31	10	1	58
		27.6	53.4	17.2	1.7	34.1
		41.0	31.3	37.0	20.0	
		9.4	18.2	5.9	0.6	
PRIV-OVER 2000	8.	10	7	6	1	24
		41.7	29.2	25.0	4.2	14.1
		25.4	7.1	22.2	20.0	
		5.9	4.1	3.5	0.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		19	99	27	5	170
		22.9	58.2	15.9	2.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.46460 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0419
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 25

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR038

VAR007	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR038				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND ING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
PRIV-UNDER 500	5.	0	15	11	0	26
		0.0	57.7	42.3	0.0	15.1
		0.0	16.1	22.0	0.0	
		0.0	8.7	6.4	0.0	
PRIV-400-1000	6.	6	30	23	4	63
		9.5	47.6	36.5	6.3	36.6
		25.0	32.1	46.0	80.0	
		3.5	17.4	13.4	2.3	
PRIV-1000-2000	7.	10	35	12	1	58
		16.9	61.0	29.3	1.7	34.3
		41.7	38.7	24.0	20.0	
		5.8	20.9	7.0	0.6	
PRIV-OVER 2000	8.	8	12	4	0	24
		33.3	50.0	15.7	0.0	14.0
		33.3	12.9	8.0	0.0	
		4.7	7.0	2.3	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		24	93	50	5	172
		14.0	54.1	29.1	2.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 22.40445 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0077
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 26

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR040

VAR007	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR040				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND ING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
PRIV-UNDER 500	5.	0	15	9	2	26
		0.0	57.7	34.6	7.7	15.2
		0.0	17.9	17.3	28.6	
		3.0	8.3	5.3	1.2	
PRIV-400-1000	6.	7	27	25	4	63
		11.1	42.9	29.7	6.3	36.8
		25.0	32.1	43.1	57.1	
		4.1	15.9	14.6	2.3	
PRIV-1000-2000	7.	14	30	13	1	58
		24.1	51.7	22.4	1.7	33.9
		37.9	35.7	25.0	14.3	
		9.2	17.5	7.6	0.6	
PRIV-OVER 2000	8.	7	12	5	0	24
		29.2	50.0	20.8	0.0	14.0
		25.0	14.3	9.6	0.0	
		4.1	7.0	2.9	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		24	84	52	7	171
		16.4	49.1	30.4	4.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.39183 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0341
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 27

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR038

VAR005	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR038				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND ING	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
PUBLIC	1.	29	111	59	3	192
		15.1	57.8	25.5	1.6	94.6
		103.0	97.4	89.1	60.0	
		14.3	54.7	24.1	2.5	
NON-PUBLIC	2.	0	3	6	8	17
		0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	5.4
		0.0	2.6	10.9	40.0	
		0.0	1.5	3.0	1.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		29	114	55	5	203
		14.3	56.2	27.1	2.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.29105 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0034
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 28

VAR005	CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL				ROW TOTAL	BY VAR040	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR040					
		OUTSTAND 1.1	GOOD 2.1	FAIR 3.1			POOR 4.1
PUBLIC	1.	33 17.3 100.0 16.3	104 54.9 99.0 51.5	50 26.2 87.7 24.8	4 2.1 67.1 2.0	191 94.6	
NON-PUBLIC	2.	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 0.5 1.3 0.5	7 3.6 12.3 3.5	3 1.5 42.9 1.5	11 5.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	33 16.3	105 52.0	57 28.2	7 3.5	202 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 30.21703 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 29

VAR005	CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL				ROW TOTAL	BY VAR020	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR020					
		OUTSTAND 1.1	GOOD 2.1	FAIR 3.1			POOR 4.1
PUBLIC	1.	37 19.5 86.0 18.4	112 58.4 99.7 55.7	35 18.4 49.7 17.4	6 3.2 100.0 3.0	190 94.5	
NON-PUBLIC	2.	6 3.0 14.0 3.0	5 2.5 4.3 2.5	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	11 5.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	43 21.4	117 58.2	35 17.4	6 3.0	201 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 8.7741 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0334
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 30

VAR005	CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL				ROW TOTAL	BY VAR034	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR034					
		OUTSTAND 1.1	GOOD 2.1	FAIR 3.1			POOR 4.1
PUBLIC	1.	4 2.1 66.7 2.0	108 56.8 95.8 53.7	66 34.7 94.3 32.9	12 6.3 100.0 6.0	190 94.5	
NON-PUBLIC	2.	2 1.0 33.3 1.0	5 2.5 4.4 2.5	4 2.0 5.7 2.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	11 5.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	6 3.0	113 56.2	70 34.6	12 6.0	201 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 9.94534 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0190
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 31

VAR001	CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE				ROW TOTAL	BY VAR019	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR019					
		OUTSTAND 1.1	GOOD 2.1	FAIR 3.1			POOR 4.1
STATE	1.	7 17.9 13.5 4.5	20 51.3 24.4 12.9	13 25.5 37.7 5.5	2 5.1 22.2 1.3	39 25.2	
LOCAL	2.	45 43.3 36.5 25.0	42 40.4 62.7 27.1	11 10.6 49.7 7.1	6 5.8 36.7 3.9	104 67.1	
NON-PUBLIC	3.	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	5 41.7 7.5 3.2	5 50.0 22.2 3.9	1 9.5 11.1 0.6	12 7.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	52 33.5	87 43.2	27 17.4	9 5.4	155 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 22.35492 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0010
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

TABLE 32

YEARS BY VAR039

YEARS	VAR039				ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR		POOR
		PERCENT	PERCENT	PERCENT		PERCENT
0-3	1	1	20	12	0	33
		3.0	60.6	36.4	0.0	25.2
		3.0	25.6	41.4	0.0	
		3.0	15.3	9.2	0.0	
4-6	2	5	25	7	1	34
		3.9	67.6	20.6	2.9	26.0
		13.6	29.5	24.1	50.0	
		4.3	17.5	5.3	0.8	
OVER 6	3	17	35	10	1	64
		21.1	54.7	15.6	1.6	48.9
		31.5	44.9	34.5	50.0	
		13.7	25.7	7.3	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		27	73	29	2	131
		16.8	59.5	22.1	1.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.76506 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0151
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 76

TABLE 33

YEARS BY VAR040

YEARS	VAR040				ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR		POOR
		PERCENT	PERCENT	PERCENT		PERCENT
0-3	1	3	16	12	1	32
		9.4	50.0	39.1	3.1	24.0
		11.1	21.3	10.5	33.3	
		2.3	12.3	9.2	0.8	
4-6	2	4	22	7	1	34
		11.8	64.7	20.6	2.9	26.2
		14.8	29.3	28.0	33.3	
		3.1	16.9	5.4	0.8	
OVER 6	3	20	37	6	1	64
		31.3	57.8	9.4	1.6	49.2
		74.1	49.5	24.0	35.3	
		15.4	28.5	4.5	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		27	75	25	3	130
		20.8	57.7	19.2	2.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.45565 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0115
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 77

TABLE 34

YEARS BY VAR039

YEARS	VAR039			ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
		PERCENT	PERCENT		PERCENT
0-3	1	21	8	2	31
		67.7	25.8	6.2	24.6
		17.4	53.3	66.7	
		16.7	5.3	1.5	
4-6	2	24	6	1	31
		83.3	12.0	3.2	24.6
		27.4	26.7	32.5	
		25.3	3.2	0.3	
OVER 6	3	31	3	0	64
		95.3	4.7	0.0	50.8
		56.5	29.0	0.0	
		46.4	2.4	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		138	15	3	126
		92.7	11.9	2.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.50122 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0091
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 31

TABLE 35

YEARS BY VAR041

YEARS	VAR041			ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
		PERCENT	PERCENT		PERCENT
0-3	1	20	10	0	30
		66.7	33.3	0.0	25.8
		19.0	50.0	0.0	
		15.9	7.9	0.0	
4-6	2	26	5	1	32
		81.3	15.6	3.1	25.4
		24.0	25.0	100.0	
		20.5	4.0	0.3	
OVER 6	3	59	5	0	64
		92.2	7.8	0.0	50.8
		53.7	25.0	0.0	
		46.8	4.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		105	20	1	126
		83.3	15.9	0.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.63905 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0116
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 91

TABLE 36

YEARS		BY VAR027				ROW TOTAL
		VAR027				
		STRENGTH	NO EFFEC	WEAKENED		
		EMED	1.	2.	3.	
YEARS	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.		
0 - 3	1.	5 15.7 17.2 3.9	4 13.3 11.1 3.1	21 70.0 33.7 16.5	30 25.6	
4 - 6	2.	5 18.2 23.7 5.7	7 27.3 25.0 7.1	1 54.5 29.0 14.2	33 28.0	
OVER 6	3.	15 28.1 31.1 14.3	23 35.9 33.9 13.1	23 35.9 37.1 19.1	64 50.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	29 22.9	35 28.3	62 49.8	127 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 10.45039 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0385
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 80

TABLE 38

YEARS		BY VAR044				ROW TOTAL
		VAR044				
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
YEARS	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	12 7.9 58.7 8.0	53 34.9 67.1 26.5	37 27.5 77.0 28.5	30 19.7 93.9 35.0	152 76.0
NO	2.	2 1.2 14.3 1.0	26 54.2 32.9 13.0	17 35.4 25.0 9.1	3 6.3 9.1 1.5	48 24.0
	COLUMN TOTAL	14 7.0	79 39.5	74 37.0	33 19.5	200 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.22815 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0415
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 37

YEARS		BY VAR026				ROW TOTAL
		VAR026				
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
YEARS	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	12 7.9 50.0 8.0	67 57.2 74.4 43.5	37 26.3 39.1 18.5	16 10.5 94.1 8.0	152 76.0
NO	2.	12 25.0 50.0 6.0	30 52.5 29.8 15.0	5 10.9 11.9 2.5	1 2.1 5.6 0.5	48 24.0
	COLUMN TOTAL	24 12.0	117 58.5	42 21.3	17 8.5	230 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.49544 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 39

YEARS		BY VAR024				ROW TOTAL
		VAR024				
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	
YEARS	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	18 11.8 68.0 9.0	59 39.6 72.0 29.4	50 32.7 33.3 24.9	25 17.3 56.7 12.9	152 76.0
NO	2.	12 25.0 40.0 6.0	26 47.9 28.0 11.4	10 20.3 16.7 5.0	3 6.3 13.3 1.5	48 24.0
	COLUMN TOTAL	30 14.9	85 40.8	60 29.9	28 14.4	203 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.71256 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0212
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 40

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR034

		VAR034				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	3 2.0 53.0 1.5	79 51.6 65.9 37.3	60 39.2 25.7 29.9	11 7.2 91.7 5.5	153 76.1
NO	2.	3 5.3 53.0 1.5	34 70.8 30.1 16.9	13 30.3 14.3 5.3	1 2.1 8.3 0.5	48 23.9
COLUMN TOTAL		6 3.0	113 55.2	73 34.3	12 6.0	201 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.78337 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0205
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 41

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR020

		VAR020				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	24 15.7 55.5 11.9	90 58.3 76.9 44.8	33 21.6 54.3 16.4	6 3.9 100.0 3.0	153 76.1
NO	2.	19 39.6 44.2 9.5	27 56.3 23.1 13.4	2 4.2 5.7 1.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	48 23.9
COLUMN TOTAL		43 21.4	117 58.2	35 17.4	6 3.0	201 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.03145 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 42

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR022

		VAR022				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	19 12.4 61.3 4.5	82 53.6 73.2 40.8	37 24.2 08.1 18.4	15 9.8 93.8 7.5	153 76.1
NO	2.	12 25.0 36.7 5.3	30 52.5 25.6 14.5	5 10.4 11.9 2.5	1 2.1 5.3 0.5	48 23.9
COLUMN TOTAL		31 15.4	112 55.7	42 20.9	16 8.0	201 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.31964 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0160
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 43

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR030

		VAR030				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	10 6.6 62.5 9.0	89 58.0 71.8 44.2	43 29.8 35.3 22.5	8 5.3 100.0 4.0	152 76.0
NO	2.	6 12.5 37.5 3.0	35 72.9 25.2 17.5	7 14.6 12.5 3.5	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	48 24.0
COLUMN TOTAL		16 8.0	124 62.0	52 26.3	8 4.0	200 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.50515 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0367
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 44

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR052

		VAR052				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	7 4.7 57.3 3.5	99 64.3 72.9 53.2	37 24.7 46.9 18.7	7 4.7 100.0 3.5	150 75.8
NO	2.	7 14.5 53.3 3.5	9 72.9 29.1 17.7	6 12.5 14.0 3.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	48 24.2
COLUMN TOTAL		14 7.1	108 67.7	43 21.7	7 3.5	198 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.03325 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0183
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

TABLE 45

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR058

		VAR058				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	27 17.4 92.1 13.3	53 60.3 81.6 45.8	33 21.3 60.0 16.3	2 1.3 43.0 1.0	155 76.4
NO	2.	3 4.3 6.9 1.0	21 43.8 13.4 10.3	22 45.3 40.0 10.9	3 6.3 60.0 1.5	48 23.6
COLUMN TOTAL		30 14.3	114 56.2	55 27.1	5 2.5	203 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.03773 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

		VAR040				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	32 20.8 97.3 15.8	91 59.1 88.7 45.0	28 19.2 45.1 15.9	3 1.9 42.9 1.5	154 76.2
NO	2.	1 3.1 3.0 0.5	14 29.2 13.3 6.9	29 60.4 55.9 14.4	4 8.3 57.1 2.0	48 23.8
	COLUMN TOTAL	33 16.3	105 52.0	57 26.2	7 3.5	202 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 41.57198 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 48

		VAR040				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	17 14.8 39.5 12.6	72 62.6 92.3 53.3	20 17.4 71.4 14.9	6 5.3 50.3 4.4	115 85.2
NO	2.	2 10.0 10.5 1.5	6 30.0 7.7 4.4	3 40.0 28.6 5.9	4 20.0 40.0 3.0	20 14.8
	COLUMN TOTAL	19 14.1	78 57.5	23 20.7	10 7.4	135 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.65718 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0055
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 50

		VAR033				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR004	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	27 21.6 65.5 17.5	36 51.4 43.5 23.5	7 10.0 21.9 4.9	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	70 45.8
NO	2.	14 10.9 34.1 9.2	38 45.0 51.4 24.3	25 30.1 70.1 18.3	6 7.2 100.0 3.9	63 54.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	41 26.8	74 48.4	32 20.9	6 3.9	153 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.33601 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

		VAR038				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	14 12.2 93.3 10.4	84 73.0 92.3 52.2	15 13.4 59.3 11.9	1 0.9 50.3 3.7	115 85.2
NO	2.	1 5.0 6.7 0.7	7 35.0 7.7 5.2	11 55.0 40.7 8.1	1 5.0 50.0 0.7	20 14.8
	COLUMN TOTAL	15 11.1	91 67.4	27 20.0	2 1.5	135 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.78954 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 49

		VAR042				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	19 16.5 75.0 14.1	63 54.3 94.3 46.7	24 20.9 75.0 17.3	7 7.8 81.3 3.7	115 85.2
NO	2.	6 30.0 24.0 4.4	4 20.0 6.0 3.0	3 40.0 25.0 5.9	2 10.0 18.3 1.5	20 14.8
	COLUMN TOTAL	25 13.5	67 49.6	32 23.7	11 8.1	135 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.55370 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0359
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 51

		VAR037				ROW TOTAL
		OUTSTAND	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	
VAR004	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	1.	29 22.0 55.4 10.6	31 44.9 48.3 20.1	7 10.1 29.7 4.5	2 2.9 23.2 1.2	69 44.8
NO	2.	21 27.1 44.2 14.4	36 42.4 53.7 23.4	11 22.4 73.1 12.7	7 8.2 77.4 4.5	65 55.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	52 33.8	67 43.5	26 16.7	9 5.8	154 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.80353 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0503
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21



TABLE 52

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF BY VAR019

VAR004	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR019				ROW TOTAL
		1. OUTSTAND ING	2. GOOD	3. FAIR	4. POOR	
YES	1. 17 24.7 11.7 11.0	38 54.3 32.7 24.5	9 12.9 33.3 9.8	6 8.6 54.7 3.9	70 45.2	
NO	2. 55 41.2 37.3 25.6	29 41.1 43.3 33.7	17 24.3 56.7 11.5	3 4.3 33.3 1.9	85 54.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	52 23.5	67 43.4	26 17.4	9 5.8	155 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 10.03221 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0179
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20.

TABLE 53

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF BY VAR027

VAR004	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR027				ROW TOTAL
		1. OUTSTAND ING	2. GOOD	3. FAIR	4. POOR	
YES	1. 11 15.7 37.9 7.1	46 65.7 62.2 29.7	11 15.7 12.3 7.1	2 2.9 103.3 1.3	70 45.2	
NO	2. 18 21.2 62.1 11.6	63 90.9 57.8 40.6	4 5.7 26.7 2.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	65 41.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	29 19.7	109 70.3	15 9.7	2 1.3	155 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 8.25319 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0414
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

TABLE 54

POSTN BY VAR046

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR046				ROW TOTAL
		1. VERY IMP ORTANT	2. RELATIVE LY IMP.	3. NEUTRAL	4. RELATIVE LY UNIMP.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1. 121 85.8 31.9 24.1	10 12.8 16.1 3.6	2 1.4 25.0 0.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	141 28.0	
PRINCIPALS	2. 129 84.2 34.0 25.6	63 31.3 59.3 12.5	5 2.5 62.5 1.0	4 2.0 100.0 0.8	201 40.0	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3. 109 85.1 34.5 25.6	31 19.3 27.7 6.2	1 0.6 12.5 0.2	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	161 32.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	379 75.3	112 22.3	8 1.6	4 0.8	503 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 27.57171 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 55

POSTN BY VAR050

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR050				ROW TOTAL
		1. VERY IMP ORTANT	2. RELATIVE LY IMP.	3. NEUTRAL	4. RELATIVE LY UNIMP.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1. 100 70.4 39.4 19.9	38 26.8 18.7 7.5	4 2.9 11.8 5.4	0 0.0 3.0 0.0	142 28.3	
PRINCIPALS	2. 20 26.1 22.0 11.2	137 93.8 52.7 21.3	77 13.0 32.7 5.4	8 4.0 80.0 1.6	199 39.6	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3. 98 60.9 38.5 19.5	58 36.0 28.5 11.6	3 1.9 8.8 0.6	2 1.2 20.0 0.4	161 32.1	
COLUMN TOTAL	254 50.6	203 40.4	34 6.8	10 2.0	502 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 81.80316 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 56

PCSTA BY VAR054

POSTN	CCLNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR054					ROW TOTAL
		VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP.	NEUTRAL	RELATIVE LY UNIMP	UNIMP ORTANT	
		1.	2.	3.	4.		
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	116	24	2	0	142	
		31.7	18.4	1.4	0.0	28.3	
		35.4	18.4	5.4	0.0		
		23.1	4.8	0.0	0.0		
PRINCIPALS	2.	73	30	33	7	199	
		35.7	43.2	16.5	3.5	39.6	
		32.3	66.7	89.2	87.5		
		14.5	17.1	4.6	1.4		
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	129	19	2	1	161	
		66.3	11.8	1.2	0.6	32.1	
		42.4	14.7	5.4	12.5		
		27.7	3.8	0.4	3.2		
COLUMN TOTAL		323	129	37	8	502	
		65.5	25.7	7.4	1.6	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 127.6294 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 58

PCSTA BY VAR058

POSTN	CCLNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR058					ROW TOTAL
		VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP.	NEUTRAL	RELATIVE LY UNIMP	UNIMP ORTANT	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	79	53	9	0	141	
		45.4	37.6	6.4	0.0	28.1	
		42.9	28.9	26.5	0.0	0.0	
		15.7	17.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	
PRINCIPALS	2.	127	77	43	2	200	
		61.5	38.0	4.0	0.5	1.0	
		44.9	31.4	23.5	50.0	100.0	
		25.7	15.0	4.0	10.2	0.4	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	179	54	17	1	161	
		45.1	35.5	10.6	0.6	0.0	
		27.5	15.2	59.6	53.3	0.0	
		15.7	12.7	3.4	0.2	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		337	177	34	2	502	
		57.0	35.3	6.5	0.4	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 16.01122 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0422
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 57

PCSTA BY VAR060

POSTN	CCLNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR060					ROW TOTAL
		VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP.	NEUTRAL	RELATIVE LY UNIMP	UNIMP ORTANT	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	83	46	9	2	141	
		58.9	32.6	6.4	1.4	0.7	
		29.5	24.7	26.0	26.5	100.0	
		16.0	9.2	1.8	0.4	3.2	
PRINCIPALS	2.	79	100	15	4	198	
		39.9	50.5	7.6	2.0	0.0	
		26.1	50.8	60.0	57.1	0.0	
		15.2	24.0	5.0	0.8	0.0	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	114	46	1	1	161	
		72.0	24.8	0.6	0.6	0.0	
		42.5	21.5	4.0	14.5	5.8	
		25.8	8.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		261	186	24	7	500	
		50.2	37.2	5.0	1.4	0.2	

CHI SQUARE = 46.47976 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 39

TABLE 59

PCSTA BY VAR060

POSTN	CCLNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR060					ROW TOTAL
		VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP.	NEUTRAL	RELATIVE LY UNIMP	UNIMP ORTANT	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	64	65	12	0	141	
		45.4	46.1	8.5	0.0	0.0	
		26.2	33.0	36.4	0.0	0.0	
		12.8	19.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	
PRINCIPALS	2.	124	61	8	2	198	
		62.6	31.8	4.0	0.5	1.0	
		47.0	32.0	24.2	32.3	60.7	
		24.8	12.0	1.6	0.2	0.4	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	75	69	13	2	161	
		47.2	42.9	8.1	1.2	0.0	
		26.8	35.0	59.4	66.7	33.3	
		15.2	13.8	2.5	0.4	0.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		264	197	33	3	500	
		52.8	39.4	6.6	0.6	0.6	

CHI SQUARE = 17.69539 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0027
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 39

TABLE 60

PCSTN BY VAR064

POSTN	VAR064					ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP 2.	NEUTRAL 3.	RELATIVE LY UNIMP 4.		UNIMP ANT 5.
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	64	59	17	1	0	141
		45.4	41.8	12.1	0.7	0.0	28.1
		27.1	23.6	29.3	16.7	0.0	
PRINCIPALS	2.	117	59	10	1	3	209
		53.5	34.5	5.0	0.5	1.5	39.8
		49.6	34.7	17.2	16.7	100.0	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	55	71	31	4	0	161
		34.2	44.1	19.3	2.5	0.0	32.1
		23.3	35.7	53.4	66.7	0.0	
	11.0	14.1	6.2	0.8	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL	236	199	58	6	3	502	
	47.0	39.6	11.6	1.2	0.6	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 37.24029 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 61

PCSTN BY VAR048

POSTN	VAR048					ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP 2.	NEUTRAL 3.	RELATIVE LY UNIMP 4.		UNIMP ANT 5.
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	71	54	14	1	1	141
		50.4	38.3	9.9	0.7	0.7	20.1
		33.3	23.0	36.8	7.1	50.0	
PRINCIPALS	2.	105	82	8	4	1	200
		52.5	41.0	4.0	2.0	0.5	39.8
		49.3	34.9	21.1	28.6	50.0	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	37	60	16	9	0	161
		23.0	61.5	9.9	5.9	0.0	32.1
		17.4	42.1	42.1	64.3	0.0	
	7.4	19.7	3.2	1.6	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL	213	235	38	14	2	502	
	42.4	46.8	7.6	2.8	0.4	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 46.05051 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 62

PCSTN BY VAR052

POSTN	VAR052				ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP 2.	NEUTRAL 3.		RELATIVE LY UNIMP 4.
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	95	38	0	1	142
		66.9	26.9	5.6	0.7	28.3
		26.2	32.5	50.0	16.7	
PRINCIPALS	2.	135	53	6	4	198
		63.2	26.3	3.0	2.0	39.5
		37.3	45.3	37.5	66.7	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	26.9	10.6	1.2	0.3	32.1
		132	26	2	1	161
		82.9	16.1	1.2	0.6	32.1
	36.5	27.2	12.5	16.7		
	20.3	5.2	0.4	0.2		
COLUMN TOTAL	262	117	16	6	501	
	72.3	23.4	3.2	1.2	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 14.43069 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0215
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 38

TABLE 63

PCSTN BY VAR062

POSTN	VAR062					ROW TOTAL	
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP 2.	NEUTRAL 3.	RELATIVE LY UNIMP 4.		UNIMP ANT 5.
SUPERINTENDENTS	1.	47	78	13	3	0	141
		33.3	55.3	9.2	2.1	0.0	28.2
		25.8	29.7	25.5	42.9	0.0	
PRINCIPALS	2.	94	15.6	2.6	0.6	0.0	198
		62	108	20	4	4	39.8
		31.3	54.5	10.1	2.0	2.3	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3.	34.1	41.1	45.5	57.1	100.0	161
		22.4	21.6	4.0	0.8	0.8	32.1
		73	77	11	0	0	32.1
	45.3	47.8	6.8	0.0	0.0		
	43.1	29.3	25.0	0.3	0.3		
	14.6	15.4	2.2	0.0	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL	162	263	44	7	4	500	
	36.4	52.6	8.8	1.4	0.8	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 16.89518 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0312
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 39

TABLE 64

POSTN BY VAR047

POSTN	VAR047			ROW TOTAL	
	CCOUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
	RC PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.		3.
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	11	34	73	118	
	9.3	28.8	61.9	34.2	
	28.5	32.1	35.9		
PRINCIPALS 2.	13	56	87	156	
	8.3	35.9	55.8	45.2	
	31.7	52.8	43.9		
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3.	17	16	38	71	
	23.9	21.5	53.5	20.6	
	41.5	19.1	19.2		
COLUMNS TOTAL	41	106	198	345	
	11.9	30.7	57.4	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 14.71241 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0053

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 194

TABLE 65

POSTN BY VAR049

POSTN	VAR049			ROW TOTAL	
	CCOUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
	RC PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.		3.
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	5	57	56	118	
	4.2	46.2	47.5	34.4	
	31.3	29.4	42.1		
PRINCIPALS 2.	9	76	69	154	
	5.8	49.4	44.8	44.9	
	56.3	35.2	51.9		
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3.	2	61	8	71	
	2.5	25.9	11.3	20.7	
	12.5	31.4	6.0		
COLUMNS TOTAL	16	194	133	343	
	4.7	56.6	38.8	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 32.27271 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 196

TABLE 66

POSTN BY VAR053

POSTN	VAR053			ROW TOTAL	
	CCOUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
	RC PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.		3.
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	10	66	41	117	
	8.5	56.4	35.0	34.2	
	17.9	43.2	23.5		
PRINCIPALS 2.	35	72	47	154	
	22.7	46.8	30.5	45.0	
	62.5	43.9	38.5		
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3.	11	26	34	71	
	15.7	36.0	47.9	20.6	
	19.6	15.9	27.9		
COLUMNS TOTAL	56	164	122	342	
	16.4	48.0	35.7	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 16.32933 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0030

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 197

TABLE 67

POSTN BY VAR059

POSTN	VAR059			ROW TOTAL	
	CCOUNT	STRENGTH	NO EFFEC		WEAKENED
	RC PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.		3.
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	39	43	34	116	
	33.5	37.1	29.3	34.2	
	41.9	33.4	25.4		
PRINCIPALS 2.	40	55	57	152	
	26.3	36.2	37.5	44.8	
	43.0	49.1	42.5		
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3.	14	14	43	71	
	19.7	15.7	63.6	20.9	
	19.1	12.5	32.1		
COLUMNS TOTAL	93	112	134	339	
	27.4	33.0	39.5	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 19.23683 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0007

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 200

TABLE 68

POSTN BY VAR061

POSTN	VAR061			ROW TOTAL
	CCLNT ROW PCT	STRENGTH NO EFFEC WEAKENED		
	CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	14	73	30	117
	12.0	62.4	25.6	34.2
	25.2	35.3	34.5	
	4.1	21.3	8.8	
PRINCIPALS 2.	23	98	28	154
	18.2	67.6	18.2	45.0
	54.3	47.3	32.2	
	5.2	26.7	8.2	
J.C. PRESIDENTS 3.	6	36	29	71
	8.5	50.7	40.8	20.8
	12.5	17.4	33.3	
	1.6	10.5	8.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	46	207	87	342
	14.0	69.5	25.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.06109 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0045
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 197

TABLE 69

POSTN BY VAR063

POSTN	VAR063			ROW TOTAL
	CCLNT ROW PCT	STRENGTH NO EFFEC WEAKENED		
	CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	6	64	47	117
	5.1	54.7	40.2	34.3
	27.3	35.2	34.3	
	1.3	14.8	13.8	
PRINCIPALS 2.	12	97	45	154
	7.8	63.0	29.2	45.2
	54.5	53.3	32.8	
	3.5	28.4	13.2	
J.C. PRESIDENTS 3.	4	21	45	70
	5.7	30.0	64.3	20.5
	18.2	11.5	32.8	
	1.2	6.2	13.2	
COLUMN TOTAL	22	162	137	341
	6.5	53.4	43.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 25.40431 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 198

TABLE 70

POSTN BY VAR065

POSTN	VAR065			ROW TOTAL
	CCLNT ROW PCT	STRENGTH NO EFFEC WEAKENED		
	CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	19	57	42	118
	16.1	49.3	35.6	34.4
	43.4	35.8	30.7	
	5.5	16.6	12.2	
PRINCIPALS 2.	17	82	55	154
	11.0	53.2	35.7	44.9
	38.2	51.8	43.1	
	5.0	23.9	16.0	
J.C. PRESIDENTS 3.	11	23	40	71
	15.5	28.2	56.3	20.7
	23.4	12.6	29.2	
	3.2	5.8	11.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	47	159	137	343
	13.7	46.4	39.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.22595 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0056
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 198

TABLE 71

POSTN BY VAR051

POSTN	VAR051			ROW TOTAL
	CCLNT ROW PCT	STRENGTH NO EFFEC WEAKENED		
	CCL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1.	9	67	42	118
	7.6	56.8	35.6	34.4
	40.9	30.9	40.4	
	2.6	19.5	12.2	
PRINCIPALS 2.	5	109	40	154
	3.2	70.8	26.0	44.9
	22.7	50.2	35.5	
	1.5	31.8	11.7	
J.C. PRESIDENTS 3.	8	41	22	71
	11.3	57.7	31.0	20.7
	36.4	19.9	21.2	
	2.3	12.0	6.4	
COLUMN TOTAL	22	217	134	343
	6.4	63.3	39.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.83954 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0432
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 196

TABLE 72

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR064

VAR007	VAR064					ROW TOTAL
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP	NEUTRAL	RELATIVE LY UNIMP	
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
PRIN-UNDER 500	5. 32.0 3.3 7.7	16 64.0 25.4 9.5	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 4.0 100.0 0.5	25 14.8
PRIN-400-1000	6. 54.9 35.4 20.1	25 43.3 35.7 14.9	2 3.2 25.0 1.2	1 1.6 100.0 0.5	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	62 36.7
PRIN-1000-2000	7. 69.0 41.7 23.7	13 22.4 20.6 7.7	5 6.6 62.5 3.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	58 34.3
PRIN-OVER 2000	8. 53.3 14.5 8.3	9 37.5 14.3 5.3	1 4.1 17.5 0.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	24 14.2
COLUMN TOTAL	96 56.3	83 37.3	8 4.7	1 0.6	1 0.6	169 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.48517 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0239
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 74

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR052

VAR007	VAR052				ROW TOTAL
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP	NEUTRAL	
	1.	2.	3.	4.	
PRIN-UNDER 500	5. 14 55.0 12.4 3.3	10 40.0 20.4 6.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 4.0 100.0 0.5	25 14.9
PRIN-400-1000	6. 54.3 35.1 20.2	25 40.3 51.0 14.9	1 4.3 60.0 1.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	62 36.9
PRIN-1000-2000	7. 62.5 41.5 23.0	8 14.0 16.3 4.3	2 3.5 40.0 1.2	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	57 33.9
PRIN-OVER 2000	8. 75.0 15.9 10.7	6 25.0 12.2 3.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	24 14.3
COLUMN TOTAL	113 57.5	49 29.2	5 3.0	1 0.6	168 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.28838 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0162
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

TABLE 73

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR062

VAR007	VAR062					ROW TOTAL
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY IMP ORTANT	RELATIVE LY IMP	NEUTRAL	RELATIVE LY UNIMP	
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
PRIN-UNDER 500	5. 2 8.0 3.8 1.2	15 76.0 20.7 11.3	2 8.0 10.5 1.2	1 4.0 25.0 0.6	1 4.0 100.0 0.5	25 14.9
PRIN-400-1000	6. 15 24.2 25.8 0.9	38 58.1 39.1 21.4	3 12.3 42.3 4.9	3 4.8 75.0 1.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	62 36.9
PRIN-1000-2000	7. 27 46.6 51.9 18.1	25 43.1 27.2 14.9	6 10.3 31.5 3.5	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	58 34.3
PRIN-OVER 2000	8. 8 31.8 15.4 4.9	12 52.2 13.2 7.1	3 13.0 15.3 1.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	24 14.2
COLUMN TOTAL	52 31.0	92 54.8	19 11.3	4 2.4	1 0.6	168 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.47618 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0239
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

TABLE 75

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR063

VAR007	VAR063			ROW TOTAL
	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	STRENGTH IMPROVED	NO EFFEC WEAKENED	
	1.	2.	3.	
PRIN-UNDER 500	1. 0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 100.0 3.1 1.7	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 1.7
PRIN-400-5000	2. 2 3.1 40.0 1.7	52 63.4 81.3 45.2	29 31.1 53.9 24.3	82 71.3
PRIN-5000-15000	3. 1 2.0 0.9	8 36.1 12.5 7.0	12 57.1 26.1 10.4	21 18.3
PRIN-OVER 15000	4. 2 20.0 47.0 1.7	2 20.0 3.1 1.7	5 50.0 15.0 5.2	10 8.7
COLUMN TOTAL	5 4.3	85 55.7	46 40.0	115 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.50421 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0167
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 38

TABLE 76

VAR035 CONTROL DISTRICT OF SCHOOL BY VAR048

VAR035	VAR048					ROW TOTAL
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
PUBLIC	103 54.5 78.1 51.5	74 39.2 93.2 57.0	8 4.2 100.0 4.0	4 2.1 100.0 2.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	189 94.5
NON-PUBLIC	2 18.2 1.9 1.3	8 72.7 9.8 4.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 7.0 100.0 0.5	1 9.1 0.0 0.5	11 5.5
COLUMN TOTAL	105 52.5	82 41.0	8 4.0	4 2.0	1 0.5	200 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.34935 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 77

YEARS BY VAR058

YEARS	VAR058			ROW TOTAL
	1.	2.	3.	
0-3	1 6.3 25.0 1.5	3 50.0 42.1 12.3	7 43.8 16.7 10.8	16 24.6
4-6	2 0.0 0.0 0.0	8 44.4 42.1 12.3	10 55.5 23.8 15.4	18 27.7
OVER 6	3 9.7 75.0 4.6	2 9.7 15.2 4.6	25 30.5 39.5 39.5	31 47.7
COLUMN TOTAL	4 6.2	19 29.2	42 64.6	65 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.11399 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0165
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 110

TABLE 78

VAR004 COLL. REGARDING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF BY VAR059

VAR004	VAR059				ROW TOTAL
	1.	2.	3.	4.	
YES	31 44.7 56.4 19.4	30 43.5 42.4 13.3	7 10.1 22.5 6.4	1 1.4 25.0 0.6	69 43.1
NO	24 25.4 43.6 15.0	40 44.0 57.1 25.0	2 2.6 77.4 15.0	2 3.3 75.0 1.9	91 56.9
COLUMN TOTAL	55 34.4	70 45.8	9 19.4	3 2.5	160 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.89239 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0203
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 15

TABLE 79

POSTN BY VAR077

POSTN	VAR077			ROW TOTAL
	1.	2.	3.	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1 0.9 11.1 0.3	58 50.0 34.5 17.1	57 49.1 35.0 16.8	116 34.1
PRINCIPALS	2 5.3 88.9 2.4	79 52.0 47.0 23.2	65 42.8 35.9 19.1	152 44.7
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3 0.0 0.0 0.0	31 43.1 18.5 9.1	41 56.9 25.2 12.1	72 21.2
COLUMN TOTAL	9 2.6	168 49.4	163 47.5	340 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.13294 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0382
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 199

POSTN BY VAR110

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TCT PCT	VAR110		ROW TOTAL
		POSITIVE EFFECT	NO EFFEC TIAL EFFEC	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1	11.3 32.1 22.7	63.0 57.4 21.0	27 24.5 27.6 5.1	110 33.0
PRINCIPALS 2	23 19.2 50.0 6.9	63.0 48.4 25.3	37 24.5 37.6 11.1	151 45.3
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3	10 13.9 23.7 3.0	20.0 17.9 5.7	34 47.2 34.7 11.2	72 21.6
COLUMN TOTAL	45 13.3	189 56.6	98 29.4	333 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.71395 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 206
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0034

POSTN BY VAR131

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TCT PCT	VAR131		ROW TOTAL
		POSITIVE EFFECT	NO EFFEC TIAL EFFEC	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1	13 11.5 32.1 8.9	5 4.3 12.2 1.5	97 84.3 27.3 21.8	115 34.1
PRINCIPALS 2	20 17.2 53.6 5.9	27 17.9 65.9 8.0	104 88.9 40.0 33.9	151 44.8
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3	3 4.2 8.3 0.9	9 12.7 22.0 2.7	59 50.1 20.7 17.5	71 21.1
COLUMN TOTAL	36 10.7	41 12.2	263 77.2	337 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.02571 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 202
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.003

TABLE 82

TABLE 83

POSTN BY VAR137

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TCT PCT	VAR137		ROW TOTAL
		POSITIVE EFFECT	NO EFFEC TIAL EFFEC	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1	37 32.5 22.9 10.0	33 28.9 38.0 9.7	44 38.5 44.4 13.0	114 33.3
PRINCIPALS 2	71 60.7 43.3 27.1	45 39.1 47.7 13.6	30 26.5 30.3 9.8	153 45.1
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3	29 25.3 40.3 5.0	18 15.8 18.6 5.3	25 22.0 20.3 7.4	72 21.0
COLUMN TOTAL	137 42.8	97 26.6	99 28.2	339 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.43967 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 200
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0059

POSTN BY VAR134

POSTN	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TCT PCT	VAR134		ROW TOTAL
		POSITIVE EFFECT	NO EFFEC TIAL EFFEC	
SUPERINTENDENTS 1	26 23.3 27.2 7.7	20 17.7 22.6 3.9	67 59.3 44.4 19.6	113 33.4
PRINCIPALS 2	51 44.5 49.5 15.1	43 37.4 67.1 14.2	54 47.5 36.8 16.3	153 45.3
J.C.PRESIDENTS 3	26 22.2 25.2 7.7	18 15.8 19.0 4.7	30 26.5 19.9 9.9	72 21.0
COLUMN TOTAL	103 30.5	81 24.9	151 44.7	339 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.93620 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 201
 SIGNIFICANCE = 0.003

TABLE 84

POSTS BY VAR113

POSTS	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR113			ROW TOTAL
		POSITIVE EFFECT	NO EFPEC TAL	DETRIMEN TAL EFPEC	
SUPERINTENDENTS	1 7 6.3 27.9 2.1	28 25.0 21.2 3.4	77 68.8 43.9 29.0	112 35.4	
PRINCIPALS	2 11 7.1 43.7 3.5	79 70.0 35.2 18.3	62 40.8 35.2 18.3	152 45.4	
J.C. PRESIDENTS	3 9 12.7 33.3 2.7	25 35.2 15.4 7.5	37 52.1 21.0 11.0	71 21.2	
COLUMN TOTAL	27 8.1	132 39.4	176 52.5	335 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 24.36787 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 204

TABLE 85

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR084

VAR007	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR084					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLE	OCCASIONAL PROBS.	MINOR OR OBLEN	NOT A PR OBLEN	
PRIV-UNDER 500	5 3.8 6.3 0.6	0 0.0 0.0	7 3.0 0.0	7 11.7 4.1	5 19.2 3.0	19 69.2 10.7	26 15.4
PRIV-400-1000	6 5.0 19.8 1.8	7 11.7 29.2 4.1	11 18.2 40.7 6.5	7 11.7 29.2 4.1	7 11.7 29.2 4.1	32 53.3 41.0 12.9	60 35.5
PRIV-1000-2000	7 9 13.6 50.0 4.7	10 16.9 41.7 5.9	10 14.9 37.3 5.9	9 15.3 37.5 5.3	22 37.5 24.2 13.0	59 34.9	
PRIV-OVER 2000	8 4 15.7 25.0 2.4	7 11.7 29.2 4.1	6 10.0 14.2 2.4	3 12.5 12.5 1.3	6 25.0 7.7 3.6	24 14.2	
COLUMN TOTAL	16 9.5	24 14.2	27 16.0	24 14.2	78 46.2	169 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 21.75122 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0404
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 86

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR093

VAR007	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR093					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLE	OCCASIONAL PROBS.	MINOR OR OBLEN	NOT A PR OBLEN	
SUP-UNDER 400	1 0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 10.0 1.4	0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0	2 1.4
SUP-400-5000	2 17 16.7 75.0 19.1	40 38.1 31.5 25.2	29 27.5 47.4 20.9	11 11.4 83.2 8.5	7 6.7 100.0 4.9	105 73.9	
SUP-5000-15000	3 6 16.0 39.1 3.8	3 12.0 8.1 2.1	13 57.0 30.1 9.7	5 20.0 26.3 3.5	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	25 17.6	
SUP-OVER 15000	4 3 12.5 7.1	5 60.0 12.2 6.2	1 10.0 2.3 0.7	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	10 7.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	24 16.9	57 34.5	43 30.3	19 13.4	7 4.9	142 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 30.27315 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0025
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

TABLE 87

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR096

VAR007	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR096					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLE	OCCASIONAL PROBS.	MINOR OR OBLEN	NOT A PR OBLEN	
SUP-UNDER 400	1 0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 50.0 0.7	0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0	1 50.0 4.7	2 1.4
SUP-400-5000	2 27 26.0 75.0 19.1	35 33.7 76.1 24.3	25 24.0 57.6 17.7	15 14.4 83.3 10.6	2 1.9 50.0 1.9	104 73.8	
SUP-5000-15000	3 7 28.0 16.2 5.0	4 24.0 13.0 4.3	8 32.0 21.5 5.7	3 12.0 16.7 2.1	1 1.0 25.0 0.7	25 17.7	
SUP-OVER 15000	4 3 12.5 7.1	4 40.0 8.7 2.3	6 60.0 10.3 2.3	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	10 7.1	
COLUMN TOTAL	36 25.5	46 32.5	37 25.2	18 12.8	4 2.8	141 100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 21.55549 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0427
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 12

TABLE 88

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR108

VAR007	VAR108					ROW TOTAL
	VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASIONAL PROBLEMS	MINOR OR NO PROBLEMS	NOT A PROBLEM	
VAR007	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
SUP-UNDER 400	1	1	0	0	0	2
	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SUP-400-5000	2	29	24	20	15	105
	15.2	27.6	22.9	19.0	14.3	73.9
	51.8	70.7	43.0	90.9	83.3	
	12.0	20.4	15.9	14.1	13.5	
SUP-5000-15000	3	9	5	2	2	25
	24.0	30.0	24.0	8.0	8.0	17.6
	15.4	22.0	20.7	9.1	11.1	
	4.2	6.3	4.2	1.4	1.4	
SUP-OVER 15000	4	7	3	0	1	10
	70.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	7.0
	20.8	4.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	
	4.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	31	41	32	22	18	142
	21.8	28.9	21.1	15.5	12.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.37715 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0451
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

TABLE 90

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR085

VAR007	VAR085					ROW TOTAL
	BECOME MUCH MORE LIGHTLY	BECOME SLIGHTLY LIGHTLY	NO CHANGE	BECOME SLIGHTLY LIGHTLY	BECOME MUCH LESS	
VAR007	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
SUP-UNDER 400	0	0	2	0	0	2
	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	
	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	
SUP-400-5000	3	13	55	2	12	95
	14.4	18.0	57.7	2.1	12.6	72.5
	47.1	72.0	75.4	65.7	85.7	
	9.1	13.7	42.3	1.5	9.2	
SUP-5000-15000	5	7	14	4	2	24
	23.3	9.3	53.3	4.3	8.3	18.3
	22.4	6.0	19.4	33.3	14.3	
	3.3	1.5	10.7	1.5	1.5	
SUP-OVER 15000	5	5	1	0	0	10
	40.0	50.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.6
	23.0	20.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	
	3.1	4.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	13	25	72	3	16	131
	13.0	15.2	55.0	2.3	12.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 22.42775 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0332
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 89

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR084

VAR007	VAR084					ROW TOTAL
	VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASIONAL PROBLEMS	MINOR OR NO PROBLEMS	NOT A PROBLEM	
VAR007	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
SUP-UNDER 400	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	
	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	
SUP-400-5000	7	10	13	11	12	103
	5.8	9.7	12.0	10.7	10.0	74.1
	46.7	56.7	72.2	73.3	81.5	
	5.0	7.2	9.4	7.9	44.6	
SUP-5000-15000	3	5	0	3	14	25
	12.0	20.0	0.0	12.0	50.0	18.0
	20.3	33.3	0.0	20.3	18.4	
	2.2	3.5	0.0	3.2	10.1	
SUP-OVER 15000	5	0	0	1	0	10
	50.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	7.2
	22.3	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	
	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	15	15	13	15	76	135
	10.8	10.3	12.9	10.8	54.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 40.65743 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 14

TABLE 91

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR088

VAR007	VAR088					ROW TOTAL
	BECOME MUCH MORE LIGHTLY	BECOME SLIGHTLY LIGHTLY	NO CHANGE	BECOME SLIGHTLY LIGHTLY	BECOME MUCH LESS	
VAR007	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
SUP-UNDER 400	0	0	1	1	0	2
	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	1.5
	0.0	0.0	1.7	33.3	0.0	
	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.0	
SUP-400-5000	14	17	44	7	7	97
	14.4	18.1	63.4	2.1	7.0	72.4
	56.7	74.0	75.3	66.7	66.7	
	10.4	27.5	32.8	1.5	1.5	
SUP-5000-15000	4	0	11	3	2	24
	14.3	0.0	43.3	2.0	8.3	18.7
	13.0	0.0	20.3	0.0	0.0	
	3.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	
SUP-OVER 15000	3	4	1	0	0	10
	20.0	40.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	7.5
	14.3	6.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	
	2.2	3.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	21	21	60	3	10	115
	15.7	15.7	44.3	2.2	7.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 24.25065 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0039
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 19



TABLE 92

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR101

VAR007	VAR101				ROW TOTAL
	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	POSITIVE EFFECT	ND EFFECT	DETERMIN TAL EFEE	
	1.	2.	3.		
SUP-UNDER 400	1	0	0	0	1
	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SJP-400-5000	35	35	35	35	79
	11.4	44.3	44.3	44.3	71.2
	66.3	93.3	63.6		
	9.1	31.5	31.5		
SJP-5000-15000	4	5	12	12	21
	19.0	23.9	57.1		19.9
	23.5	11.7	21.8		
	3.6	4.5	10.3		
SUP-OVER 15000	3	2	8	8	10
	0.9	20.0	90.0		9.0
	3.3	4.9	14.5		
	9.0	1.8	7.2		
COLUMN TOTAL	44	42	55	111	
	12.6	37.3	49.5	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 14.33100 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0261
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 42

TABLE 93

VAR003 SIZE OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR092

VAR003	VAR092					ROW TOTAL
	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY CAT	IMPORT.	OCCASION MINOR PR	NOT PRSN	
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
UNDER 500	7	3	3	2	0	8
	37.5	13.6	13.6	25.0	0.0	5.0
	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.3	0.0	
500-1000	26	8	8	4	2	26
	34.6	40.9	22.2	15.4	7.7	16.4
	5.7	5.0	2.5	1.3	1.9	
1000-3000	3	9	9	8	18	50
	12.0	27.3	18.0	33.3	35.0	31.4
	3.8	5.7	5.7	5.0	11.3	
3000-5000	4	7	2	4	6	20
	5.0	19.4	10.0	20.0	30.0	12.6
	0.6	7.4	1.3	2.5	3.8	
OVER 5000	5	9	10	10	23	55
	5.5	16.4	18.2	19.2	41.8	34.6
	13.6	25.0	27.0	41.7	46.0	
	1.9	5.7	6.3	6.3	14.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	22	36	27	24	50	159
	13.8	22.5	17.0	15.1	31.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 31.56975 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0114
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 16

TABLE 94

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OF SCHOOL BY VAR120

VAR005	VAR120					ROW TOTAL
	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY CAT	IMPORTAN	OCCASION MINOR PR	NOT A PR	
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
PUBLIC	67	40	15	6	6	192
	33.8	34.9	20.8	8.3	3.1	94.5
	12.4	48.5	88.9	84.2	85.7	
	1.0	33.0	19.7	7.9	3.0	
NON-PUBLIC	1	5	3	1	1	11
	0.1	9.1	45.5	27.3	9.1	5.4
	1.6	1.5	11.1	15.8	14.3	
	0.5	0.5	2.5	1.5	0.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	68	45	19	7	7	203
	31.5	33.5	22.2	9.4	3.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.83136 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0187
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 95

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OF SCHOOL BY VAR111

VAR005	VAR111					ROW TOTAL
	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY CAT	IMPORTAN	OCCASION MINOR PR	NOT A PR	
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
PUBLIC	45	61	45	21	19	192
	23.4	31.8	23.4	11.0	9.9	94.6
	95.7	100.0	95.7	45.7	78.0	
	22.2	30.0	22.2	10.8	9.4	
NON-PUBLIC	2	0	2	0	6	11
	18.2	0.0	18.2	0.0	54.5	5.4
	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	24.0	
	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	47	61	47	21	25	203
	23.2	30.0	23.2	11.3	12.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.63634 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 96

VAF005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR001

VAR005	VAR001						ROW TOTAL
	COL 1	COL 2	COL 3	COL 4	COL 5	COL 6	
PUBLIC	45	90	39	10	9		193
	23.3	46.6	20.2	5.2	4.7		94.6
	93.7	93.6	86.7	90.9	90.0		
	22.1	44.1	19.1	4.9	4.4		
NON-PUBLIC	2	6	1	1	1		11
	16.2	9.1	5.5	9.1	9.1		5.4
	4.3	1.1	13.3	9.1	10.0		
	1.0	0.5	2.9	0.5	0.5		
COLUMN TOTAL	47	91	45	11	10		204
	23.0	44.6	22.1	5.4	4.9		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.66112 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0462
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 97

VAF005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR121

VAR005	VAR121						ROW TOTAL
	COL 1	COL 2	COL 3	COL 4	COL 5	COL 6	
PUBLIC	66	62	51	10	1		190
	34.7	32.6	26.8	5.3	0.5		95.0
	97.1	100.0	86.4	100.0	100.0		
	33.3	31.0	29.5	5.0	0.5		
NON-PUBLIC	2	0	8	0	0		10
	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0		5.0
	2.9	0.0	13.6	0.0	0.0		
	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL	68	62	59	10	1		200
	34.0	31.0	29.5	5.0	0.5		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.56682 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0089
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 98

VAF005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR112

VAR005	VAR112						ROW TOTAL
	COL 1	COL 2	COL 3	COL 4	COL 5	COL 6	
PUBLIC	68	65	52	2	1		188
	36.2	34.6	27.7	1.1	0.5		94.9
	97.1	100.0	86.1	64.7	100.0		
	34.3	32.8	26.3	1.0	0.5		
NON-PUBLIC	2	0	7	1	0		10
	20.0	0.0	70.0	10.0	0.0		5.1
	2.9	0.0	11.9	33.3	0.0		
	1.0	0.0	3.5	0.5	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL	70	65	59	3	1		198
	35.4	32.8	29.8	1.5	0.5		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.92951 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0048
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

TABLE 99

VAF005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR082

VAR005	VAR082						ROW TOTAL
	COL 1	COL 2	COL 3	COL 4	COL 5	COL 6	
PUBLIC	75	75	33	2	2		187
	40.1	40.1	17.6	1.1	1.1		94.9
	96.7	97.4	82.5	100.0	100.0		
	36.1	38.1	16.9	1.0	1.0		
NON-PUBLIC	1	2	7	0	0		10
	10.0	20.0	70.0	0.0	0.0		5.1
	1.3	2.5	17.5	0.0	0.0		
	0.5	1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL	76	77	40	2	2		197
	38.6	39.1	20.3	1.0	1.0		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.23940 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0027
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10



TABLE 100

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR093

VAR005	COLN PCW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY CRT TICAL PCT 1.	IMPRTN PROBLE 2.	OCCASION AL PRBLM 3.	MINOR OBLN 4.	PR NOT A PR BLEM 5.	ROW TOTAL
PUBLIC	1.	37 14.3 94.9	28 11.2 94.9	26 10.3 94.9	12 4.7 94.9	7 2.7 94.9	193 94.6
NON-PUBLIC	2.	10 3.9 1.0	27 10.5 1.5	3 1.1 1.5	27 10.5 1.5	2 0.7 1.0	11 5.4
COLUMN TOTAL		47 18.2	55 21.7	29 11.4	39 15.2	9 3.4	204 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.15093 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0429
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 101

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR096

VAR005	COLN PCW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY CRT TICAL PCT 1.	IMPRTN PROBLE 2.	OCCASION AL PRBLM 3.	MINOR OBLN 4.	PR NOT A PR BLEM 5.	ROW TOTAL
PUBLIC	1.	31 16.1 96.9	56 29.2 96.6	50 26.0 98.0	35 18.2 94.6	20 10.4 80.0	192 94.6
NON-PUBLIC	2.	9 4.1 3.1	2 1.0 3.4	1 0.5 2.0	2 1.0 5.6	5 2.5 20.0	11 5.4
COLUMN TOTAL		40 19.8	58 28.6	51 25.1	37 18.2	25 12.3	203 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.32899 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0151
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 102

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR095

VAR001	COLN PCW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY CRT TICAL PCT 1.	IMPRTN PROBLE 2.	OCCASION AL PRBLM 3.	MINOR OBLN 4.	PR NOT A PR BLEM 5.	ROW TOTAL
STATE	1.	6 15.6 1.0	12 30.8 4.9	5 12.7 3.1	15 38.5 10.6	8 20.5 5.0	39 24.1
LOCAL	2.	41 38.9 27.2	39 36.8 25.3	58 55.3 40.3	10 9.7 7.0	4 3.6 2.5	111 68.5
NON-PUBLIC	3.	3 0.0 0.0	3 0.0 0.0	3 0.0 0.0	3 0.0 0.0	4 3.3 2.5	12 7.4
COLUMN TOTAL		50 29.0	54 32.6	66 40.0	28 16.7	16 9.9	162 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 26.88334 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0003
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

TABLE 103

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR071

VAR001	COLN PCW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VERY CRT TICAL PCT 1.	IMPRTN PROBLE 2.	OCCASION AL PRBLM 3.	MINOR OBLN 4.	PR NOT A PR BLEM 5.	ROW TOTAL
STATE	1.	3 7.7 12.5	15 38.5 9.3	15 38.5 9.3	3 7.7 1.9	3 7.7 1.9	39 24.1
LOCAL	2.	20 18.0 83.3	44 39.6 68.8	33 34.2 70.4	5 4.5 50.0	4 3.6 43.0	111 68.5
NON-PUBLIC	3.	1 0.3 4.2	5 4.7 7.3	1 0.6 3.1	2 1.9 0.6	3 2.5 1.2	12 7.4
COLUMN TOTAL		24 14.8	64 39.5	54 33.3	10 6.2	10 6.2	162 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.06538 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0015
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

TABLE 104

TABLE 105

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR076

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR109

VAR001	VAR076				ROW TOTAL
	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	POSITIVE EFFECT 1.	NO EFFEC TAL 2.	DETRIMEN TAL 3.	
STATE	1.	5 45.5 41.7 7.1	3 27.3 13.0 4.3	3 27.3 8.6 4.3	11 15.7
LOCAL	2.	7 11.9 53.3 10.0	20 33.9 87.0 28.8	32 54.2 91.4 45.7	59 84.3
COLUMN TOTAL		12 17.1	23 32.9	35 50.0	70 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.57431 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0227

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 105

VAR001	VAR109				ROW TOTAL
	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	POSITIVE EFFECT 1.	NO EFFEC TAL 2.	DETRIMEN TAL 3.	
STATE	1.	4 33.3 53.0 5.6	4 33.3 15.4 5.6	4 33.3 10.5 5.5	12 16.7
LOCAL	2.	4 6.7 50.0 5.6	22 36.7 84.6 30.6	34 55.7 99.5 47.2	60 82.3
COLUMN TOTAL		8 11.1	26 36.1	38 52.3	72 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.46235 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0240

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 103

TABLE 106

TABLE 107

YEARS BY VAR082

YEARS BY VAR083

YEARS	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR082				ROW TOTAL
		BECOME 4 JCH MORE 1.	BECOME 5 LIGHTLY 2.	NO CHANG E 3.	BECOM SL IGHLY L 4.	
0 - 3	1.	13 44.8 23.5 10.2	15 51.7 23.8 11.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 3.4 100.0 0.8	29 22.8
4 - 6	2.	16 47.1 32.7 12.6	15 44.1 26.8 11.8	3 8.8 14.3 2.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	34 26.8
OVER 6	3.	20 33.3 49.8 19.7	20 49.5 46.4 20.5	13 29.1 85.7 14.2	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	64 50.4
COLUMN TOTAL		49 38.6	56 44.1	21 16.5	1 0.8	127 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.97191 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0094

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 80

YEARS	COUNT FOR PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR083				ROW TOTAL
		POSITIVE EFFECT 1.	NO EFFEC TAL 2.	DETRIMEN TAL 3.		
0 - 3	1.	5 15.1 41.7 3.9	3 9.7 8.6 2.4	23 74.2 28.3 18.1		31 24.4
4 - 6	2.	2 6.1 16.7 1.6	8 24.2 22.9 6.5	23 69.7 28.3 18.1		33 26.0
OVER 6	3.	5 7.9 41.7 3.9	24 38.1 68.5 18.9	34 54.7 42.5 26.3		63 49.6
COLUMN TOTAL		12 9.4	35 27.6	80 63.0		127 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.95110 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0413

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 80

TABLE 108

YEARS		BY VAR087						
		VAR087						
YEARS		VERY CRITICAL	CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASIONAL PROBLEMS	MINOR PROBLEMS	NOT A PROBLEM	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
0 - 3	1.	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	4 22.2 12.9 3.7	8 44.4 18.6 7.4	6 33.3 30.0 5.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0		18 16.7
4 - 6	2.	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	7 28.0 22.6 6.5	8 32.0 18.6 7.4	5 20.0 25.0 4.6	5 20.0 83.3 4.6		25 23.1
OVER 6	3.	8 12.3 103.0 7.4	20 30.8 64.5 18.5	27 41.5 62.8 25.0	9 13.8 45.0 8.3	1 1.5 16.7 0.9		65 60.2
COLUMN TOTAL		8 7.4	31 28.7	43 39.8	20 18.5	6 5.6		108 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.39166 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0052
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 49

TABLE 109

YEARS		BY VAR072						
		VAR072						
YEARS		VERY CRITICAL	CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASIONAL PROBLEMS	MINOR PROBLEMS	NOT A PROBLEM	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
0 - 3	1.	1 5.6 3.0 0.9	11 61.1 24.4 10.0	3 16.7 13.6 2.7	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	3 16.7 00.0 2.7		18 16.4
4 - 6	2.	7 26.9 21.2 6.4	9 34.6 29.0 8.2	8 30.8 36.4 7.3	1 3.8 20.0 0.9	1 3.8 20.0 0.9		26 23.6
OVER 6	3.	25 37.9 75.8 22.7	25 37.9 55.6 22.7	11 16.7 50.0 10.0	4 6.1 80.0 3.6	1 1.5 20.0 0.9		66 60.0
COLUMN TOTAL		33 30.0	45 40.9	22 20.0	5 4.5	5 4.5		110 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.56184 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0248
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 47

TABLE 110

YEARS		BY VAR086						
		VAR086						
YEARS		VERY CRITICAL	CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASIONAL PROBLEMS	MINOR PROBLEMS	NOT A PROBLEM	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
0 - 3	1.	1 5.7 3.3 1.5	7 41.2 29.2 10.4	2 11.3 11.3 3.0	7 41.2 63.6 10.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0		17 25.4
4 - 6	2.	3 19.8 25.0 4.5	8 42.1 35.5 11.9	5 26.3 29.4 7.5	1 5.3 9.1 1.5	2 10.5 66.7 3.0		19 23.4
OVER 6	3.	3 25.3 64.7 11.6	9 29.3 7.5 13.4	10 32.3 58.8 14.9	3 9.7 27.3 4.5	1 3.2 31.3 1.5		31 46.3
COLUMN TOTAL		12 17.9	24 35.8	17 25.4	11 16.4	3 4.5		67 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.13825 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0404
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 108

TABLE 111

VAR008		BY VAR087						
		VAR087						
VAR008		VERY CRITICAL	CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASIONAL PROBLEMS	MINOR PROBLEMS	NOT A PROBLEM	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
YES	1.	12 7.9 83.0 6.0	58 38.4 87.9 26.9	56 37.1 69.1 27.9	18 11.9 66.7 4.0	7 4.6 59.3 3.5		151 75.1
NO	2.	3 6.0 20.0 1.5	8 16.0 12.1 4.0	25 50.0 30.9 12.4	9 18.0 33.3 4.5	5 10.0 41.7 2.5		50 24.9
COLUMN TOTAL		15 7.5	66 32.8	81 40.3	27 13.4	12 6.0		201 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.33646 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0352
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 112

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR102

VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR102					ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
		VERY TICAL	CRITICAL PR	IMPORTANT PROBLE AL	OCCASION AL PROB.	MINOR OBLEM	
YES	1.	25 15.9 78.1 12.3	52 34.0 90.0 25.5	41 26.8 87.2 20.2	17 11.1 60.7 3.4	18 11.8 58.1 8.9	153 75.4
NO	2.	7 4.0 21.9 3.4	13 26.0 20.0 6.4	6 12.0 12.8 3.0	11 22.0 39.3 5.4	13 26.0 41.9 6.6	50 24.6
COLUMN TOTAL		32 15.3	65 32.0	47 23.2	28 13.8	31 15.3	203 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.68577 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0129
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 113

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR093

VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR093					ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
		VERY TICAL	CRITICAL PR	IMPORTANT PROBLE AL	OCCASION AL PROB.	MINOR OBLEM	
YES	1.	36 21.5 98.3 17.6	59 38.5 73.3 28.9	34 22.2 66.7 16.7	20 13.1 80.0 9.8	4 2.6 44.4 2.0	153 75.0
NO	2.	3 5.9 7.7 1.5	21 41.2 28.3 10.3	17 33.3 33.3 8.5	5 9.8 29.0 2.5	5 9.8 55.3 2.5	51 25.0
COLUMN TOTAL		39 19.1	80 39.2	51 25.0	25 12.3	9 4.4	204 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.00113 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0113
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 114

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR108

VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR108					ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
		VERY TICAL	CRITICAL PR	IMPORTANT PROBLE AL	OCCASION AL PROB.	MINOR OBLEM	
YES	1.	35 23.0 85.4 17.3	46 30.3 74.2 22.5	32 21.1 83.0 15.9	12 7.9 50.0 5.9	27 17.8 77.1 13.4	152 75.2
NO	2.	6 12.0 14.0 3.0	16 32.0 29.4 3.4	9 16.0 20.0 4.3	12 24.0 50.0 5.9	8 16.0 22.9 4.0	50 24.8
COLUMN TOTAL		41 20.3	62 30.7	40 19.3	24 11.9	35 17.3	202 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.05689 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0259
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 115

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR126

VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR126					ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
		VERY TICAL	CRITICAL PR	IMPORTANT PROBLE AL	OCCASION AL PROB.	MINOR OBLEM	
YES	1.	23 15.0 63.5 11.5	55 35.9 79.7 27.3	41 26.3 70.7 23.1	23 15.0 76.7 11.3	11 7.2 52.7 5.4	153 75.0
NO	2.	3 5.9 11.5 1.5	14 27.5 20.3 6.9	17 33.3 24.3 9.3	7 13.7 23.3 3.4	10 19.6 47.8 4.9	51 25.0
COLUMN TOTAL		26 12.7	69 33.8	58 28.4	30 14.7	21 10.5	204 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.67355 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0462
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3



TABLE 116

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR111

		VAR111					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASION AL PROBS.	MINOR PROBS.	NOT A PROBLEM	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
YES	1.	39 25.7 31.0 19.2	47 30.9 77.0 23.2	39 25.0 80.9 18.7	11 9.9 65.2 7.4	13 8.6 52.0 6.4	152 74.9
	2.	9 15.7 17.0 5.9	14 27.5 23.0 5.9	9 17.6 19.1 4.4	8 15.7 34.8 3.9	12 23.5 48.0 5.9	51 25.1
	COLUMN TOTAL	47 23.2	61 30.6	47 23.2	23 11.3	25 12.3	203 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.70071 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0291
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 117

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR090

		VAR090					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASION AL PROBS.	MINOR PROBS.	NOT A PROBLEM	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
YES	1.	45 29.4 89.5 22.1	56 36.6 84.0 27.5	32 20.9 57.1 15.7	16 10.5 64.0 7.8	4 2.6 83.0 2.0	153 75.0
	2.	7 13.7 11.5 3.4	10 19.8 15.2 4.9	24 47.1 42.9 11.8	9 17.6 36.0 4.4	1 2.0 20.0 0.5	51 25.0
	COLUMN TOTAL	52 25.5	66 32.4	56 27.5	25 12.3	5 2.5	204 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.31023 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0011
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 118

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR096

		VAR096					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASION AL PROBS.	MINOR PROBS.	NOT A PROBLEM	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
YES	1.	28 13.4 87.5 13.8	49 22.2 34.5 24.1	33 25.0 74.5 18.7	27 17.8 73.0 12.3	10 6.8 40.0 4.9	152 74.9
	2.	4 7.8 12.5 2.0	9 17.6 15.5 4.4	13 25.5 25.5 6.4	10 19.6 27.0 4.9	15 29.4 80.0 7.4	51 25.1
	COLUMN TOTAL	32 15.3	58 28.6	51 25.1	37 18.2	25 12.3	203 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.79617 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 119

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR081

		VAR081					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRITICAL	IMPORTANT PROBLEMS	OCCASION AL PROBS.	MINOR PROBS.	NOT A PROBLEM	
VAR008	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
YES	1.	37 24.2 78.7 18.1	75 49.0 82.4 36.9	27 17.6 60.0 13.2	8 5.2 43.0 3.9	6 3.9 60.0 2.9	153 75.0
	2.	10 19.6 11.5 4.9	16 31.4 17.6 7.8	19 35.3 43.0 8.9	3 5.9 27.3 1.5	4 7.8 40.0 2.0	51 25.0
	COLUMN TOTAL	47 23.0	91 44.6	45 22.1	11 5.4	10 4.9	204 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.64815 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0468
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

		VAR091					ROW TOTAL	
COUNT	ROW PCT	BECOME M	BECOME S	NO CHANG	BECOM SL	BECOME M		
		UCH MORE	LIGHTLY	E	IGHTLY L	UCH LESS		
TOT PCT	TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
VAR008	YES	1.	46	66	29	9	2	152
			30.3	43.4	19.1	5.9	1.3	76.4
			35.2	83.5	58.7	75.0	66.7	
		20.1	33.2	14.6	4.5	1.0		
NO	2.	3	13	22	3	1	47	
			17.3	27.7	46.8	6.4	2.1	23.6
			14.8	16.5	43.1	25.0	33.3	
		4.0	6.5	11.1	1.5	0.5		
COLUMN TOTAL		54	79	51	12	3	199	
		27.1	39.7	25.6	6.0	1.5	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 14.50693 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0038
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

TABLE 122

		VAR097					ROW TOTAL	
COUNT	ROW PCT	BECOME M	BECOME S	NO CHANG	BECOM SL	BECOME M		
		UCH MORE	LIGHTLY	E	IGHTLY L	UCH LESS		
TOT PCT	TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
VAR008	YES	1.	50	63	30	3	2	149
			35.9	42.6	23.2	2.3	1.4	76.3
			80.6	94.0	65.2	50.0	43.0	
		29.5	32.5	15.3	1.5	1.0		
NO	2.	12	12	13	3	3	46	
			25.1	26.1	34.3	5.5	6.5	23.7
			14.4	16.0	34.3	50.0	67.0	
		6.2	6.2	8.2	1.5	1.5		
COLUMN TOTAL		62	75	46	6	5	194	
		32.0	38.7	23.7	3.1	2.6	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 12.16525 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0162
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

TABLE 123

		VAR082					ROW TOTAL	
COUNT	ROW PCT	BECOME M	BECOME S	NO CHANG	BECOM SL	BECOME M		
		UCH MORE	LIGHTLY	E	IGHTLY L	UCH LESS		
TOT PCT	TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
VAR008	YES	1.	60	65	23	1	1	150
			40.0	43.3	15.3	0.7	0.7	76.1
			73.9	84.4	57.5	50.0	50.0	
		33.5	33.0	11.7	0.5	0.5		
NO	2.	14	12	17	1	1	47	
			34.0	25.5	36.2	2.1	2.1	23.9
			21.1	15.6	42.5	50.0	50.0	
		8.1	5.1	8.5	0.5	0.5		
COLUMN TOTAL		76	77	40	2	2	197	
		38.6	39.1	20.3	1.0	1.0	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 12.35778 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0147
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

TABLE 124

		VAR115					ROW TOTAL	
COUNT	ROW PCT	BECOME M	BECOME S	NO CHANG	BECOM SL	BECOME M		
		UCH MORE	LIGHTLY	E	IGHTLY L	UCH LESS		
TOT PCT	TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
VAR008	YES	1.	23	60	61	3	2	149
			15.4	40.3	40.9	2.0	1.3	76.0
			92.0	84.5	67.0	50.0	66.7	
		11.7	30.6	31.1	1.5	1.0		
NO	2.	2	11	30	3	1	47	
			4.3	23.4	63.8	6.4	2.1	24.0
			8.0	15.5	33.0	50.0	33.3	
		1.0	5.6	15.3	1.5	0.5		
COLUMN TOTAL		25	71	91	6	3	196	
		12.8	36.2	46.4	3.1	1.5	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 12.71167 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0128
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

TABLE 125

		VAR100					ROW TOTAL	
COUNT	ROW PCT	BECOME M	BECOME S	NO CHANG	BECOM SL	BECOME M		
		UCH MORE	LIGHTLY	E	IGHTLY L	UCH LESS		
TOT PCT	TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
VAR008	YES	1.	47	76	24	1	2	150
			31.3	50.7	16.0	0.7	1.5	76.1
			73.3	81.7	61.5	33.3	100.0	
		23.9	38.6	12.2	0.5	1.0		
NO	2.	13	17	15	2	0	47	
			27.7	36.2	31.3	4.3	0.0	23.9
			21.7	18.5	38.5	66.7	0.0	
		8.6	8.5	7.5	1.0	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL		60	93	39	3	2	197	
		30.5	47.2	19.8	1.5	1.0	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 9.98331 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0407
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

		VAR086					ROW TOTAL	
COUNT	ROW PCT	EVERY CAT	IMPOR.	OCCASION	MINOR PR	NOT FROM		
		TCL PROBL	PROBL	AL FROM	OBLEM	Y PROBL		
TOT PCT	TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.		
VAR004	YES	1.	12	26	13	11	4	71
			16.9	26.6	25.4	15.3	5.5	43.9
			73.6	44.1	47.4	37.9	21.1	
		7.4	16.0	11.1	6.4	2.5		
NO	2.	5	33	23	14	15	91	
			5.5	36.3	22.0	14.8	16.5	56.2
			29.4	55.9	52.6	62.1	75.9	
		3.1	20.4	12.3	11.1	9.3		
COLUMN TOTAL		17	59	36	25	19	162	
		10.5	36.4	23.5	17.9	11.7	100.0	

CHI SQUARE = 9.55266 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0467
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13



TABLE 126

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAF BY VAR074
 * * * * *

VAR004	COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	VAR074					ROW TOTAL
		VERY CRT ICL PRCL	IMPORT. PROBLM	OCCASION AL PROBLM	MINOR PR JBLM	NOT PRSN T PROBLM	
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
YES	1.	16 22.9 76.2 10.0	26 37.1 40.0 16.3	23 32.9 41.3 14.4	2 2.9 18.2 1.3	3 4.3 37.5 1.9	70 43.8
NO	2.	5 5.6 23.8 1.1	39 43.3 60.0 24.4	32 35.6 58.2 20.0	9 10.0 81.8 5.6	5 5.6 62.5 3.1	90 56.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	21 13.1	65 40.6	55 34.4	11 6.9	8 5.0	160 100.0

CHI-SQUARE = 12.48424 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0141
 NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 15