

Negotiations and NEA vs.

ALTHOUGH negotiations between employees and employers became a common phenomenon during the early 20th century, it was not until 1946, in Norwalk, Connecticut, that the first contract between teachers and a school board took effect.

The negotiation of individual items of a contract apparently follows an evolutionary process. Charles Perry and Wesley Wildman¹ divided the evolution of negotiated items, after the salary issue, into three main stages. The first stage, after the salary issue, is to increase the power of the teacher organization in relation to the school board and any rival organizations. The second stage includes demands which relate to work for which teachers receive their basic salary. The final set of issues relates to the establishment of policies.

Leslee Bishop predicted, "Once wages, hours, benefits, and rights are established, curriculum and instruction will become the next logical area in which to move."²

Studies conducted in the past several years indicate that curriculum and instruction components are included in teacher contracts. The National Education Association Research Division examined 398 comprehensive agreements, in effect for the

1966-67 school year.³ The 10 most frequently included curriculum and instruction components in these contracts were: (a) transfers; (b) school calendar or year; (c) teaching assignment in subject areas; (d) procedure for teacher evaluation; (e) pupil ratio and class size; (f) duty-free periods for planning, etc.; (g) teaching hours or day; (h) instructional aids which are available for the teachers' use in the development planning and teaching in the classroom; (i) educational conference leave; and (j) selection and distribution of textbooks.

In 1967, J. Edward Andrews⁴ conducted a study of 40 contracts with the purpose of collecting information about the content of negotiated agreements. From this study it was concluded that AFT affiliates negotiated somewhat more comprehensive and specific contracts than did affiliates of the NEA. However, when items which affect curriculum and instruction were considered, Edwards found only limited reference to these items in affiliate contracts of both national teacher organizations. When the items were included, both NEA and AFT contracts contained similar provisions.

In 1970, the NEA Research Bureau⁵ pub-

³ National Education Association. "What's Negotiable." *NEA Research Bulletin* 46 (2): 42; May 1968.

⁴ J. Edward Andrews, Jr. "What Are the Issues?" *Educational Leadership* 26 (6): 536; March 1969.

⁵ National Education Association. "Curriculum Review in Negotiation Agreements." *NEA Research Bulletin* 48 (4): 106; December 1970.

¹ Charles R. Perry and Wesley A. Wildman. *The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education: The Evidence from the Schools*. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970. p. 129.

² Leslee J. Bishop. *Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction: Questions and Concerns*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967. p. 4.

Curriculum: AFT

RUSSELL H. ZIEMER*
A. GRAY THOMPSON

lished a review of NEA affiliate contracts in effect during the 1968-69 school year. The study concluded that many of the contracts included some provision for teacher participation in curriculum decisions. The major emphasis of the 1968-69 contracts was on teacher involvement in curriculum decisions through the establishment of curriculum councils or committees rather than the inclusion of specific curriculum content.

A recent investigation into the role of curriculum and instruction in negotiated contracts involved the analysis of contracts from 14 affiliates of the American Federation of Teachers and 14 affiliates of the National Education Association.⁶ The questions asked were: (a) To what extent do selected NEA and AFT affiliate contracts contain curriculum and instruction components? (b) How does the leadership rate the curriculum and instruction components in terms of their importance in negotiations? (c) What are the differences or similarities in emphasis of the curriculum-instruction components between the NEA and AFT contracts? and (d) What are the differences or similarities in emphasis of the curriculum and instruction components between the leadership of NEA and AFT affiliates?

In early 1972, contracts were submitted for analysis by 14 large city or county

⁶ Russell H. Ziemer. "An Identification and Analysis of Curriculum-Instruction Components Negotiated by Selected Affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, 1972.

affiliates of the National Education Association and by 14 large city affiliates of the American Federation of Teachers.

The basis for the analysis of the contracts was 96 curriculum and instruction components identified from the writings of Doll, Saylor, Taba, and Young. Table 1 summarizes data indicating the extent to which NEA and AFT contracts contain curriculum-instruction components.

This table indicates: (a) more of the curriculum and instruction components were included in all or at least half of the AFT affiliate contracts than were included in all or half of the NEA contracts; (b) the NEA affiliate contracts excluded more of the 96 curriculum and instruction components than did the AFT affiliate contracts; and (c) the 14 contracts of AFT affiliates included more curriculum and instruction components than did the 14 NEA affiliate contracts.

To determine which components were considered most important in negotiations by the affiliates, the leadership was asked to rate each component as being of either primary or secondary importance in negotiation of a new contract with a school system. Table 2 summarizes the ratings of the components by the leadership.

This table indicates: (a) the AFT

* Russell H. Ziemer, Curriculum Coordinator, Steuben Junior High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and A. Gray Thompson, Director of Teacher Education, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

	NEA	AFT
Number of components referred to in all 14 contracts	0	2
Number of components referred to in at least seven contracts	22	31
Number of components not referred to in any of the 14 contracts	23	15
Total number of references made to the components in the 14 contracts	361	471

Table 1. Curriculum-Instruction Components in NEA and AFT Contracts

affiliate leadership rated a majority of the components as being of primary importance in negotiations while the NEA affiliate leadership rated a majority of the components as being of secondary importance in negotiations; (b) the NEA affiliate leadership rated 95 of the 96 components as being of some importance in negotiations while the AFT affiliate leadership rated 93 of the components as being of some importance. The AFT affiliate leadership rated components dealing with homework, course credit for students, and student grades as being irrelevant in negotiations, while the NEA affiliate leadership rated the component dealing with released time for students as being irrelevant in negotiations.

The 96 components were grouped into 18 clusters of related items to determine which types of curriculum and instruction components were most frequently included in contracts and most frequently selected by the affiliate leadership as being of primary importance in negotiations. A comparison was made of the number of times curriculum and instruction components were referred to in each cluster. The results of this comparison were placed in rank order. The "working condition" components are of the greatest importance in the NEA and AFT contracts, while "teaching procedure" components are ranked as virtually least in importance for both contracts and leadership.

An analysis of the columns in Table 3 shows the relative relationship between the various clusters within the NEA and AFT contracts or leadership while an analysis of the four ratings for each cluster permits comparison of ratings between the contracts and leadership. For example, working condition components (such as nonteaching duties,

teaching assignments, and teacher supervision) are included most often in contracts of both organizations; and although the leadership gives this cluster a high rating, it is not as high as indicated by the analysis of the contracts. Racially oriented components (for example, multiethnic materials, pupil and faculty integration) have a higher rating by the leadership than is shown by the rate of inclusion in the contracts. Although the NEA leadership rates this cluster relatively high, in practice it is one of the clusters of components least often included in their contracts. There is greater agreement in ranking between the AFT contract rate of inclusion and the AFT leadership.

Use of the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient to determine what relationships exist between the rank ordering of the various columns shows that: (a) there is a high level of agreement in the emphasis given to the component clusters by the NEA and AFT affiliate contracts; (b) there is a moderately high level of agreement between the ratings of the NEA and AFT leadership; (c) there is a moderately high level of agreement between the AFT leadership ratings and AFT affiliate contracts; and (d) there is a moderate level of agreement between the NEA leadership ratings and NEA affiliate contracts.

Based on the facts that AFT affiliate contracts included a greater number of curriculum and instruction components and that AFT affiliate leadership rated a greater number of components as being of primary importance to negotiations, it can be concluded (at least for the contracts included in this study) that the affiliates of the American Federation of Teachers place a greater emphasis on the negotiation of items which affect the curriculum and instructional poli-

	NEA	AFT
Number of components rated as being of primary importance in negotiations	45	60
Number of components rated as being of secondary importance in negotiations	50	31
Number of components rated equally as being of primary or secondary importance	0	2
Number of components rated as being irrelevant in negotiations	1	3

Table 2. Ratings of Components by the Leadership

Curriculum-Instruction Cluster	Contract		Leadership	
	NEA	AFT	NEA	AFT
Additional personnel components	6	5	12	9
Class components	4.5	2	1	3
Community participation components	13.5	14	15	14
"Curriculum" components	13.5	12	10	7
Extra-class components	11	13	18	15.5
Faculty involvement components	9	9.5	2	4
Materials components	8	7	11	5
Professional improvement components	2	3	9	6
Racially oriented components	16	9.5	5	8
School goal components	15	18	8	15.5
School organization components	18	16	14	13
Special programs components	10	8	13	10
Student related components	12	11	16	17
Teacher meeting components	3	4	7	11
Teacher professional responsibility components	7	15	6	12
Teaching procedure components	17	17	17	18
Time components	4.5	6	4	1
Working condition components	1	1	3	2

Table 3. Relationship Between Clusters Within the NEA and AFT Contracts or Leadership

cies of a school system than do the affiliates of the National Education Association.

Although the purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the components were considered of importance in negotiations or were included in the examined contracts, it seems worthwhile to speculate on why the AFT affiliates place greater emphasis on curriculum-instruction components than do the NEA affiliates. A comparison of the types of communities represented by the two groups of 14 contracts and of the approaches the AFT and NEA originally took in negotiations may sup-

ply some clues for understanding the differences which were identified.

An examination of the types of communities represented by the NEA and AFT, as included in this study, reveals that the AFT affiliates are located in large cities which are highly industrialized and union oriented, while the NEA affiliates are located in smaller cities or suburban communities where the union movement may not be as strong. If curriculum-instruction is considered to be a segment of working conditions, the strong union influence in the AFT cities could explain the greater emphasis on curriculum-instruction components, since a union's goal is to control working conditions to as great a degree as possible.

A second factor which may account for the difference in emphasis of curriculum-instruction components is that the AFT had a union attitude and assistance from other unions in developing their early contracts, while the NEA affiliates negotiated in a manner designed to maintain their professional image. The union approach would encourage the inclusion of more items to have greater control of curriculum-instruction than would the professional approach.

Regardless of the causes, it is apparent that the area of curriculum and instruction is considered of importance in negotiations between teacher groups and school boards.

References

- J. Edward Andrews, Jr. "What Are the Issues?" *Educational Leadership* 26 (6): 535-38; March 1969.
- Leslee J. Bishop. *Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction: Questions and Concerns*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967.
- Ronald Doll. *Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making and Process*. Second Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.
- National Education Association. "What's Negotiable." *NEA Research Bulletin* 46 (2): 42-43; May 1968.
- National Education Association. "Curriculum Review in Negotiation Agreements." *NEA Research Bulletin* 48 (4): 106-108; December 1970.
- Charles R. Perry and Wesley A. Wildman. *The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education: The Evidence from the Schools*. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970.
- John G. Saylor and William M. Alexander. *Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1954.
- Hilda Taba. *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962.
- William F. Young. "Curriculum Negotiations: Present Status—Future Trends." *Educational Leadership* 26 (4): 341-43; January 1969.
- Russell H. Ziemer. "An Identification and Analysis of Curriculum-Instruction Components Negotiated by Selected Affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, 1972. □

Copyright © 1973 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.