



Building Support for Teachers' Unions: The Role of Values Framing

A FrameWorks Research Report
Prepared for The FrameWorks Institute
by
Adam F. Simon

June 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study uses an experimental survey design that attempts to identify a value that will inoculate against negative messages concerning teachers' unions and create a space for a constructive conversation about education reform that will, at the same time, promote positive views toward teachers' unions.

The empirical evidence indicates that the value of Pragmatism is the right value for teachers' unions to build their messaging around. Pragmatism prompts strong and statistically significant moves attitudes in a progressive direction on three scales of paramount importance to advocates, namely on attitudes toward teachers' unions, the scope of government and professional development. At the same time, basing messages on Pragmatism does not negatively impact the other important outcomes. The value of Pragmatism slightly boosts support for K through 12 reforms and does not diminish support for higher education reform. Pragmatism also slightly shifts attitudes toward a more favorable emphasis on allocating resources to schools instead of individual factors on the resource prioritization measures. Of the six outcomes under study here, the value of Pragmatism has strong, positive outcomes on three; smaller but substantive outcomes on two and no negative outcomes on the last.

In contrast the other three values, Collaboration, Fairness Across Places and Future Preparation plus Common Good, tend not exert strong or statistically significant effects. Of the values tested here Collaboration proves to be particularly detrimental as a way to start conversations about education reform from the standpoint of teachers' unions. The effects of collaboration on the six outcome measures discussed above were never statistically significant. The estimates of the effects of Collaboration were often negatively signed, indicating that we would expect it to *reduce* support on the outcomes in question. Of the remaining values, only Fairness Across Places exerted a detectable effect on moving attitudes toward resource prioritization in a more systemic direction.

This evidence leads us to unambiguously conclude that Pragmatism fulfills are two goals and represents the best choice of values for advocates to use in their communications concerning teachers' unions and their relevance to education.

INTRODUCTION

FrameWorks has conducted ample research that examines the linkage between public discourse and support for education reform, investigating the ties among communication, citizens' attitudes and support for public policy proposals. This report continues FrameWorks' investigation into the dynamics of the education debate and other relevant issues as this discourse affects the public's attitudes as well as their support for particular policies. In particular, the experimental survey presented below, which was funded by the Ford Foundation, investigates attitudes toward teachers' unions and support for education reform. The overarching goal of this research is to identify the right value to begin a conversation about education reform from the unions' perspective.

As discussed below, values form the cornerstone of FrameWorks' approach to bolstering public conversations and enhancing support for attendant progressive public policies. Simply put, conversations that begin with the certain values encourage people to think about issues in a more open and systemic way, prompting them to hold particular attitudes and endorse related policies. Conversations that rely on other values inhibit public debate and lead to less desirable views. So by changing the fundamental value inherent in a message, you have the potential to reorient the entire conversation along with the attitudes that accompany that conversation.

In the case of teachers' unions, the right value will satisfy two interrelated goals. First, the value must preempt those who would vilify teachers' unions. Too often in contemporary public discourse, advocates who propose real education reform are stymied by responses that seek to blame teachers' unions for all the problems in the educational system¹. These responses, essentially reflexive derisions that scapegoat unions and their supporters, deflect attention away from the problems education reform must solve and reinforce the negative views toward teachers' unions held in some segments of the population².

Second, the right value will get proponents of teachers' unions back into the conversation about education reform. With rampant scapegoating, there is a diminished capacity for spokespeople associated with teachers' unions to deliver their message about education and related matters successfully. The idea here is to find a value that will elide snappish, accusatory responses while encouraging a more open-minded discourse. With this value in hand, teachers' unions can combat direct attacks on themselves while promoting the programs and policies that the unions endorse.

To accomplish this goal, this research will assess the impact of four values: Future Preparation plus Common Good, Pragmatism, Fairness Across Places and Collaboration

across a range of outcome measures. These outcome measures concentrate along two dimensions: support for teachers' unions and support for education reform. Here education reform includes four sets of policies: first items directed at higher education, second, items directed at K through 12, third items directed at teacher development and, finally, educational spending priorities. In short, our aim is to provide empirical evidence that one of these values will inoculate against negative messages concerning teachers' unions and create a space for a constructive conversation about education reform that will, at the same time, promote positive views toward teachers' unions.

METHODS

Values

Research by the FrameWorks Institute strongly suggests that the foundation for moving support for policy lies in improving issue understanding via framing. A critical part of this process is the application of the values that are inherent in all frames. Values serve as the organizing principles by which people evaluate social issues and reach decisions (Rokeach, 1973). The values contained within frames compete for use in any given situation (for a review see Nelson & Willey, 2003). When one frame with its one value "wins," people tap into accessible patterns of higher-level reasoning that guide subsequent responses. Thus, how social issues are aligned with specific values has a significant impact on how the public reasons about and evaluates both the causes of, and solutions to, social problems.

The study tested the effects of five values, including two versions of collaboration, against each other and a control condition in which participants were not exposed to any treatment. The exact wording of the values treatments used in this experimental survey appears in the appendix. Note two things. First the value frames were relatively short, at around ninety words. Second, the values frames differed from one another by three or four key phrases. This statement preceded the presentation of the value frame: "The following passage was taken from an editorial that appeared in a major newspaper." The four values and further rationales for their inclusion are:

Future preparation + common good

Future Preparation was the most successful value in education reform research cited above; this value emphasizes the need to train students in the skills the needed for success. The element of common good was added to emphasize the fact that we are all in this together and collectively share in the benefits education has to offer, together. As a value, Future Preparation + Common Good was also productive in our higher education

research, particularly as it reoriented people away from dominant consumerist cultural models about education and toward considerations of the importance of an educated citizenry³. Finally, during peer discourse sessions on Teachers' Unions, the Future Preparation with Common Good and Fairness Across Places values (more on the latter value, below) facilitated more productive discussions about teachers' unions and their role in education reform⁴.

Fairness across places

In our higher education work, the value of Fairness Across Places allowed people to see beyond a belief that individual motivation is the key determinant of college access and success⁵. In peer discourse sessions on Teachers Unions, Fairness Across Places encouraged conversations in which unions played a central role in addressing educational inequalities. Participants in these sessions were also able to discuss educational inequalities as systemic and in need of systemic solutions⁶.

Pragmatism

Pragmatism is a new value in the FrameWorks inventory. The inclusion of Pragmatism as a value stems from a realization that this value lurks deeply in the background of almost every value FrameWorks has successfully tested. For instance the values of Ingenuity and Responsible Management, which have played a successful role in fostering many conversations across issue areas⁷ both contain a strong dose of pragmatism entwined in their iterations. The value is also consonant with several successful simplifying models, remodeling, for instance⁸. This experiment offers the opportunity to pull this value out for direct testing. The idea here is to see if a treatment based upon a strong dose of “can-do-it-ness” and practical, evidence based approaches to public policy will foster productive attitudes toward teachers' unions. At the same time, this value is to be “purer,” that is uncontaminated by tinges of other values, like Ingenuity.

Collaboration

Collaboration represents the value that pervades existing communication from and about teachers' unions. For example, we found Collaboration is the value most used in National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers messaging, being used to connect the public to the importance of unions as a major contributor to education reform debates⁹. It also aligns well with the Orchestra simplifying model from the education work, which effectively explained the multiple players in the education system and expanded thinking beyond the tangible triad of parent-teacher-student. In addition, it is consonant with one of the simplifying models for teachers' unions going into further

testing – the “effectiveness web¹⁰.” Here, we assess the effectiveness of Collaboration to provide a benchmark for the other values being tested. After all, if none of the values we test proves more effective than those used already in discourse, there is no reason to change. To maximize the potential for Collaboration’s success—in other words to provide the strongest possible candidate for a benchmark—we tested two versions of Collaboration. The first version supplies a more generic version of Collaboration, one that has no specific quotes attributable to extant communication and so provides a more refined test of the value. The second version mimics the use of Collaboration in the messages we reviewed; this version essentially tests the status quo in messaging.

Outcomes

After reading the values treatment, the participants in this study were asked a series of questions that tapped into six aspects of their attitudes toward the education, teachers’ unions and the role of government in this area. The questions in each area (that is, a battery of questions constituting the measure of each dimension) were formed into a single scale using Principal Components Analysis (PCA); this statistical technique examines multiple questions simultaneously to find the common element between them that maximizes the percentage of the variation captured by a single number.

The success of this method is charted by a statistic known as explained variance, which charts the amount of material from each question accounted for by the single scale. In addition, all the values were scaled to 100 points in order to approximate percentages, where higher values correspond to more progressive attitudes. The questionnaire in the study was preceded by the instruction: “The following are a number of statements about education in the United States. Please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly.” These are the scales — the exact wordings of the questions used in constructing these scales appear in the appendix:

Higher and Lower Education

Measures concerning education reform were included to assess the ability of the values to further or at least not negatively impact support for more progressive policies in the education arena. Everyone sees unions as part of educational system; thus FrameWorks does not want to recommend values that enhance support for teachers’ unions but diminish support for other relevant policies. In essence, the inclusion of these outcomes allows us to look for a value that is consonant with both goals—support for teachers’ unions and support for education reform.

In order to mirror commonly accepted wisdom the education the reform scale takes on two parts: one scale concerning lower, K through 12, education and another concerning higher, post high school, education. Again the exact wording of these questions is

included in the appendix. The PCA for these two scales placed the amount of explained variance 50.3 percent for lower education and 46.6 percent for higher education, which are respectable scores for both. In each case, the single factor “explains” roughly half of all variation in all the questions making up the scale.

Attitudes toward Teachers’ Unions

This scale taps into the central concern of study, namely attitudes toward teachers’ unions themselves. A successful value necessarily has to move attitudes to be more supportive of teachers’ unions. The single factor produced by PCA explains a remarkably good 72.5 of the variance in all the questions of this scale.

Teaching and Professional Development

The Ford Foundation and teachers’ unions are also interested in attitudes toward policies that are important to teachers but not directly related to unions. The six items on this scale attempt to capture these key elements regarding the professional development of teachers. Taken together, the single factor produced by the PCA accounts for a respectable 53 percent of the variance among all the items.

Education Resource Priorities

Along with increasing support for teachers’ unions, teacher development and education reform, we are also interested in how respondents are willing to direct resources to deal with problems in education. Here we are especially interested in the distinction between prioritizing resources for school systems as opposed to prioritizing resources for individual effort and motivation. For example, schools as systems are represented by the item “improving educational supports and resources for students,” while effort is represented by “motivating parents to help their children excel.” To produce a single scale we included all the collective needs as well as the inverse of the motivational needs (listed in the appendix). In other words, the collective needs were positively coded and the private needs were negatively coded. The PCA reducing these items to a single measure accounted for over half, 56.8 percent, of the variance in all the items.

Scope of Governance

Finally, we are interested in the role of governance in the education arena. Governmental involvement can be seen as a prerequisite to all other reform efforts. This scale taps into respondents’ support for a broader role for government. The items in this scale reduce to

a single factor, using PCA, which accounts for 53.5 percent of the total variance or over half of those of the individual items.

Data

The findings reported here are drawn from an experimental online survey administered by YouGov Polimetrix.¹¹ It took place between April 11 and December 25, 2011. The study includes a sample of 2,400 registered U.S. voters, weighted on the basis of age, gender, education level and party identification to statistically represent all adult registered voters in the nation. Of these, 400 respondents were randomly assigned to the control group, which saw no treatment but answered all policy questions, while the remaining respondents were randomly assigned to one of the experimental conditions, in which case they saw one of the five values treatments before answering the questions contained in the outcome measures.

RESULTS

Estimates of the effectiveness of the value treatments stem from comparisons of the effects of the treatments on the outcome measures. Multiple regression was used to compute these estimates. This statistical technique fits a straight line to the pattern of data made up of all the variables in the analysis. The line is fitted simultaneously across all the dimensions the data contains. We report the slopes of this line as regression coefficients that chart the magnitude of each variable's effect, so the larger the coefficient, the larger the effect. Because each of the treatment variables is scaled to 100 points, the coefficients can be interpreted as percentages; for example, a coefficient of 2.2 for the effect of Responsible Management on PPACA provisions represents roughly a 2 percent increase in respondents' support because of exposure to that value.

Multiple regression has a salient advantage. The coefficients are accompanied by a measure of statistical significance that represents the chance that the estimate is actually equal to zero. For the Pragmatism value, the Teachers' Unions scale estimate significance level is less than 0.09, which means that there is a less than one in ten chance that the estimate is actually zero. High significance levels — ones that indicate a lower likelihood that an estimate is due to chance — increase the confidence we can place in the results. We will examine each outcome measure in turn prior to discussing the results in the last section.

K through 12 Provisions

Table 1 reports the K through 12 regression. These estimates indicate that the effect of one of the value treatments almost reaches conventional levels of statistical significance.

Table 1. Value Treatments' Effects on K through 12 Support

<u>Value</u>	<u>Effect</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Future Prep + Common		
Good	0.9	
Pragmatism	1.7	+
Fairness Across Places	0.4	
Collaboration (Generic)	-1.4	
Collaboration (Client)	-0.1	

Asterisks indicate significance levels: + < .2

Pragmatism caused an almost 2 percentage point gain in respondents' support on the K through 12 scale. This effect was almost statistically significant, being at the 0.2 level. This estimate means that the likelihood of it being due to chance is less than one in 20. This change represents a fairly large effect considering the small size (in terms of words) of the value treatment. The effects of the remaining values are both relatively small and do not reach statistical significance. From an advocate's perspective, Pragmatism embodies the best value to use in communication if the goal is to generate support for K through 12 education reform.

Higher Education Provisions

Table 2 reports the higher education regression. These estimates indicate that none of the value treatments reach conventional levels of statistical significance.

Table 2. Value Treatments' Effects on Higher Education Support

<u>Value</u>	<u>Effect</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Future Prep + Common		
Good	-0.8	
Pragmatism	.1	
Fairness Across Places	-0.6	
Collaboration (Generic)	-1.5	
Collaboration (Client)	-0.5	

Although none of the treatments caused statistically significant results, there is one noteworthy finding. All the coefficients except one are negatively signed. This result means that all of the values save Pragmatism can be expected to cause a *decrease* in support for items charting support for higher education reform. Again, from an advocate’s perspective, Pragmatism embodies the best value to use in communication if the goal is to do the least “damage” to respondents’ attitudes where higher education reform is concerned.

Teachers’ Unions

Table 4 reports the teachers’ unions regression. These estimates indicate that the effect of one of the value treatments reaches conventional levels of statistical significance.

Table 4. Value Treatments’ Effects on Teachers’ Unions Support

<u>Value</u>	<u>Effect</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Future Prep + Common		
Good	0.8	
Pragmatism	3.6	*
Fairness Across Places	0.9	
Collaboration (Generic)	0.3	
Collaboration (Client)	0.4	

Asterisks indicate significance levels: * < .1

Pragmatism caused an over three and a half percentage point gain in respondents’ support for teachers’ unions. This effect was statistically significant, at the 0.1 level. This estimate means that the likelihood of it being due to chance is less than one time in ten. Even more than the other effects we have examined, this change represents a large effect considering the size of the value treatment. The effects of the remaining values are both relatively small and do not reach statistical significance. Here more than anywhere else, an advocate would do well to use to see Pragmatism as the best value to use in communication if the goal is to generate support for teachers’ unions.

Teacher Development

Table 3 reports the teacher development regression. These estimates indicate that the effect of one of the value treatments reaches conventional levels of statistical

significance.

Table 3. Value Treatments' Effects on Teacher Development Support

<u>Value</u>	<u>Effect</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Future Prep + Common Good	1.1	
Pragmatism	1.9	+
Fairness Across Places	0.1	
Collaboration (Generic)	0.6	
Collaboration (Client)	0.2	

Asterisks indicate significance levels: + < .15

Pragmatism caused an almost 2 percentage point gain in respondents' support on the teacher development scale. This effect was statistically significant, at the 0.15 level. This estimate means that the likelihood of it being due to chance is less than fifteen times in a hundred. Again, this change represents a fairly large effect considering the small size (in terms of words) of the value treatment. With the exception of Future Preparation plus Common Good, the effects of the remaining values are both relatively small and do not reach statistical significance. The effect of Future Preparation plus Common Good is substantively larger; however, it does not come close to reaching statistical significance. Once again, from an advocate's perspective, Pragmatism embodies the best value to use in communication if the goal is to generate support for teacher development measures.

Education Funding Priorities

Table 5 reports the teacher development regression. These estimates indicate that the effect of one of the value treatments reaches conventional levels of statistical significance.

Table 5. Value Treatments' Effects on Education Funding Priorities

<u>Value</u>	<u>Effect</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Future Prep + Common Good		
Good	0.7	
Pragmatism	1.0	

Fairness Across Places	1.8	*
Collaboration (Generic)	-0.6	
Collaboration (Client)	-0.3	

Asterisks indicate significance levels: * < .1

Fairness Across Places caused an almost 2 percentage point gain in respondents’ support on for systemic funding priorities. This effect was statistically significant, at the 0.1 level. This estimate means that the likelihood of it being due to chance is less than one time in ten. Again, this change represents a fairly large effect considering the small size (in terms of words) of the value treatment. The effects of the remaining values are both relatively small and do not reach statistical significance. Notably, the effects of the two collaboration treatments are negatively signed, indicating that we would expect them to reduce support for systemic funding priorities. Here, from an advocate’s perspective, Fairness Across Places embodies the best value to use in communication if the goal is to generate support for systemic funding.

Scope of Government

Table 6 reports the scope of government regression. These estimates indicate that the effect of one of the value treatments reaches conventional levels of statistical significance.

Table 6. Value Treatments’ Effects on Scope of Government Attitudes

<u>Value</u>	<u>Effect</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Future Prep + Common		
Good	1.4	
Pragmatism	3.2	**
Fairness Across Places	-0.8	
Collaboration (Generic)	-0.9	
Collaboration (Client)	-0.1	

Asterisks indicate significance levels: ** < .05

Pragmatism caused an over three-percentage point gain in respondents’ support for government action in the educational system. This effect was highly statistically

significant, at the 0.05 level. This estimate means that the likelihood of it being due to chance is less than one time in twenty. Along with the effect on teachers' unions, this change represents a large effect considering the size of the value treatment. The effects of the remaining values are both relatively small and do not reach statistical significance. In fact, three of the remaining values—including the two versions of collaboration—are negatively signed here as well, an advocate would do well to use to see Pragmatism as the best value to use in communication if the goal is to generate support for government action.

CONCLUSIONS

The standout finding from these results is the strong performance of the value of Pragmatism. Of all the values under consideration this is the one that stands the best prospect for being the right value to rely on in messages and subsequent conversations about teachers' unions. In the first place, Pragmatism produces the strongest single effect in the study; moreover that effect occurs on the most important scale, the focus of the research—attitudes toward teachers' unions. Here, Pragmatism pushed these attitudes in a direction more favorable to teachers' unions by a over three and a half percent, a huge substantive increase on the hundred point, percentage scale. This movement was above the sampling error on most national polls, a fact that is reinforced by the high level of statistical significance associated with the Pragmatism estimate. The 3.6 percent estimate of the effect of Pragmatism on attitudes toward teachers' unions was significant at the .1 level, meaning that the change that this finding was due to random fluctuations in the data was less than one in ten. Given the small size of the treatment, as referenced above, this degree of movement on the outcome scale is enormous—in fact, it is one of the largest single movements in FrameWorks history. With the little doubt, this finding indicates that messages built upon Pragmatism offer the best, most confident avenue for bolstering attitudes in the way desired by proponents of teachers' unions.

At the same time the value of Pragmatism also exerts beneficial effects on other important outcome measures. Here, the two main effects are on the scope of governance and on teacher development. First, in terms of scope of governance, Pragmatism produces profound movement toward the progressive end of the scale. Exposure to the Pragmatism treatment prompted respondents to shift an average of 3.2 percentage points closer to the most progressive views on government activity. Further, this movement was extraordinarily statistically significant. The shift was associated with a .05 level, meaning that the odds that this change was due to random fluctuations are less than one time in twenty. Because government action is seen as a prerequisite to many of the changes union supporters would advocate, this finding is of critical importance.

The second shift produced by Pragmatism relates to the teacher development scale. Here, exposure to Pragmatism leads to an almost two percentage point shift in the direction of favoring measures to foster professional development. This change is also statistically significant though not at the level of the previous two findings. In all, the value of Pragmatism offers a potent one, two, three combination that moves attitudes on three scales of paramount importance to advocates, namely on attitudes toward teachers' unions, the scope of government and professional development.

On top of all these beneficial effects, basing messages on Pragmatism does not negatively impact the other important outcomes studied here. On the two education reform

outcomes, the value of Pragmatism boosts support for K through 12 reforms by almost two percentage points—a value that is close to statistically significant. Likewise, Pragmatism does not diminish support for higher education reform, unlike its competition, the value of Collaboration, as discussed shortly. Exposure to Pragmatism also slightly shifts attitudes toward a more favorable emphasis on allocating resources to schools instead of individual factors on the resource prioritization measures. Of the six outcomes under study, then, the value of Pragmatism has strong, positive outcomes on three; smaller but substantive outcomes on two and no negative outcomes on the last. To put it simply, Pragmatism emerges as the one right value that meets the two interrelated goals laid out at the beginning of the study. This value provides a way to talk about education reform that gets around those who reflexively vilify teachers' unions, and this value provides an entrée for union supporters to build support for unions when talking about education more broadly.

A study like this is also valuable for identifying what does not work as well as what does. In this case, the results show which values failed to produce desirable changes on the outcome measures. Chief among this lack of results was the current way of talking about teachers' unions—collaboration. Never once, across all six outcomes, did collaboration, in either of its two versions (see appendix) produce positive, statistically significant changes in outcomes. In fact, the estimates for both versions of collaboration were typically negatively signed, meaning that they reduced support on the outcome measures among respondents exposed to this value. Though we have to be careful not to overstate this finding because the negative estimates were not statistically significant, the conclusion we take away from this experimental survey is that collaboration is not the right value to lead with in messages produced by union proponents.

Note we need to be careful to distinguish between the use of collaboration as an element in communications strategy from the actual use of collaboration on the ground in the educational arena. The impetus for collaboration as a means to solving the problems the educational system is clear and undeniably praiseworthy, these findings indicate that the use of collaboration as a value on which to base a communications strategy is misguided. In other words, while it is true diverse elements in the education system need to collaborate, it does not work as a redirecting value when in communication, when trying to persuade people to support teachers unions and engage in education reform. Thus, we argue that you can still encourage collaboration in messaging; however, these results indicate that it should not be the leading element in advocates' messages. Instead, we strongly suggest that that role be offered to Pragmatism.

Fairness Across Places is the one other value that produced a positive result, which occurred on education resource prioritization. The prioritization items asked respondents

to decide whether to allocate resources within the education system to give support to spending areas associated with individual work ethic and motivation or to support areas devoted to more systemic improvements in the educational system. As with previous FrameWorks research on education we found that Fairness Across Places encourages respondents to move past supporting individualized programs and toward a systems policy approach that is favored by progressive advocates. We believe that this occurs via a change in their the sense of place, moving the diversity of locations to the forefront of thinking and thereby prompting respondents to look beyond individually directed solutions and toward more systemic measures¹².

On a closing note, we are a bit surprised that Future Preparation plus Common Good did not work as well here at promoting progressive attitudes toward unions and education, given its success in past education work¹³. After a review of the relevant materials, we speculate that the reason for this lack of effectiveness was the failure of this treatment to specifically reference education as it has in past studies¹⁴.

In sum, this reports seeks to identify a value that can fulfill two related communicative function functions. First, can this value reduce people's willingness to see teachers' unions as the "bad guy" in conversations about education reform? Second, can proponents of teachers' unions find a value that advances support for their ideals without damaging prospects for education reform? The answer to both questions is an unqualified yes. This study on a nationally representative sample of respondents finds that messages relying on the value of Pragmatism will build support for teachers' unions, contribute toward audiences seeing education as a place for government intervention and foster positive attitudes toward teacher development. Meanwhile, this value does not contribute to less desirable attitudes when it comes to education reform or resource prioritization. In short, our evidence indicates that Pragmatism is the best value to use as a foundation for messages concerning teachers' unions and education.

References

Nelson, T.E., & Willey, E.A. (2003). Issue frames that strike a value balance. In Reese, S., Gandy, O., & Grant, A. (Eds.), *Framing public life* (pp. 227-243). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

About FrameWorks Institute: The FrameWorks Institute is an independent nonprofit organization founded in 1999 to advance science-based communications research and practice. The Institute conducts original, multi-method research to identify the communications strategies that will advance public understanding of social problems and

improve public support for remedial policies. The Institute's work also includes teaching the nonprofit sector how to apply these science-based communications strategies in their work for social change. The Institute publishes its research and recommendations, as well as toolkits and other products for the nonprofit sector, at www.frameworksinstitute.org. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of FrameWorks Institute.

Please follow standard APA rules for citation, with FrameWorks Institute as publisher. Simon, A. (2011). *Building Support for Teachers' Unions: The Role of Values Framing*. A FrameWorks Research Report. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.

Appendix: Exact Wording of Values Treatments and Dependent Measures

Values Treatments

Note: each treatment was preceded by the instruction: “The following passage was taken from an editorial that appeared in a major newspaper.”

Future Preparation plus Common Good

Header: Education to prepare us for the future

Society functions best when we have a strong education system. The most important goal when improving education is to prepare our nation for the future. In order to have the best education system possible, we need to make sure that we are prepared to contribute productively to our communities and society more generally. This means addressing current problems with education that keep students from developing the skills they will need to contribute to our common well-being as a nation. If we fail to act with this goal in mind, we will not be prepared for the future, which will impact all of us.

Side bar: Education reform should focus on preparing us all for the future

Pragmatism

Header: A common sense approach to improving education

Society functions best when we have a strong education system. The most important goal when improving education is that we put in place common sense solutions. In order to have the best education system possible, we need to make sure that the programs we put in place are those that have been proven both feasible and effective. This means addressing difficult problems in a practical step-by-step way, eliminating failing programs and replacing them with those that are most likely to produce success. If we fail to act with this goal in mind, we will have an education system that relies on impractical and unworkable methods and solutions instead of one that makes use of demonstrated and up to date techniques.

Side bar: Education reform should focus on feasible solutions

Fairness across places

Header: Improving education through fairly allocated resources

Society functions best when we have a strong education system. The most important goal when improving education is to make sure educational resources are allocated to children fairly across communities. In order to have the best education system possible, we need to make sure that all communities have access to the resources necessary for quality education. This means addressing the problem of unequal distributions of resources between places, so that all communities will have the educational resources they need. If we fail to act with this goal in mind, we will have some areas with good education systems and others where education systems do not do their jobs.

Side bar: Education reform should allocate resources evenly between places

Collaboration (Generic)

Header: Collaboration between parts essential for educational quality

Society functions best when we have a strong education system. The most important goal when improving education is to make sure there is collaboration between the parts of the system. In order to have the best education system possible, we need to make sure that the various parts that make up the education system can share knowledge, learn from each other and collaborate to solve problems. This means having opportunities to air and resolve differences of opinion in order to create collaborative relationships. If we fail to act with this goal in mind, we will lose the opportunity to collaborate and work together constructively towards the goal of a harmonious and high-quality system.

Side bar: Parts of the system need to have the opportunity to collaborate

Collaboration #2 (Client Specific)

Header: Educational collaboration needs to be effectively managed

Society functions best when we have a strong education system. The most important goal when improving education is to ensure that all stakeholders are well represented and that they have a means of managing conflict. In order to have the best education system possible, we need to create ways to manage inevitable conflicts between powerful and less powerful groups. This means that we need to find a way to oversee the interactions between parts of the system and work on the relationships that prevent key players from collaborating effectively. If we fail to act with this goal in mind, we will continue to have a system in which there is unresolved conflict between important players who are unable to work together to come to the agreements required to improve education.

Side bar: The education system needs a way of managing conflicts

Dependent Measures

Note: The questions were preceded by the instruction: “The following are a number of statements about education and teaching in the United States. Please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly.”

Teaching and Professional Development for Teachers

1. States and school districts should **not** provide out-of-classroom time, support, and resources for teachers to master and integrate new content into their classes. (reverse coded).
2. Programs to support professional development and growth should be made available throughout a teacher’s career.
3. Any teacher identified as not meeting standards should be given opportunity to improve through coaching, mentoring, and training with more experienced teachers.
4. States should offer incentives for teachers to participate in professional development.
5. States should be required to establish mentoring systems for new teachers.

Attitudes toward teachers’ unions

1. If school districts put more effort into building trust with teachers’ unions, they will reduce problems associated with contract negotiations.
2. School districts should support teachers’ union-sponsored professional development for teachers.
3. Teachers’ unions should **not** have a voice in negotiating teacher salary and benefits. (reverse coded).
4. Providing teachers with the resources and support they need to teach is a major role of teachers unions.
5. Student success is a primary concern of teachers’ unions.
6. Teachers unions provide a necessary way for teachers to collaborate with other teachers across their field to improve their teaching practice.

K-12 Education Reform policies

1. States should make funding available to extend the hours of instruction students receive.
2. While the basics (reading, writing, math) should be taught, America's schools must also teach subjects that will develop the types of skills needed in the 21st century.
3. States should revise their student testing systems, moving away from standardized tests of subject knowledge (like reading, math) toward measures of higher-level thinking and problem-solving skills across subject areas.
4. Public funding should **not** be used to address the achievement gap between different groups. (reverse coded).
5. High school graduation requirements should be revised to incorporate a variety of practical, out-of-school learning experiences that will count for academic credit toward graduation.

Higher Education Reform Policies

1. Federal and state funding should be increased for colleges and universities that focus on educating students from groups that are underrepresented in higher education.
2. To deal with financing of college education and to encourage progress toward graduation, colleges should reduce the number of years required for a degree from four to three.
3. In awarding financial aid to students, colleges should prioritize financial need, as opposed to athletic or academic merit.
4. Any remedial courses that colleges offer should be combined with college-level study, so that remedial students don't fall further behind.

Educational Resource Prioritization

Note: This scale was preceded by the additional instruction: "To improve educational outcomes we should prioritize:"

1. Improving educational supports and resources for students.

2. Having caring teachers in every classroom (reverse coded).
3. Ensuring teachers have sufficient support and resources.
4. Motivating parents to help their children excel (reverse coded).
5. Providing academic mentoring programs in schools.

Scope of Government

1. State and local government should do more to improve education.
2. Keeping schools free from government interference is the best way to ensure student success (reverse coded).
3. State and local governments have to play a leadership role in making sure students have quality educational environments that support better learning.
4. Public/private partnerships can be helpful in promoting educational opportunities, but state and local government has the main responsibility for solving problems within our educational system.
5. Private organizations are **not** the best source of ideas and leadership when it comes to reforming our education system (reverse coded).

¹ Manuel, Tiffany and Remington-Bell, Tia (2010) What's In All This Talk about Teachers? A Summary Review of the Common Narratives Used By Teachers' Unions to Articulate the Importance of Their Role in Education Reform. A FrameWorks Materials Review Report. Confidential.

² Kendall-Taylor, Nathaniel (2010) Understanding Teachers' Collective Role in Reform: Mapping the Gaps Between the Expert and the Public Understandings of Teachers' Unions. A FrameWorks Research Report. Confidential.

³ Simon, Adam and Lynn Davey (2010) College Bound: The Effects of Values Frames on Attitudes toward Higher Education Reform. A FrameWorks Research Report www.FrameWorksInstitute.org.

⁴ O'Neil, Moira (2010) Getting on the Right Side of Change: How Peer Discourse Sessions See the Role of Teachers' Unions in Education Reform. A FrameWorks Research Report. Confidential.

⁵ Simon, Adam and Lynn Davey (2010) College Bound: The Effects of Values Frames on Attitudes toward Higher Education Reform. A FrameWorks Research Report www.FrameWorksInstitute.org.

⁶ O'Neil, Moira (2010) Getting on the Right Side of Change: How Peer Discourse Sessions See the Role of Teachers' Unions in Education Reform. A FrameWorks Research Report. Confidential.

⁷ See www.FrameWorksInstitute.org.

⁸ Teachers' Unions Simplifying Model Report, In Process.

⁹ Manuel, Tiffany and Remington-Bell, Tia (2010) What's In All This Talk about Teachers? A Summary Review of the Common Narratives Used By Teachers' Unions to Articulate the Importance of Their Role in Education Reform. A FrameWorks Materials Review Report. Confidential.

¹⁰ Teachers' Unions Simplifying Model Report, In Process.

¹¹ For methodological details, see www.yougov.com.

¹² Simon, Adam and Lynn Davey (2010) College Bound: The Effects of Values Frames on Attitudes toward Higher Education Reform. A FrameWorks Research Report www.FrameWorksInstitute.org.

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ See this appendix as well as the appendix to the last cited paper.