



12-1971

A Comparison of Perceived Organizational Characteristics between Selected Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage School Districts in the State of Michigan

Philip Durward Haynes
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Haynes, Philip Durward, "A Comparison of Perceived Organizational Characteristics between Selected Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage School Districts in the State of Michigan" (1971). *Dissertations*. 3017.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/3017>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A COMPARISON OF PERCEIVED
ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
BETWEEN SELECTED WORK STOPPAGE
AND NON-WORK STOPPAGE SCHOOL
DISTRICTS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

by

Philip Durward Haynes

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1971

PLEASE NOTE:

**Some pages have indistinct
print. Filmed as received.**

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

72-14,182

HAYNES, Philip Durward, 1931-
A COMPARISON OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL
CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN SELECTED WORK STOPPAGE
AND NON-WORK STOPPAGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
STATE OF MICHIGAN.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1971
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	i
LIST OF APPENDIX EXHIBITS.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	11
Hypotheses and Rationale.....	15
Assumptions.....	17
Significance of the Study.....	18
Limitations of the Study.....	18
Overview.....	19
II SURVEY OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.....	21
Purpose and Overview.....	21
Collective Negotiations in Education.....	22
Collective negotiations, collective bargaining, and professional negotiations defined.....	23
Legislative history of collective bargaining in the private sector.....	24
History of collective negotiations in education.	34
Causal factors in the emergence of collective negotiations in public education.....	38
Research studies concerning collective negotiations.....	43
The future of collective negotiations.....	50

CHAPTER	PAGE
Work Stoppage, Strikes, and Sanctions.....	52
Work stoppage.....	52
Strike.....	53
Sanctions.....	53
Essential elements of sanction and strikes.....	54
Legality of strikes.....	55
Strike statistics.....	58
NEA and AFT position and policies on strikes or work stoppages.....	59
Effects of strikes on pupils.....	62
The future of strikes and work stoppages.....	63
Participative Management Theory.....	66
Theorists who have influenced modern management.	67
Measuring organizational performance.....	69
Participative group management (System 4).....	70
Causal, intervening, and end result variables...	72
Summary.....	73
III PROCEDURES AND RESEARCH DESIGN.....	75
The Variables.....	75
Samples and Populations.....	76
Instrumentation.....	82
Reliability of the instruments.....	84
Statistical Hypotheses.....	85
Procedures.....	86
Preliminary planning.....	86

CHAPTER	PAGE
	Procedures used in gathering data..... 89
	Data Analysis..... 95
	Summary..... 105
IV	ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION..... 106
	Board Member Related Hypotheses..... 109
	Individual question analysis..... 109
	Grand mean analysis..... 119
	Causal group analysis..... 120
	Superintendent Related Hypotheses..... 125
	Individual question analysis..... 125
	Grand mean analysis..... 137
	Causal group analysis..... 138
	Administrative Assistant Related Hypotheses..... 144
	Individual question analysis..... 144
	Grand mean analysis..... 154
	Causal group analysis..... 155
	Principal Related Hypotheses..... 160
	Individual question analysis..... 160
	Grand mean analysis..... 176
	Causal group analysis..... 177
	Teacher Related Hypotheses..... 182
	Individual question analysis..... 182
	Grand mean analysis..... 193
	Causal group analysis..... 194

CHAPTER	PAGE
	Summary..... 197
V	CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS; IMPLICATIONS; LIMITATIONS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH; AND SUMMARY OF THE STUDY..... 200
	Conclusions and interpretations..... 200
	Implications..... 209
	Limitations of the Study..... 212
	Recommendations for Further Research..... 213
	Summary of the Study..... 214
	APPENDIX..... 221

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This investigator is indebted to Dr. Rensis Likert, author of questionnaires used in this study, for his permission to use the instruments and for his personal guidance and support. Also, a special word of thanks is given to those board members, superintendents, administrative assistants, principals, and teachers who participated in the study.

The writer is especially thankful for the professional guidance and moral support that were given by his Major Adviser, Dr. Maurice Seay, Research Adviser, Dr. David Curl, and the other members of his doctoral committee, Dr. Clara Chiara, Dr. David Hause, and Dr. William Bennett.

A special note of gratitude is extended by the writer to the Mott Foundation and the School of Graduate Studies at Western Michigan University for their financial assistance during his graduate work.

In conclusion, the writer dedicates this dissertation to his family, the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership, and his fellow Mott Interns for their support, patience, and encouragement.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Recipients in Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage Districts.....	78
2. Total Number of Recipients in Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage School Districts.....	79
3. Selected Criteria for the Determination of Comparability for Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage School Districts (Work Stoppage Districts).....	80
4. Selected Criteria for the Determination of Comparability for Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage School Districts (Non-Work Stoppage Districts).....	81
5. Statistics for Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage School Districts.....	88
6. Respondent Returns from Work Stoppage Districts.....	92
7. Respondent Returns from Non-Work Stoppage Districts.....	93
8. Overall Returns and Percentages for Each Group.....	94
9. Paradigm for Item Analysis Mean Comparisons Between Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage Groups.....	97
10. Paradigm for Nine Causal Group Mean Comparisons Between Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage Groups.....	99
11. Analysis of Data for Each Question Regarding Board Members.....	110
12. Questions Which Supported the Stated Hypothesis Between Board Member Groups.....	116
13. Analysis of Data for Grand Mean Scores Between Board Member Groups.....	119
14. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 1: Causal Items to the Superintendent (Downward) From Board Members.....	121
15. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 2: Causal Items to the Principal (Downward) From Board Members.....	124

Table	Page
16. Analysis of Data for Each Question Regarding Superintendents.....	126
17. Questions Which Supported the Stated Hypothesis Between Superintendent Groups.....	134
18. Analysis of Data for Grand Mean Scores Between Superintendent Groups.....	137
19. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 3: Causal Items from Board Members (Upward) to Superintendents.....	139
20. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 4: Causal Items to Principals (Downward) from Superintendents.....	141
21. Analysis of Data for Individual Questions Regarding Administrative Assistants.....	145
22. Questions Which Supported the Stated Hypothesis Between Administrative Assistant Groups.....	151
23. Analysis of Data for Grand Mean Scores Regarding Administrative Assistants.....	154
24. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 5: Causal Items from Superintendents (Upward) to Administrative Assistants....	156
25. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 6: Causal Items to Principal (Downward) From Administrative Assistants.....	158
26. Analysis of Data for Individual Questions Regarding Principals.....	161
27. Questions Which Supported the Stated Hypothesis Between Principal Groups.....	169
28. Analysis of Data for Grand Mean Scores Regarding Principals.....	176
29. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 7: Causal Items from Superintendents (Upward) to Principals.....	178
30. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 8: Causal Items to Teachers (Downward) from Principals.....	180
31. Analysis of Data for Individual Questions Regarding Teachers.....	183

Table	Page
32. Questions Which Supported the Stated Hypothesis Between Teacher Groups.....	190
33. Analysis of Data for Grand Mean Scores Regarding Teachers.....	193
34. Analysis of Data for Causal Group 9: Causal Items from Principals (Upward) to Teachers.....	195

LIST OF APPENDIX EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Page
1. Sample Page From A Profile of A School Form.....	222
2. Estimated Reliability Coefficients Based on California Data Furnished by Dr. Rensis Likert (August 7, 1970).....	223
3. Letter Requesting Recipients to Participate in the Study.....	224
4. Follow-up Letter Sent to Recipients of the Questionnaires.....	225

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This investigation is designed to analyze and compare the profiles of organizational characteristics between work stoppage and non-work stoppage school districts in the state of Michigan as perceived by board members, superintendents, administrative assistants, principals, and teachers. This chapter will provide a general statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, a definition of theoretical terms, the stated hypotheses and rationale, and the basic assumptions and limitations of the study.

Statement of the Problem

During the decade of the sixties, important changes have taken place in education which have had a profound effect on the perceptions, attitudes, roles, and relationships that previously existed between professional educators, school boards, parents, students, and the general public. Regrettably, most of the positive changes have been eclipsed by negative issues, such as racial and student unrest, teacher strikes, millage defeats, the critical lack of funds that are necessary to meet the spiraling educational costs, and the apparent decline in community support of education.

Employer-employee relations in the public schools have become a critical problem. Robert F. Risely¹ recently opened a conference on Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University with the following statement:

The problem of the employee relationships in public schools is one which has implications, not only for the administrative structure of the schools and schools' operation, but also for the educational process itself. It is one which should be of as much concern to the people of the State as any other issue at the moment.

What are the factors which have caused employer-employee relations to emerge as such an important issue? This question was answered at the same conference by James E. Allen, Jr.²

1. There has been a national trend during the past 35 years toward more consideration by employers of the interests and needs of their employees. This is an outgrowth of the basic American desire for the maximum of liberty and dignity for each individual.

2. Reorganization and rapid growth of school districts have resulted in a more complex district structure, giving the teacher the feeling of being increasingly removed from top administration and board of education policy making.

3. There has been an increasing awareness that teacher organizations should not continue to be nationally oriented but should have strong leadership at the local level.

¹Risely, Robert F., Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools, (Ed.) Robert E. Doherty, A Publication of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, January, 1967, p.3.

²Allen, James E. Jr., "Interest and Role of the State Education Department with Respect to Employer-Employee Relations." Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools, (Ed.) Robert E. Doherty, a Publication of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, January, 1967, pp. 8-9.

4. Rapid and dynamic changes have occurred in the attitudes of the individual teacher and his desire to become more effectively involved in the decision-making process. Economic considerations have hastened this development since increased numbers of men have entered the teaching profession. Generally they have become heads of families and feel the need for higher salaries.

5. Intense organizational rivalry has developed between major teachers' groups to demonstrate how well they can produce tangible gains for their constituents.

The recent enactment of laws in a number of states which provide for collective bargaining between public employees, including teachers, and their employers, has brought the public employer-employee relationship into sharper focus. Heald and Moore¹ have written:

Because large numbers of conservative school districts have traditionally placed monetary costs above the accomplishment of educational goals, teachers have, in the recent past, begun to organize themselves into bargaining units capable of bringing new and additional pressures to bear upon the board of education as the community's representatives. Encouragement to local teachers groups has come from national and state educational associations and from unions which have actively sought teacher membership. Additional support has come from state legislatures who have passed permissive or mandatory legislation to cover the process by which teachers and boards of education shall reach agreement on problems of mutual concern. The potential for conflict is great, and the general areas of salaries and negotiations may well become the largest internal force for changing the shape of public education.

Prior to 1965, Wisconsin was the only state that had enacted a comprehensive law regulating collective negotiations in education. During 1965 nine states passed collective negotiations bills in

¹Heald, James E., Moore, Samuel, A. The Teacher and Administrative Relationships in School Systems. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968, pp. 247-48.

both houses of their respective legislatures. The governors of Minnesota, New Jersey, and New York vetoed their bills, however, the bills were signed in California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Washington, and Oregon.¹

In the state of Michigan, collective negotiations between teachers and school boards are mandatory under the provisions of Michigan Public Act 379. This act was signed by governor George Romney on July 23, 1965. Public Act 379 is not confined to public school teachers but applies to most state and public employees. Prior to the passage of Public Act 379, a proposed bill granting separate representation rights to teachers, sponsored by the Michigan Education Association, was defeated in the House Labor Committee. Once Public Act 379 was introduced, it was supported by both the Michigan Education Association and the Michigan Federation of Teachers. Lieberman and Moskow² have described some of the specific features of the law as follows:

The Act provides for the right of public employees to organize; protects employees from unlawful interference, coercion, or intimidation; authorizes the Michigan Labor Mediation Board to conduct representation elections; requires public employers to negotiate in good faith with the designated exclusive representative of the employees on "rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment"; and establishes unfair labor

¹Lieberman, Myron, Moskow, Michael H., Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966, pp. 49-50.

²loc. cit., pp. 50-51.

practices. Strike prohibitions from previous legislation were continued, but public employers are no longer required to impose firings, fines, and jail terms on public employees who go on strike.

The Michigan Labor Mediation Board is authorized to determine appropriate units of representation, investigate unfair labor practices, issue cease-and desist orders, and provide mediation services when an impasse arises. Fact-finding with nonbinding recommendations is the terminal point of the impasse procedure. Immediately after the Act was enacted, the Labor Mediation Board appointed two new members experienced in public education to mediate any disputes arising between school boards and teachers' organizations.

The legal right that has been granted to teachers and their representative organizations to enter into collective negotiations with their respective school boards has provided teachers with a source of power that they have never had before. Their demands for higher salaries and a greater involvement in the planning and decision-making process have threatened the power, influence, and authority of a number of individuals and groups within the educational hierarchy. "In some instances, however, the response has been one of acceptance. Those who have taken this attitude have done so in the belief that negotiation is not necessarily a destructive process, and there is a distinct possibility that it may be shaped so that it may actually strengthen teacher-administrator-board member relationships." ¹

¹ _____, The School Administrator and Negotiation. Washington, D.C., A Publication of the American Association of School Administrators, 1968, p.5.

The emergence of "teacher militancy" has unquestionably changed the image of teachers. "Professional teacher organizations are on the march. Many have repudiated acquiescence, abandoned passivity, and challenged the leadership of school administrators. Pressure for a more vital and greater share in educational decision-making is evident in more and more school systems."¹ The changing teacher image has been explained by Heald and Moore² as follows:

For years, the teaching staff of American public school systems was composed primarily of persons characterized as "little old ladies" who "dearly love children." Many changes have recently been made within the teaching population; more young men have entered the field of teaching; the average age of teachers has markedly declined; more married women than ever before are engaged in teaching; and all of these changes have resulted in a teaching population much more sensitive to the environmental changes around it. No longer are teachers satisfied with being the lowest paid professional group. No longer are they willing to accept the typical rations doled out by conservative boards of education. No longer will they accept treatment which is perceived as subprofessional. The "group personality" has undergone massive transformation. In many cases, the transformation has been largely bewildering to the public accustomed to the acquiescent "old maid" who so often compromised the teaching corps.

The introduction of the concept of negotiations between teachers' organizations, on one hand, and administrators and school boards on the other has, and perhaps permanently, polarized these components within the system. "The acceptance, on the part of teachers' organizations, of the labor-management model has been

¹ibid

²op. cit., p. 252.

divisive and has tended to magnify the differences existing between administrators and teachers."¹

Collective bargaining began in private industry in the United States at the turn of the nineteenth century when workers and their representatives sought to bargain collectively with management. The origins of formal collective negotiations in education are, of course, much more recent. "Although there are probably thousands of examples of some type of consultations between teachers and boards of education over the past fifty years or more, the acknowledged breakthrough that served as a forerunner for contemporary bargaining activities in Michigan and elsewhere was the December, 1961, recognition of the United Federation of Teachers as the exclusive bargaining agent for public school teachers in New York City."² The following evaluation of the success of collective bargaining process in Michigan has been given by Schmidt:³

Whether or not the Michigan experience is typical or applicable elsewhere is obviously unknown. Nevertheless, collective bargaining, in almost the classical sense, was unbelievably successful in its first full year of implementation in public education in Michigan. Novices negotiated well over 400 complex collective agreements, and negotiations broke down in only about fifteen of these situations. Whether this high degree of success can be sustained in the immediate future is certainly questionable. Continued success in

¹ibid

²Schmidt, Charles T. Jr., Parker, Hyman, Repas, Bob, A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education. Published for The School of Industrial Relations, Michigan State University, 1967, p. 3.

³loc. cit., p.2.

collective negotiations will require certain changes in the roles and attitudes of the participants, and the next few years will be critical ones for the future of such negotiations in education. In my opinion the process can and will produce these desired accommodations if left unencumbered by administrative and legislative curbs. My position is that the collective bargaining process is a satisfactory and successful institution for the resolution of potential or actual employer-employee conflict in education.

It must be recognized that two important factors have had profound effects upon the expansion of the scope of bargaining. "One is the power of some of the unions to exact concessions from the employers. The second is the evolving genuine acceptance by some employers that their employees must share in decisions determining work conditions. This later point is directly in line with much of the advanced management theory proposed by Rensis Likert, Douglas McGregor, and others."¹

Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose of this study to investigate, compare, and analyze the significance of hypothesized differences in the management systems being used in ten Michigan school districts that have suffered work stoppages during the 1969-70 school year with ten Michigan school districts that have never been involved in work stoppages. Statistical analysis of group means will be made between "work stoppage" and "non-work stoppage" school districts on responses obtained from board members, superintendents, admin-

¹loc. cit., p. 3.

istrative, principals, and teachers. This study is done with the hope that possible insights and/or solutions will be found that will help resolve some of the negative employer-employee relationships that presently exist.

Why have some school districts in the state of Michigan been able to negotiate successfully, effectively, and with a minimum amount of conflict? Why have certain districts been able to avoid work stoppages? Why have other districts suffered continuing confrontations, threats, sanctions, and work stoppages? Perhaps the key to the resolution of such conflict situations can be found in the research that has been done in labor-management relations and the behavioral sciences. Researchers like McGregor, Halpin, Herzberg, Blake, Mouton, Maslow, Argyris, Likert and many others have been concerned about those factors which will help individuals better understand themselves, their perceptions of others, their needs, and their motivations as they relate to others in their daily lives. It is important to realize that this research in human relations and modern management theory has had a significant impact on improved relations in business and industry. If these factors are considered and implemented in educational management systems, in their interpersonal relations with subordinates and superordinates, and, more specifically, in their relations with students.

Dr. Rensis Likert and his staff at the Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, have done extensive and meaningful research concerning the effectiveness of various management systems in business and industry. Their findings support the theory that participative management systems are more productive, have lower costs, and produce more favorable attitudes than those management systems which involve employees to a lesser degree. In his book, New Patterns in Management, Dr. Likert explains that the theory of participative management need not be confined to the business and industrial organizational setting alone. He contends that the "application of the theory is not limited to these enterprises. It is equally applicable to other kinds of organized human activities such as, schools, voluntary associations, unions, hospitals, etc. . . ."1

Recently, Dr. Likert developed a group of Profile of Organizational Characteristics questionnaires which can be used to measure organizational variables and perceived management systems in school districts. These questionnaires are similar to the Profile of Organizational Characteristics questionnaires which have been so widely used in business and industry. Individual questionnaires for schools were developed for school board members, superintendents, administrative staff, principals, teachers.

¹Likert, Rensis, New Patterns in Management, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961, p. 4.

Responses to these new questionnaires provide data on how individuals at various levels perceive the management system that is used in their school district.

Definition of Terms

Currently, many of the terms that have generally been associated with business and industry are being used in education. Since a number of these terms are used in this study, it is important that their applicability to the educational model be clarified and defined.

1. Management Systems: Dr. Likert describes the four major management systems that are commonly used in organizations as follows:

- System 1 (Exploitive-authoritative management)
- System 2 (Benevolent-authoritative management)
- System 3 (Consultative management)
- System 4 (Participative group management)

2. POC: (Form for Schools): POC is an abbreviation for the term, Profile of Organizational Characteristics. The POC (Form for Schools) will be the data gathering instrument that will be used in this study.

3. Profile of Organizational Characteristics: An organization as a human social system can be described in terms of a fundamental dimension, namely, where it falls on a System 1 to System 4 continuum. The following organizational variables are included in such a profile; (1) leadership processes, (2) motivational forces,

(3) communication processes, (4) decision-making processes, (5) goal setting or ordering and (6) control processes.

4. Causal Variables:¹

The "causal" variables are independent variables which determine the course of developments within an organization and the results achieved by the organization. The causal variables include only those independent variables which can be altered or changed by the organization and its management. General business conditions, for example, although an independent variable, is not included among the causal variables. Causal variables include the structure of the organization and management's policies, decisions, business and leadership strategies, skills, and behavior.

5. Intervening Variables:²

The "intervening" variables reflect the internal state and health of the organization, e.g., the loyalties, attitudes motivations, performance goals, and perceptions of all members and their collective capacity for effective interaction, communication, and decision making.

6. End-result Variables:³

The "end-result" variables are the dependent variables which reflect the achievements of the organization such as, its productivity, costs, scrap loss, and earnings.

7. "Work Stoppage": There seems to be little, if any, difference between the terms "strike" and "work stoppage." The terms are used interchangeably in the literature and writers apparently see no significant difference between the terms. "Work stoppage" is used in this study because it is the term that has been adopted by the State Department of Education and school districts in the state of Michigan.

¹Likert, Rensis, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967, pp. 28-29.

²loc. cit., p. 29.

³ibid.

8. "Work Stoppage" School Districts: All "work-stoppage" districts that participated in this study met the following criteria: (1) they must have been involved in five (5) or more days of work stoppages during the 1969-70 school year, and (2) they must have a student enrollment in the district of not less than 2,000 and not more than 10,000 students. Ten work stoppage districts were randomly selected from a list of fifteen districts that met the above mentioned criteria.
9. "Non-Work Stoppage" School Districts: All "non-work stoppage" districts that participated in this study met the following criteria: (1) they must never have been involved in a work stoppage since the enactment of Public Act 379 in July, 1965, and (2) they must have a student enrollment in the district of not less than 2,000 and not more than 10,000 students. Ten non-work stoppage districts were matched with the ten work stoppage districts. Every effort was made to match each work stoppage district with a non-work stoppage district which had similar demographic characteristics. Particular attention was given to student size and geographical location.
10. School Board Member: School board members will be defined as individuals who are currently serving as board members in each participating district.
11. Superintendents: Superintendents will be defined as the individual currently employed in that position in each participating district.

12. Administrative Assistants: Administrative assistants will be defined as central or district office certificated personnel who are currently serving in staff positions.
13. Principals: Principals will be defined as any certificated elementary and/or secondary principal who is currently employed in each participating district. They must be the chief administrative officer in their school.
14. Teachers: Teachers will be defined as any certificated elementary and/or secondary teacher who is currently employed in each participating district. Fifteen per cent of the teachers in each participating district were randomly selected and asked to participate in the study.
15. Collective Negotiations: Collective negotiations will be defined according to Lieberman,¹ who writes:

Collective negotiations is an agreement-making process. It involves agreement within a group of employees as well as, between the employees and their employer. Collective negotiations must now be confused with teacher right to be consulted, to make proposals, or to confer with the school administration. Under collective negotiations, certain employment decisions are made jointly by the school board and the designated representative of the teachers.

Since it is desirable to use a term that is unbiased, "collective negotiations" will be adopted as the most appropriate terminology in this study. Because it is tedious to repeat "in education" every time the text refers to collective negotiations, the qualifying phrase will be omitted. Therefore, "collective negotiations"

¹Lieberman, op. cit. p. 1.

will mean "collective negotiations in public education" unless a different meaning is obvious.

Collective negotiations will be defined as "a process whereby employers make offers and counter-offers in good faith on the conditions of their employment relationship for the purpose of reaching mutually acceptable goals."¹

Hypotheses and Rationale

The rationale for the following hypotheses is based on some findings reported in The Human Organization: Its Management and Value by Dr. Rensis Likert. A significant finding emerged when experienced managers were asked the following question:²

In your experience what happens in a company when the senior officer becomes concerned about earnings and takes steps to cut costs, increase productivity, and improve profits? Does top management usually continue to use the management system it has been employing, or does it shift its operation to a management system more toward System 1 or more toward System 4? Most managers reported that when top management seeks to reduce costs, it shifts its system more toward System 1, i.e., toward a system which they know from their own observations and experience, yields poorer productivity and higher costs, on the average and over the long run, than does the existing management system of the company.

Do internal pressures such as, teacher demands for higher pay, greater involvement in decision-making and planning, sanctions, and work stoppages; and external pressures such as, collective bargaining legislation, millage defeats, and public demands for

¹loc. cit., p. 1.

²loc. cit., pp. 11-12.

"accountability" in the face of higher educational costs, force school boards, superintendents, and administrators into "running a tighter ship?" Do management systems shift more toward System 1? If so, it could be that shifting leadership styles and management systems have contributed to conflict situations and a breakdown of employer-employee relations.

The following hypotheses will be tested:

Hypothesis 1 Board members from "non-work stoppage" districts will perceive the management systems used in their districts to be more toward participative group management (System 4) than will board members from "work stoppage" districts.

Hypothesis 2 Superintendents from "non-work stoppage" districts will perceive the management systems used in their districts to be more toward participative group management (System 4) than will superintendents from "work-stoppage" districts.

Hypothesis 3 Administrative staff members from "non-work stoppage" districts will perceive the management systems used in their districts to be more toward participative group management (System 4) than will administrative staff members from "work-stoppage" districts.

Hypothesis 4 Principals from "non-work stoppage" districts will perceive the management systems used in their districts to be more toward participative group management (System 4) than will principals from "work-stoppage" districts.

Hypothesis 5 Teachers from "non-work stoppage" districts will perceive the management system used in their districts to be more

toward participative group management (System 4) than will teachers from "work stoppage" districts.

Assumptions

Several important assumptions have been made in relation to this particular study which should be identified.

1. It is assumed that modern management theory is applicable to the educational setting.
2. It is assumed that the enactment of Public Act 379 and teacher negotiations have had a significant effect on a shift in power in education.
3. It is assumed that the sample of selected districts participating in this study are representative of other districts of similar size and demographic characteristics in the state of Michigan.
4. It is assumed that respondents answered the questions objectively and honestly since the questionnaire used as data gathering instruments were anonymous.
5. It is assumed that personal bias and idiosyncratic behavior, which can be attributed to the unique personality of individual respondents, has been controlled for the following reasons: (1) all board members, superintendents, administrative staff, and principals in each district were asked to respond, (2) fifteen per cent of the teachers in each district were randomly selected and asked to respond, and (3) data analysis was done on group means.

Significance of the Study

After a careful review of the literature, it was found that a number of authors claim the effects of teacher negotiations have changed perceptions, attitudes, relations, and the balance of power between principals, administrators, superintendents, and school board members. At the present time, however, very little empirical data are available to determine the nature and extent of such changes. Studies have been done to investigate teacher-administrator attitudes toward collective negotiations, sanctions, and work stoppages; the role of principals, superintendents, and board members during the negotiations process; changes in principal-staff relations; and issues and outcomes of teachers' work stoppages. No studies were found which actually compared school districts that have had work stoppages with districts that have not had work stoppages to determine if differences do exist. Hopefully, the significance of this study will be to provide meaningful data relevant to this issue.

Limitations of the Study

Since this is a field study, it is subject to the same strengths and weaknesses as suggested by Kerlinger.¹

¹Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967, p. 389.

He writes: "field studies are strong in realism, significance, strength of variables, theory orientation, and heuristic quality. The variance of many variables in actual field setting is large, especially when compared to the variance of the variables of laboratory experiments." Attempts have been made to control for a number of variables, however, variables such as, prejudiced attitudes, conservatism, liberalism, economic frustration and individual school district policies, procedures, and practices are difficult, if not impossible, to control for experimentally in a field study.

Another limitation which should be pointed out is the "ex post facto" nature that is inherent in field studies. For example, independent variables such as, Public Law 379, and the management systems being used in the districts, and dependent variables such as, involvement and/or non-involvement in work stoppages had already occurred. Therefore, the researcher was unable to control for possible intervening variables such as, teacher militancy and individual school district policies, practices, and procedures. Thus, statements of causal relations are much weaker in a field study than they would be in laboratory or experimental research.

OVERVIEW

In Chapter II, the pertinent literature is reviewed. Included in this review is a survey of the literature related to: (1) the legislative history of the collective bargaining process in the

private sector and in public education; (2) work stoppages, strikes, and sanctions and their use in education; and (3) participative management theory and its applicability to organizational models in education.

In Chapter III, the research design of the study is described including sources of data, instruments used, procedures employed, and methods of data analysis.

In Chapter IV, an analysis of the data pertaining to the research hypotheses is presented. A statement of acceptance or rejection of each hypothesis follows the data analysis for each group, i. e., superintendents, board members, administrative staff members, principals and teachers.

In Chapter V, general and specific conclusions are presented. The remainder of the chapter will include an interpretation of the data, limitations of the study, recommendations for further research, and a final summary.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Purpose and Overview

The purpose of Chapter II is to review pertinent literature and research which is particularly germane to this study. This review will provide the researcher with a cognitive orientation that should enable him to better understand the depth and scope of the problem being investigated.

The chapter is presented in three parts. Part One, "Collective Negotiations in Public Education," is a survey of the legislative history of collective bargaining in the private sector and in public education. Part One reviews causal factors in the emergence of collective negotiations which are found in related research. A survey of predictions about the future development of the collective negotiation process in education concludes this discussion.

Part Two, "Strikes and Sanctions," gives a review of important considerations, such as characteristics of strikes, legality, policies and positions of major teacher organizations, effects on children, and related research. Part Two concludes with a brief review concerning the future of strikes in public education.

Part Three, "Participative Management Theory," gives a review of modern management theory and its applicability in education.

Collective Negotiations in Education

Since the collective negotiation process in education is an important variable to consider with the framework of this study, it is appropriate that consideration be given to its history, development, and effect on employer-employee relationships.

The current efforts being made by teachers to formalize their employment relationships with employers through the collective negotiation process can be explained in a large part by the growing dissatisfaction teachers apparently feel about salaries and working conditions. Doherty and Oberer¹ write:

There is a certain irony in the fact that, while salaries have increased and working conditions have been somewhat ameliorated, teacher discontent has also increased. Small improvements seem to have aroused the expectation of larger ones. At least it became apparent to some that changes for the better would not come quickly enough or be far-reaching enough if teachers continued to rely solely on the good will of the community and the local school board to bring them about. Such an arrangement denied them effective leverage and left the questions that concerned them the most to unilateral control of school boards and administrators. And concessions which are unilaterally granted, many teachers are beginning to argue, can be unilaterally withdrawn Through bilateral determination, i.e. the collective bargain, they aspire to partnership in establishing the employment arrangement.

Before investigating the historical and legislative aspects of collective negotiations, a discussion is needed to define and clarify the terms, "collective negotiations," "professional negotiations," and "collective bargaining."

¹Doherty, Robert E., Oberer, Walter E., Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining: A Changing of the Guard. New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1967, p. 21.

Collective negotiations, collective bargaining, and professional negotiations as defined

When surveying the literature it is quite possible to become confused over the subtle differences implied in terms currently being used to describe the negotiations process in education.

"Professional negotiation" has been identified with and espoused by the National Education Association. This term involves certain procedural differences when compared with "collective bargaining" which has been identified with and espoused by the United Federation of Teachers. Stinnett¹ describes these procedural differences when he writes:

1. Professional negotiation procedures can result in the removal of teachers and school boards from the operation of labor laws and labor precedent, whereas collective bargaining procedures, adapted from the private sector will not.
2. For the purposes of mediation and appeal, procedures will go through educational channels under professional negotiation and through labor channels under collective bargaining.

The "subdifferences" which flow from the two major differences are primarily two. First, the local certificated employees make unit determinations under professional negotiation so that certain levels of employees are not automatically excluded as "supervisory" and thus could be appropriately included. Second, precedents set will be education oriented under professional negotiation procedures. This is not as likely to be true if appeals and mediation are handled by labor agencies, which, of course, have only labor oriented precedent on which to draw.

¹Stinnett, T.M., Kleinmann, Jack H., Ware, Martha L., Professional Negotiation in Public Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966, p. 16.

Lieberman and Moskow¹ extend the clarification of terms answering the question: "Is 'collective negotiations' an alternative to professional negotiations or collective bargaining? Or is it one of these under a different label?" They write:²

It is difficult to answer these questions categorically because the difference between collective bargaining and professional negotiations are not at all clear. Some respected authorities not connected with either NEA or AFT have asserted that there are no differences or relatively unimportant ones between these procedures. Be that as it may, the objective here is to analyze issues which must be faced whenever teachers as a group negotiate with school boards, regardless of what procedures are adopted or how they are labeled. In doing so, it is desirable to use terminology that does not prejudice or appear to prejudice these issues. Hopefully, "collective negotiations" is a part of such terminology.

Legislative history of collective bargaining in the private sector

To fully understand the history of collective negotiations, it is necessary that the researcher be exposed to some of the significant legislation and events that have affected the development of collective bargaining in the United States. Although collective negotiations have had a relatively brief history; when it is viewed as a part of the continuing evolution of the negotiation process, its significance gains import.

The labor movement, however, has endured a long and often violent struggle in its attempt to gain for workers the right to

¹loc. cit., p. 2.

²loc. cit., p. 2.

organize and have some say about the conditions of their employment. Certainly, the precedent for present day collective negotiations can be traced and often compared to the events of the past. Lieberman and Moskow¹ have provided an excellent and comprehensive account of the legislation and events that have led to the present status of the employees' right to organize and negotiate with employers. Their starting point dates back to 1806 and the Philadelphia Cordwainers Case, which was the beginning of what now is referred to as the "criminal conspiracy doctrine." Lieberman and Moskow² write: "In this case, defendants were found guilty of a conspiracy to raise their wages. Thus, at this time any concerted or group action by organized employees was declared illegal by the courts." The courts went so far as to punish violators with criminal penalties, including jail sentences. This decision points out an early anti-labor attitude held by the courts. Supposedly, the criminal conspiracy doctrine came to an end in 1842 with the decision of Chief Justice Shaw of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in the Commonwealth v. Hunt case.³ Justice Shaw ruled that the mere act of combination did not make a labor organization an unlawful body. Whether a combination was criminal or not depended upon the nature and the purpose of the organized group.

¹loc. cit., p. 62.

²loc. cit., p. 63.

³ibid.

The anti-labor attitude in the courts continued to prevail, however, and were reflected in decisions pertaining to the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890. Congress passed this Act in an attempt to limit the monopoly powers of business trusts. The federal courts interpreted terms, such as "person" or "persons" to include labor unions within the meaning of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. The federal courts did not hesitate to rely on this Act to find unions guilty of conspiracy to restrain trade.¹ Lieberman and Moskow² write: "Violators were subject to fines and imprisonment, restraining orders and injunctions, and civil suits for triple damages. Since all three types of penalties were applied to unions, their activities were greatly weakened."

In spite of the specific removal of unions from the application of anti-trust laws under Section 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act of 1914, the United States Supreme Court continued to apply the Sherman Act to unions until the early 1940's. Finally, the Supreme Court conceded in the Apex Hosiery Company v. Leader, United States v. Hutcheson, and Allen Bradley v. Local 3, IBEW cases, that continued application of the Sherman Act had been unjustified.³ "Thus it took a series of judicial decisions in the 1940's to uphold a law passed in 1914 intended to avoid the anti-labor implications of a

¹loc. cit., p. 64.

²ibid.

³loc. cit., pp. 64-65.

law passed in 1890."¹ The courts had restricted the activities of organized workers more than they did the activities of corporations. After the passage of the Sherman-Anti-Trust Act, management developed several powerful weapons for dealing with its employees with the aid of the courts. Lieberman and Moskow² write:

Court injunctions which required unions to stop planned strikes on the grounds that employers would incur grave damages, were used as a strike breaking technique. Also, "yellow-dog contracts," under which employees agreed not to join a union as a condition of employment, gained wide acceptance. It is rather interesting that although both of these measures are now prohibited in private employment, they can be used in education; school boards relied upon court injunctions to prevent teacher strikes several times in the 1960's. Yellow-dog contracts in which teachers have agreed not to join a teacher union have also been used in education, but their legality has never been tested in the Supreme Court.

The power of the federal courts were neutralized in dealing with union-management relations with the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932.³ The passage of this Act reflected a fundamental change in public policy toward labor and, consequently, in the law of labor-management relations as well. The conditions of this Act removed the power of the courts to interfere with or restrict union activities which did involve fraud or violence. It also affirmed the right of workers to engage in collective bargaining through unions of their own choice. "Congress guaranteed labor the

¹ibid.

²ibid.

³loc. cit., p. 66.

right to engage in strikes, secondary boycotts, sympathy strikes, picketing by persons not employees, and other activities where non-employees could assist a firm's employees in labor disputes directly or by applying pressure upon third parties."¹ Lieberman and Moskow² write:

The Norris-LaGuardia Act basically reflected a laissez-faire philosophy of employment relations. Its main effect was to deprive the federal courts of jurisdiction in most labor disputes. The parties were left to their own resources to work out their problems without interference by the courts. The Act did not obligate employers to bargain collectively with unions, but it forbade federal courts from interfering with most of their self-help activities. If the employer was strong enough, he could ignore the union.

The next major legislative development was the National Industrial Recovery Act which was passed by Congress in June, 1933.³ Section 7 (a) of this Act included a forthright endorsement of collective bargaining, however, there were no effective penalties for non-compliance. A number of employers interpreted Section 7 (a) as an invitation to establish "company-dominated unions" or "employee representation plans" that were controlled by the employers. "The major failing of company unions was their lack of power to represent the employees effectively. Since they were created by employers, they were not intended to possess or exert a sufficient amount of power to achieve substantial concessions for their employees."⁴

¹ibid.

²ibid.

³loc. cit., p. 67.

⁴ibid.

In spite of the provisions in the National Industrial Recovery Act, many employers continued with their attempts to prevent union organization. "Yellow-dog contracts, black lists, lockouts, intimidation, spying, and discrimination against union leaders were commonplace."¹ The fight for the right of employees to be represented by an organization of their own choice in collective bargaining led to "large scale riots" and "pitched battles." Following an investigation of industrial espionage by the La Follette Committee of the United States Senate, a significant report was prepared. Lieberman and Moskow² write that the La Follette Committee reported that "1,475 companies had been clients of detective agencies during the years 1933-36 for 'espionage, strike-breaking guards in connection with labor disputes, or similar services.' Company arsenals were found to include pistols, rifles, tear gas bombs, and even machine guns. Expenditures for weapons and strike-breaking services in the years 1933-37 amounted to nearly \$9.5 million."

Intense industrial conflict and instability in labor-management relations motivated congress to enact the National Labor Relations Act, also called the Wagner Act, in 1935 in an attempt to improve employment relations. "Without questions, the Wagner Act was one of the most significant labor laws ever enacted in the United States."³

¹ibid.

²loc. cit., pp. 67-68.

³loc. cit., p. 68.

Because there was such a great disparity of power between the individual employee and his employer, the government felt that it could no longer remain neutral between them. "It was now necessary to limit employers' rights to oppose employee organizations. In this way, the Wagner Act strongly encouraged collective bargaining and constituted a fundamental turning point in public policy concerning labor relations."¹ In a close five-to-four decision, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Wagner Act in the NLRB v. Jones and Laughlin Steele Company case, on April 12, 1937. Lieberman and Moskow² present the following discussion about the decision and applicability of the Act to public employees, especially teachers:

This decision, one of the most important in the entire history of labor relations in this country, upheld the right of employees to organize and various administrative measures taken by the National Labor Relations Board to protect that right. Since the Jones and Laughlin case, all federal labor legislation has been based upon the commerce clause of the constitution, and no major legislation in this area has been declared unconstitutional.

In part, the commerce clause determines the range of employees who are covered by federal labor legislation, since such legislation applies to anyone engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce. Employees working for the federal government, for any wholly owned government subsidiary, for any state or political division thereof, or for non-profit hospitals have been specifically excluded from federal labor legislation.

¹loc. cit., pp. 68-69.

²ibid.

Legally speaking, school boards are subdivisions of state governments; hence teachers work for a political subdivision of the state. For this reason, they are excluded from coverage of federal labor legislation. Some educators have expressed concern lest education might be covered by federal labor law, but this is unrealistic. Federal regulation of employment relations in public education would constitute a major change in our federal system, and there appears to be little likelihood of any such change in the foreseeable future. It is up to each state to regulate employment relations in public education. Presumably, any state legislature or state court which applies labor laws or precedents to education will do so only because it believes such application to be justified on its merits.

Many of the rights accorded employees under the Wagner Act were not new, however, under the provisions of this Act these rights were enforceable by appropriate measures. The Act spelled out a number of unfair labor practices for employers and it established the National Labor Relations Board to investigate and correct abuses. In addition, the Wagner Act provided that employees could elect their representatives to bargain collectively for them, and employers had to recognize and bargain with these representatives.

In spite of growing legislative support by the courts, the Labor Movement continued to have problems. The general public became disenchanted by the rash of strikes in the middle of the 1940's and its attitude toward unions changed considerably by 1947. "Although concern was still expressed about 'inequality of bargaining power,' there was a widespread feeling that unions had too much power instead of too little."¹ Just as unfair labor practices had been spelled out in the Wagner Act, a set of unfair labor practices for unions

¹loc. cit., p. 74.

were incorporated in the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Unions had applied pressures, such as illegal strikes, secondary boycotts, featherbedding, and closed shop agreements. The Taft-Hartley Act was enacted to insure union responsibility for their actions. Employers, individual employees, and individual union members needed protection. Just as the Wagner Act had originally guaranteed employees the right to self-organization and to designate representatives of their own choosing, the Taft-Hartley Act guaranteed that employees had ". . . the right to refrain from any or all such activities."¹

Twelve years after passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Senate Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor Movement Field, more commonly known as the McClellan Committee, documented unethical practices by unions and recommended legislation to regulate the "internal affairs of union organizations."² Essentially, this recommendation led to the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin Act which provided a number of provisions designed to ensure "internal democracy and fiscal integrity in employee organizations."³

As mentioned earlier, federal legislation, such as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, and the Landrum-Griffin Act, apply only to private employees working in firms which

¹loc. cit., p. 75.

²loc. cit., p. 76.

³loc. cit., p. 78.

affect interstate commerce. Thus, these acts do not apply to all employees in the private sector. Neither do they apply to public employees at the federal, state, or local level. Lieberman and Moskow¹ write:

As school boards are required to negotiate with teacher organizations, there is likely to be some sentiment for ensuring organizational democracy and fiscal integrity. The extent to which legal regulation is necessary to achieve these objectives is debatable, but some movement in these directions is inevitable. Greater responsibility and accountability must accompany greater power. This is a characteristic of our society and there is no reason why teachers' organizations should be an exception to it. Of course, the extent to which these organizations voluntarily adopt certain safeguards will affect the extent of legal regulation imposed on them.

In June, 1961, President Kennedy appointed a committee to study and make recommendations regarding employment-management relations in the federal service.² This action reflected the view that employment-management in the federal service could be improved by greater employee participation. Following the final committee report and recommendations, President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988 on January 7, 1962. The following is a summary of the major provisions of Executive Order 10988: (1) federal employees were guaranteed the right to join organizations of their own choice; (2) employee organizations were accorded informal, formal, or exclusive recognition; (3) a majority of eligible employees could designate a particular organization to represent them with respect to personnel policies and

¹ibid.

²loc. cit., p. 83.

working conditions; (4) the Order authorized advisory arbitration or contract interpretation or application; however, such arbitration may not be used to resolve impasses concerning conditions of employment; (5) the Order denies recognition of organizations which assert the right to strike against the United States government or which advocate the overthrow of our constitutional form of government; and (6) employee organizations may not discriminate against any employee with regard to terms or conditions of membership because of race, religion, or national origin.¹

Therefore, Executive Order 10988 was the first legislative move to provide the precedent that was needed for states to enact similar legislation permitting or requiring state employing agencies to grant public employees the right to organize and to negotiate working conditions.

History of collective negotiations in education

Formal collective negotiations in education have had a relatively brief history; however, there are probably many examples of some kind of informal negotiations that have taken place between teachers and school boards over the years. For example, in 1946, a collective negotiations agreement was reached between the Norwalk, Connecticut Teachers' Association and the Norwalk Board of Education² concerning

¹loc. cit., pp. 83-84.

²loc. cit., p. 473.

a dispute over salary rates. The teachers had rejected individual contracts and refused to return to their teaching duties. After further negotiations, in which the governor and the state board of education took part, a contract was finally approved and accepted by both parties. The teachers' organization was recognized as the bargaining agent for all of its members. It defined working conditions and set up a grievance procedure and salary schedule. Similar contracts were entered into in succeeding years. Again in 1951, the Norwalk Teachers' Association and the School Board were involved in a landmark case concerning the legality of teacher-board negotiations. The Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors answered "yes" to the following question: "Is collective bargaining to establish salaries permissible between the plaintiff (teachers' association) and the defendant (school board)?"¹ The Court went on to explain and qualify its decision.²

The statutes . . . give broad powers to the defendant with reference to educational matters and school management in Norwalk. If it chooses to negotiate with the plaintiff with regard to employment, salaries, grievance procedure and working conditions of its members, there is no statute . . . which forbids such negotiations. It is a matter of common knowledge that this is a method pursued in most school systems large enough to support a teachers' association in some form. It would seem to make no difference theoretically whether the negotiations are with a committee of the whole association or with individuals or small related groups, so long as any agreement made with the committee is confined to members of the association. (All but two of the Norwalk teachers belonged to the association) . . . The claim of the defendant that this

¹Doherty and Oberer, op. cit., p. 56.

²ibid.

would be an illegal delegation of authority is without merit. The authority is and remains with the board.

The court continued:¹

The qualified "yes" which we give . . . should not be construed as authority to negotiate a contract which involves the surrender of the boards' legal discretion, is contrary to law or is otherwise ultra vires.

Lieberman and Moskow² suggest that for all practical purposes, 1960 marked the beginning of the collective negotiation movement in the United States. "Prior to 1960, both the NEA and the AFT had advocated various forms of collective action by teachers but nothing that would be deemed collective negotiations. . . ."³ One of the major factors that slowed the progress toward collective negotiations was the lack of unity and organizational power within the teaching ranks. This point is made clear when Lieberman and Moskow⁴ write:

In the late 1950's, New York City's teachers presented a picture of organizational chaos unmatched in American education. There were at least ninety-three teachers' organizations in the school system. These organizations were organized on virtually every conceivable basis; grade level, borough, religion, subject matter, administrative rank, years of preparation, and so on.

This multiplicity in and of itself would not have been so harmful except for the fact that most of these organizations claimed to represent their members in dealing with school boards. As a result . . . teachers of New York City were completely ineffectual despite their enormous power as a unified group.

¹ ibid.

² op. cit., p. 35.

³ ibid.

⁴ ibid.

During the 1960's, however, the three thousand member New York Teachers' Guild (AFT) and the High School Teachers' Association (HSTA) worked out an uneasy but successful merger.¹ This new organization kept the AFT charter held by the Teachers' Guild and became the United Federation of Teachers. This organization then embarked on developing a program that would appeal to most of the teachers in the system. Shortly after the merger the UFT drafted and submitted a number of proposals to the New York City Board of Education, including one calling for collective bargaining between the Board and the teachers. It is interesting to note that the UFT did not request that it be designated as the representative of the teachers. Instead, it requested that action be taken to determine which organization, if any, the teachers wished to have represent them.² After some time the UFT threatened to strike unless some action was taken concerning its proposals. As a result, the election proposal was acknowledged and an election was held. Finally, in December, 1961, after considerable controversy and political maneuvering on both sides, the United Federation of Teachers won the exclusive right to represent the teachers of New York City in their negotiations with the board. Since that time there has been a phenomenally rapid growth in the collective negotiations movement throughout the United States.

¹ibid.

²loc. cit., p. 36.

Phi Delta Kappan¹ reported, "By September, 1969, over one third of all U.S. teachers, kindergarten through high school are employed in districts where collective negotiated contracts are in force."

Schmidt, Parker, and Repas² write as follows:

In these and potentially thousands of other school districts across the country, teachers and boards of education are sitting down at the bargaining table to resolve the classical questions of equity in wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Like their counterparts in private industry, they have made the questions of appropriate representation, political involvement, and bargainable issues the major focus of their discussions. Although the answers may differ from state to state, the process in education has evolved in much the same way as it has in private industry.

Causal factors in the emergence of collective negotiations in public education

What major factors have caused the rapid emergence of collective negotiations in public education? Lieberman and Moskow³ discuss several significant factors.

The first factor is the need for "effective representation at the local level." As a result of organizational inadequacies at the local level, school boards have almost always set the salaries and working conditions unilaterally. Teacher recommendations to the board could be rejected without explanation. "Many educators believe

¹ _____, "Present Scope of Teacher Negotiations: Employment Relations in Higher Education." Phi Delta Kappan, LI (September, 1969), 60.

²Schmidt, op. cit., p. 4.

³op. cit., p. 55.

collective negotiations are chiefly a reaction to ineffective school administration. This view is an over simplification. Although an ineffective school administrator can stimulate the development of collective negotiations, an effective administrator cannot always avoid them. Events clearly beyond the control of school administrators may bring about collective negotiations. Therefore, it is a mistake to regard collective negotiations as merely a crisis-inspired reaction,"¹

The second factor pertains to "changes in teachers attitudes." In a 1952 study conducted by the NEA's Research Division,² superintendents were asked: "If no group has been recognized for collective bargaining, what are the primary reasons why this procedure has not developed?" Ninety-four per cent of the superintendents answered that, in their opinion, the procedure was not deemed necessary by the teachers and the administration. "Clearly, no such result would be forth coming today."³

The third factor is "organizational rivalry." Both the NEA and AFT have been under increasing pressure to demonstrate that each can do more for teachers than its rival. "Just as both the NEA and AFT publicize their successes, so they publicize situations wherein affiliates of the rival organization supposedly bungled the task of

¹ibid.

²loc. cit., p. 57.

³ibid.

representing teachers effectively."¹ Lieberman and Moskow² feel that "the organizational rivalry between the NEA and the AFT is perhaps the most important single factor underlying the rapid spread of collective negotiations." Bramlett,³ presents an important observation about the NEA and AFT rivalry when he writes about more recent changes in the philosophies of both groups:

". . . the differences between the two philosophies and tactics implied by the NEA's professional negotiations and the AFT's collective bargaining are minor indeed. Both organizations have competed for teacher membership, and both organizations have catered to higher salaries and better working conditions. Further, the two organizations have used pressure tactics including strikes and sanctions to reach their objectives. There is evidence that the advocated procedures and philosophies of the two organizations are coming closer together. In Flint, Michigan in September, 1969, the Flint Federation of Teachers and the Flint Education Association, local affiliates of AFT and NEA respectively, merged into one teachers' organization; thus becoming the first merger of these heretofore rival organizations in the nation.

The fourth factor is concerned with "larger school districts."⁴ The consolidation of many small school districts has led to the increased size of those remaining districts. "The decrease in the number of school districts is impressive: 104,000 districts in 1947, 59,000 in 1956, and 26,000 (operating districts) in 1964."⁵ The size

¹loc. cit., p. 58.

²ibid.

³Bramlett, Troy E., "The Relationship of Public Act 379 to the Elementary School Principal's Role Behavior in Kalamazoo County, Michigan." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, April, 1970. p. 27.

⁴op. cit., p. 58.

⁵ibid.

of a system is important in organizational dynamics. The larger the system, the easier it is for teachers to support the local organization which represent their interests. Collective negotiations have emerged from large city systems "characterized by slum areas, heavy teacher mobility, hierarchical administration, and other phenomena which tend to make teachers more receptive to collective mechanisms for solving their problems."¹ Large school districts seem to generate a feeling of lost identity for those who are involved in the milieu. Stinnett² states the following:

It has been said that "in the small community the teacher is everything; in the great city he is nothing." This has a devastating effect upon the spirit of any human being, especially upon the articulate and perceptive teacher. He resents the loss of identity. As a result he often tends in overt ways to gain some kind of solid recognition. If he doesn't get a recognition in well planned ways, he will seek it in rebellious ways, or ways that appear to be rebellious in the light of past mores.

The fifth factor is entitled the "snowball" effect.³ "A school board which is reluctant to be the first or only board in the state to negotiate collectively may find it easier to be the tenth to do so. Each state law that places some obligation on school boards to negotiate makes it easier to convince other legislatures that they ought to enact such laws."⁴

¹loc. cit., p. 59.

²Stinnett, op. cit., p. 5.

³op. cit., p. 59.

⁴ibid.

The sixth factor deals with "developments outside education." It is apparent that some of the basic ideas espoused by teacher organizations originated in the private sector. Many teachers have been reluctant to identify with industrial workers, but they frequently have common interests with other public employees. There seems to be little doubt that the attitudes of teachers toward collective negotiations have been strongly influenced by developments in both private and public employment.

Stinnett, Kleinmann and Ware² have also written about some "causal factors in teacher demands for participation" that should be considered. First, they discuss the "mounting impatience of teachers with what they consider economic injustice." Historically teacher salaries have lagged behind what comparable groups have earned. "As a quite general practice, soothing phrases about the importance of teachers has been proffered them in lieu of increased economic rewards." As a result, teachers have decided to "become involved in matters pertaining to economic justice." Second, teachers have "grown increasingly bitter at the neglect of schools by our affluent society." They are concerned about obsolete school buildings, inadequate facilities, overloaded classrooms, and the deterioration in the quality of education that is offered. Teachers

¹ibid.

²Stinnett, op. cit., pp. 4-6.

have realized that they cannot continue to be passive. They feel they must join in a vigorous effort to effect needed changes. Third, the push for human and civil rights has had great impact everywhere. It is quite possible that this has had a psychological effect on teachers who have viewed their treatment by society as being far less than that commensurate with the importance of their contribution to the general welfare. "Apparently, the activism of the civil rights movement and the effectiveness of that activism have had a significant impact upon the behavior patterns of teachers who have aspired to improve their status."¹ Stinnett, Kleinman and Ware² conclude this section by writing:

What teachers hunger for most, above salaries and welfare matters-as important as these are-is recognition and dignity. And the answer to this hunger is to be found in enlightened personnel policies which, in fact, reflect society's recognition of teachers as competent professionals, who if competent to teach our children, are competent to have a real, not token, part in the planning of the educational program for those children.

Research studies concerning collective negotiations

In a study by Carlton³ at the University of North Carolina, 1966, certificated instructional personnel in North Carolina were

¹ibid.

²ibid.

³Carlton, Patrick W., "Attitudes of Certificated Instructional Personnel in North Carolina Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiation and 'Sanctions.'" Dissertation Abstracts International, XXX, (October, 1969).

questioned concerning their attitudes toward collective negotiations and "sanctions." The purposes of the study were: (1) to identify, measure, describe, and compare attitudes of teachers and principals toward collective negotiations and sanctions; and (2) to compare traditional-progressive attitudes between teachers and principals. The study was implemented through the use of two attitude measuring instruments, the Collective Action Scale, developed by the researcher, and Kirlinger's Education Scale I.

The total sample size was 1,249, of which 849 useable returns were obtained. The sample was categorized on the basis of sex and position. The data were analyzed by using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation to determine whether attitudes toward collective negotiation and progressivism-traditionalism were related. In addition, two part analysis of variance was used to identify significant response difference within the sample. Where analysis of variance indicated significant differences between or among the subsets, t was used to further isolate sources of variance.

The following is a summary of the findings and conclusions in Carlton's study:¹

1. A low but significant correlation between attitudes toward collective action and progressivism in education was identified, indicating that those respondents holding progressive views tended to favor collective action, and visa versa. Female principals apparently saw no connection between progressive educational philosophy and collective action.

¹ Ibid.

2. No significant relationship between ideas dealing with collective action and traditionalism was found.
3. Male teachers in North Carolina were more favorable to collective action than female teachers, possibly because they were primary income earners
4. Female teachers tended to be neutral on the subject of collective negotiations.
5. Male teachers . . . were more favorable to collective action than male principals, apparently as a result of "economic-administrative" factors.
6. Male principals . . . were less negative toward collective action than female principals. Male principals tended to be neutral in their attitudes to collective action.
7. Male and female teachers in North Carolina showed similar attitudinal patterns toward progressive educational ideas. They also showed similar attitudinal patterns toward traditional educational ideas.
8. Male principals . . . were found to be more progressive than female principals in their educational beliefs.
9. Attitudes of North Carolina educators toward progressive educational thought apparently were not significantly affected by the positions in which the individuals were employed.
10. Male and female teachers . . . were found to be more traditional in their educational philosophies than male and female principals. This may have been because of the higher educational levels obtained by the principals.

It is interesting to note that nothing was mentioned in this summary of findings and conclusions pertaining directly to the attitudes of educators toward "sanctions."

A study by Oker¹, at St. Louis University in 1968, was also designed to measure the attitudes of teachers toward the negotiation process. Three aspects of professional negotiation were investigated: (1) the subjects of negotiation, (2) the process of negotiation, and (3) the interested parties of negotiation. A demographic inventory was included in the questionnaire mailed to teachers. The data were analyzed by computing chi-squares to test for significant influence of the items in the demographic inventory on the attitudes of teachers toward negotiation.

Some of the more significant findings of the study were:²

1. Men had a higher return of questionnaires than women.
2. Teachers employed in the two districts having level-three agreements had the best return of questionnaires.
3. Teachers employed in districts having no written negotiation agreement were more aware of their absence of agreement than teachers employed in districts were aware of the nature of their agreements.
4. Elementary teachers had the lowest return of questionnaires.
5. Teachers exhibited high consistency in their response to related propositions to the process of negotiation toward the interested parties of negotiation.
6. Teachers agreed to every proposition concerning the subjects of negotiation. The greatest agreement was shown toward the negotiability of salary; the least agreement was expressed toward the negotiability of policies for employing new teachers.

¹Oker, Robert Lee, "A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers in St. Louis County, Missouri, School Districts Toward Negotiation." Dissertation Abstracts International, xxx (October, 1969), p. 1372-A

²ibid.

7. Teacher organizations are desirable, but unions are not the most desirable form of organization.
8. Teachers have a positive attitude toward the principal in negotiation and cast his role in negotiation away from the superintendent.
9. Teachers rejected strikes as a desirable means to achieve educational goals. Teachers did not see strikes as being as effective as sanctions.
10. Teachers saw better board-teacher relations being the outcome of the negotiation process.
11. Teachers did not know where to place the superintendent in negotiation sessions.
12. Teaching assignment had the second most significant influence on teacher attitude toward the subjects of negotiation.
13. Membership in a teacher organization had no significant influence on teacher attitude toward professional negotiation.

Several interesting conclusions were reported from these findings. First, male teachers seem to be more actively concerned about the negotiation process. Second, teachers seem to have a more positive attitude toward the principal in relation to the negotiation process than would generally be expected. Third, the fact that "teaching assignment" had the second most significant influence on teacher attitude toward subjects of negotiation, indicates that serious consideration should be given to those factors which generate greater job satisfaction. Fourth, it is interesting to note that teachers feel the negotiations process will lead to improved, rather than negative, relations with the board.

In a recent study by O'Hare¹ at Iowa State University in 1969, the perceptions of Iowa teachers and superintendents were measured in an attempt to "delineate the status of the collective negotiations phenomenon." A sample of 115 districts were randomly selected from the 455 public school districts in Iowa. The sample was stratified on enrollment size. The data were statistically treated by using frequency analysis and chi-squares on responses to the question: "What is the primary of findings?"²

The study revealed that:

1. The right to collectively negotiate.
2. The most important item to be negotiated.
3. Technical personnel belong with classroom teachers in the negotiation process.
4. State negotiation guidelines should cover teachers separately from other public employees.
5. The educational organizations will enjoy increased importance.

The study revealed that teachers and superintendents disagree on:

1. the existence of direct teacher-board communication;
2. the role of the superintendent and his supervisory personnel;
3. the right to strike;

¹O'Hare, Marvin George, "Collective Negotiations as Perceived by Iowa Teachers and Superintendents." Dissertation Abstracts International, xxx (October, 1969), p. 1359-A.

²ibid.

In a recent study by O'Hare¹ at Iowa State University in 1969, the perceptions of Iowa teachers and superintendents were measured in an attempt to "delineate the status of the collective negotiations phenomenon." A sample of 115 districts were randomly selected from the 455 public school districts in Iowa. The sample was stratified on enrollment size. The data were statistically treated by using frequency counts, percentages, and chi-squares on responses to the questions. The following is a summary of findings:²

Teachers and superintendents agree that:

1. Teachers should have the right to collectively negotiate with their local boards.
2. "Salaries and wages" is the most important item to be negotiated.
3. Technical instructional personnel belong with classroom teachers in the negotiation process.
4. State negotiation guidelines should cover teachers separately from other public employees.
5. The educational organizations will enjoy increased importance.

The study revealed that teachers and superintendents disagree on:

1. the existence of direct teacher-board communication;
2. the role of the superintendent and his supervisory personnel;
3. the right to strike;

¹O'Hare, Marvin George, "Collective Negotiations as Perceived by Iowa Teachers and Superintendents." Dissertation Abstracts International, xxx (October, 1969), p. 1359-A.

²ibid.

4. exclusive negotiating rights of the majority organizations;
5. the composition of the negotiation unit;
6. the enactment of a state negotiation statute;
7. the scope of a state negotiation statute;
8. the suggestion of a merger of AFT and NEA;
9. the factors that ignite teacher militancy.

The study further revealed that:

1. Elementary and secondary teachers view the negotiation phenomenon similarly.
2. Respondents from larger schools tend to express the same attitude toward negotiations as do their counterparts from smaller schools.
3. There is a high degree of job satisfaction among Iowa teachers and superintendents.

In spite of the fact that a number of the findings in this particular study are expressed more as opinions than as perceptions, it is important to point out the growing necessity to investigate perceptual differences of individuals, especially within organizations that are attempting to resolve interpersonal conflict. "The right to strike" is an opinion; however, the disagreement between teachers and the superintendent concerning "the existence of direct teacher-board communication" is a perception. The important issue here is that perceptual differences should be investigated and clarified if they exist. For example, if superintendents take measures to review and improve communications by involving teachers in the process, perceptions and attitudes should become more congruent. It could well be that the channels of communication were

open, but if they are perceived to be closed, they are closed until the perception is changed. The breakdown could be in perceptions not communications.

The future of collective negotiations

In an excellent review of the literature by Smith,¹ ERIC/CEA editor, 1968, the recent works of Lieberman, Moskow, Elam, Doherty, Oberer, Stinnett, Klienman, Ware, Dykes, Allen, Schmid, and others were summarized. One section of the review entitled "Future of Negotiations" was particularly interesting and appropriate for concluding this section on collective negotiations. "The consensus of these authors seems to be that the movement will expand at a continuing rapid rate, and that negotiations will continue to take place under a variety of procedures."² Some of the more specific recommendations and predictions were:

1. The authors generally favor legislation that permits flexibility in the conduct of negotiations so that procedures can be adopted that fit local conditions.
2. Teachers are expected to continue their demands for meaningful negotiations with school boards and to organize more effectively.

¹Smith, Stuart C., Collective Negotiations in Education: A Review of the Literature. ERIC/CEA Supplement, Center of Advanced Study in Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968, pp. 1-8.

²loc. cit., p. 6.

3. More states will adopt collective negotiations statutes.
4. Increased power of teachers "is generally welcomed as a prerequisite for a strong educational system."
5. "Dykes considers the resistance of administrators and boards of education to greater involvement of teachers in decision making to be 'irrational.'"
6. In Dykes' view, "collective negotiations is one of a number of large social and cultural changes which will contribute to a reduction of conflict between teachers and administrators and to a democratization of the organizational structure of schools."
7. Administrators will not be relegated to positions of secondary importance. They will be required to "provide stronger and more effective leadership than is currently provided."
8. On the other hand, Ohm anticipates "a growing conflict between teachers and administrators" and pleas for "extensive and intensive research on the problem."
9. There is conflicting opinion among writers concerning a possible merger of NEA and AFT.
10. The fiscal structure of local school boards will probably have to be adjusted in ways which will both increase and decrease the authority of school boards to make certain decisions.
11. School district consolidation will probably increase "as public financial authorities seek to broaden the geographical base for taxes to meet teacher demands."
12. Teacher organizations will rapidly improve staffing, funding, and overall leadership.

In conclusion, Smith¹ writes:

. . . education must remain a cooperative enterprise of teachers, supervisors, administrators, and boards of education; proper use of the negotiations process by each of these groups is one way to guarantee that it will.

It is clear the future of the collective negotiation process depends a great deal on what is happening now, and what has gone on in the past. It appears that there is a general consensus that the negotiation process will eventually lead to improved educational conditions; however, just as the collective bargaining model has been adopted by teachers' organizations to formalize employer-employee relationships, so have these same organizations adopted militant tactics, such as strikes and sanctions in their attempt to enforce demands. There are those who deeply resent and are fearful of this increasing wave of teacher "militancy."

Work Stoppage, Strikes, and Sanctions

The terms work stoppage, strikes, and sanctions are clarified in the literature as follows:

Work stoppage: Lieberman and Moskow² define "work stoppage" as:

A temporary halt to work, initiated by workers or employer, in the form of a strike or lockout. This term was adopted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to replace "strikes and lockouts." In aggregate figures, "work stoppages" usually means "strikes and lockouts, if any"; as applied to a single stoppage. It usually means strike "or" lockout unless it is clear that it can only be one.

¹loc. cit., p. 8.

²Lieberman, op. cit., p. 429.

Strike: Lieberman and Moskow¹ define "strike" as:

Temporary stoppage of work by a group of employees (not necessarily members of a union) to express a grievance, enforce a demand for changes in the conditions of employment, obtain recognition, or resolve a dispute with management.

Koontz² defines "strike" as:

The term "strike" or "work stoppage" is used here as any concerted group effort that disrupts the regular scheduled instructional periods for at least one day. Strikes or work stoppages may affect a particular school building, a local school district, or a state school system.

Sanctions: The American College Dictionary³ defines "sanction" as:

1. authoritative permission; countenance or support given to an action. 2. something to support an action, etc. 3. binding force given, or something which gives binding force, as to an oath, rule of conduct, etc. . . .

Lieberman and Moskow⁴ discuss sanctions as follows:

. . . sanctions consist of a wide range of techniques, each of which has a different impact on a school system. Indeed the term itself is nothing more than a wide range of things teachers can do to increase pressure on a school administration; when one looks at the meaning of "sanctions" in practice, it is difficult to see where they consist of anything new, either in education or private employment.

Two examples of sanctions that have been used in education are:

(1) discouraging teachers from applying for jobs in a particular school district, and (2) encouraging teachers in a district to

¹loc. cit., p. 428.

²Koontz, Elizabeth D., "NEA Views on Teacher Strikes." Childhood Education, XLV (April, 1969), pp. 435-36.

³Barnhart, C.L. (Ed.), The American College Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1964, p. 1073.

⁴Lieberman, op. cit., p. 307.

resign. Sanctions such as these are extreme and can do considerable harm to a district. They are, however, a source of power to those organizations that elect to apply pressure through sanctions.

Essential elements of sanctions and strikes

Some individuals have difficulty in seeing differences between professional sanctions and strikes by teachers. It is argued that withdrawing of withholding services is tantamount to a strike. There are essential differences that should be considered. Stinnett¹ writes: "The sanctions of withdrawing or withholding services by teachers do not violate existing contracts." Generally, sanctions are invoked effective the following school year. This procedure allows the offending school district several months notice to correct those conditions which prevent adequate educational services. The power of the sanction lacks in its appeal to public opinion. "If the facts supporting the profession's judgment are clear that high quality services to children cannot be provided under existing conditions, parents will not often support the short-changing of their children."²

Stinnett³ discusses the legality of sanctions when he writes:

Whether the courts will equate professional sanctions with teacher strikes in the public schools, and thus declare the former illegal under the laws of certain states, probably

¹Stinnett, op. cit., p. 129.

²ibid.

³loc. cit., pp. 129-30.

cannot at present be predicted. There are some precedents, but they are not extensive enough to be definitive.

Stinnett¹ cites the following examples of what could be considered legal precedents:

In the Little Lake (California) sanctions' case, the district asked the court to enjoin the California Teachers' Association from withholding teacher placement services, and from discouraging its members from seeking employment in the District. The courts declined to issue such injunctions. An informal commitment of the courts expressed the point of view that criticism of public agencies is a part of the concept of a democratic society.

.....
 A decision of the National Labor Relations Board, with reference to a case in private industry, indicates there are three essential elements in a strike: (1) an employee-employer relationship must exist; (2) there must be a refusal by employees to perform all or part of the work they were hired to do; and (3) the refusal to perform the work must be concerted. This decision said: "The broadest definition of a strike includes 'quitting work' or 'stoppage of work.' Men cannot quit work before they are hired; they cannot stop work before they start. We reject therefore, the contention that the alleged refusal to refer employees (by the union involved) should be construed as a strike."

This decision would seem to have some analogy to various sanctions that have been applied in education. Such sanctions would appear not to embrace all of the three essential elements in a strike as previously described.

Legality of strikes:

The legal right that private employees enjoy to strike and engage in activities, such as picketing and boycotts is a powerful bargaining leverage; however, such activities have rarely been

¹ibid.

considered legal in public employment. At least fifteen states have enacted legislation prohibiting strikes by public employees. In the absence of statutes, many state courts have applied sanctions on those participating in strike activities.¹

The legal view that strikes by public employees are illegal is usually justified on the basis of "sovereignty." The Connecticut court supported the sovereignty argument in the Norwalk Teachers' case. In its ruling regarding strikes, it said:²

In the American system, sovereignty is inherent in the people. They can delegate it to a government which they create and operate by law. They can give that government the power and authority to perform certain duties and furnish certain services. The government so created and empowered must employ people to carry on its task. Those people are agents of the government. They exercise some part of the sovereignty entrusted to it. They occupy a status entirely different from those who carry on a private enterprise. To say that they can strike is equivalent to saying they can deny the authority of government and contravene the public welfare.

The "sovereignty" argument leaves teachers and other public employees in a curious position during collective bargaining. While they may bargain collectively, they are legally denied the right to engage in those demonstrations of strength which have, at times, been found necessary to produce agreement at the bargaining table.

There are those who do not subscribe to the "sovereignty" argument. This line of reasoning has produced a counter-argument which favors legalizing teacher strikes. Supporters of this view

¹Doherty and Oberer, op. cit., p. 97.

²ibid.

infer a constitutional basis for their position. Moskow¹ writes:

Some authorities still maintain, however, that "no-strike" statutes are only constitutional when the health and safety of the public are endangered. They would have no objection to "no-strike" legislation pertaining to policemen and firemen, since this would clearly jeopardize the health and safety of the public.

. . . These authorities feel that statutes should at least say that under some circumstances public employees have the right to strike.

Moskow² cites two recent court cases that "seem to differ from the traditional view towards strikes by public employees." The New Hampshire Supreme Court upheld an injunction prohibiting a teacher organization from striking. In its opinion the court said:³

"There is no doubt that the Legislature is to provide by 'Statute' that public employees may enforce their right to collective bargaining by arbitration or strike."

In another opinion in a Minnesota case the court said:⁴

". . . to indulge in the expression of a personal belief and then to ascribe to it a legality on some tenuous theory of sovereignty or supremacy of government . . . the right to strike is rooted in the freedom of men, and he may not be denied that right except by clear, unequivocal language embodied in a constitution, statute, ordinance, rule, or contract."

Whether or not these opinions can be considered beginning modifications in the traditional sovereignty view is debatable. In any event, the traditional view still exists and strikes by public employees, including teachers, are illegal.

¹ Moskow, Michael H., Teachers and Unions, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania, 1966, p. 54.

² *ibid.*

³ *ibid.*

⁴ *ibid.*

Strike statistics

In spite of the fact that strikes and work stoppages are illegal, they have been increasing at a rapid rate. Koontz¹ writes: "Although no teacher wants to strike, many thousands of them have felt that they must strike--that they have been forced to leave their classrooms to obtain improved education for children and better teaching conditions. From 1940 through July, 1968, more than 287,000 teachers participated in 295 work stoppages involving an estimated 1,824,363 man-days."

The NEA Research Bulletin² reports:

The past school year from August, 1967 through June, 1968, was witness to a vertiable explosion in teacher strikes and work stoppages--a total of 114. These strikes accounted for over one-third of the number of teacher strikes and 80 percent of the estimated number of man-days involved in strikes since 1940. They occurred in 21 of the 50 states and in the District of Columbia and ranged from 1 day to more than 3 weeks.

Koontz³ reports on teacher organization involvement in the 114 strikes during the 1967-68 school year:

. . . 70 of which were called by local and state affiliates of the National Education Association (NEA), 38 by affiliates of the teachers' union, 2 by joint action of the local association and the union, 1 by an unaffiliated organization, and 3 by teachers who belonged to no organization.

¹Koontz, op. cit., p. 435.

²_____, "Teacher Strikes in Perspective." NEA Research Bulletin, XLVI (December, 1968), pp. 113-116.

³loc. cit.

Lambert¹ suggests that strikes have been nurtured by the apathy of the public and some school officials. He predicts that strikes "are destined to decrease, however, as the taxpaying public exhibits a willingness to pay for quality education and as ground rules for teacher-board negotiations become perfected and accepted in more communities."

NEA and AFT positions and policies on strikes or work stoppages

Teacher strikes are illegal, and yet both the NEA and the AFT have increasingly supported their affiliates who have become involved in such action. Basic positions and policies have changed in both organizations; however, the greatest change has taken place within the National Education Association.

In 1962, the NEA's Representative Assembly passed the following resolution:²

The seeking of consensus and mutual agreement on a professional basis should preclude the arbitrary exercise of unilateral authority by boards of education and the use of strikes by teachers.

In 1965, the last seven words of the resolution were changed to read:³

The seeking of consensus and mutual agreement on a professional basis should preclude the arbitrary exercise of unilateral authority by boards of education, administrators, or teachers.

¹ibid.

²Lieberman, op. cit., p. 289.

³ibid.

Lieberman and Moskow¹ report that: ". . . prior to the 1965 amendment, the resolution in force did not assert that the NEA was opposed to teacher strikes, regardless of the circumstances. Neither did it state the conditions under which the NEA would approve a teacher' strike. In effect, it said only that strikes would not happen if people were reasonable."

In May of 1968, the Representative Assembly adopted the following policy regarding strikes:²

The National Education Association recognizes that the deplorable conditions in education in some school systems have brought about emergency situations which have forced educators to take drastic measures.

The Association recommends several procedures to be used in the resolution of impasse. They are mediation, fact-finding, voluntary arbitration, political action, and sanctions. The Association believes these procedures should make the strike unnecessary and recommends that every effort be made to avoid the strike as a procedure for the resolution of impasse. The Association supports efforts by its state and local affiliates to obtain repeal of state laws which prohibit the withdrawal of services.

It recognizes that under conditions of severe stress, causing deterioration of the education program, and when good faith attempts at resolution have been rejected, strikes have occurred and may occur in the future. In such instances, the Association will offer all of the services at its command to the affiliate concerned to help resolve the impasse.

The Association denounces the practice of staffing schools with any personnel when, in an effort to provide high quality education, educators withdraw their services.

¹loc. cit., p. 292.

²Koontz, op. cit., p. 436.

The NEA has spelled out its position and its intent to support those affiliates who "withdraw their services." The motive for this position is clear when one considers the following statement by Koontz:¹ "I do not see how the NEA could adopt any other policy. It must support its affiliates or go out of business." This statement substantiates the view that policies and positions have been forced to change in order to meet the competition for membership between these rival organizations.

The AFT position, on the other hand, has been quite clear since the adoption of the following resolution in 1964:²

. . .

Whereas, numerous boards of education have refused to grant the right to a representation election in accordance with established policy, procedure, and practice in other areas of employment, and

Whereas, even after the establishment of collective bargaining school boards often fail to bargain in good faith,

Therefore Be It Resolved: that the AFT recognize the right of locals to strike under certain circumstances, and Be It Further

Resolved: that the AFT urge the AFL-CIO and affiliated international unions to support such strikes when they occur.

This resolution represented a change in long standing AFT policy. Prior to 1963, the AFT had officially renounced resort to strikes and AFT support for locals which used them.³

Regardless of national policies, affiliates of both the AFT and the NEA have been involved in a large number of strikes.

Because the term "strike" is unpopular and because strikes may evoke heavy legal penalties, both organizations have applied other

¹ibid.

²op. cit., p. 292.

³ibid.

labels, such as "mass-resignation", and "professional holidays." Regardless of organizational semantics; administrators, citizens, and many educators see no basic differences between such labels. In fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics counts a "professional holiday" as a strike in its statistics on work stoppages by teachers. Lieberman and Moskow¹ point out that: ". . . from a legal standpoint there is no difference between 'professional holiday' and 'strikes.'" Both actions could be enjoined by the courts and could subject organization leaders to fines and imprisonment for such violations.

Effects of strikes on pupils

Some of the major arguments against teacher strikes deal with the adverse effect they have on children. There are those who argue that strikes deprive children of schooling. In a majority of cases, however, such closings are invariably made up by lengthening the school year or adjusting the school calendar. Classes that are missed by students can, and generally are, made up at a later date.

Lieberman and Moskow² give the following answer to the question: "Should teacher strikes be prohibited for the sake of children?"

We don't even know how long such a strike would have to be, but it would have to continue for a long time indeed to justify this argument. Schools are closed for summer, Christmas, Easter, and Thanksgiving vacations, for football games, basketball tournaments, harvesting, teachers' conventions, inclement weather, presidential visits, and for a host of other reasons

¹loc. cit., p. 296.

²loc. cit., p. 299.

without anyone getting excited over the harm done to children. But if schools are closed for one day as a result of a teacher strike, the time lost supposedly constitutes irreparable damage to them. Intellectually, this is not an overwhelming argument.

Koontz¹ discusses an argument or "line of reasoning" that is "unique to education."

This line of reasoning is as follows: a teacher's primary obligation is to the children and therefore, a strike by teachers is always wrong regardless of circumstances or effect upon public health, safety, or welfare.

Koontz² gives the following conclusion in response to this position:

Teachers who walk off the job after they have exhausted every other method of bringing about needed improvements show dedication and commitment. Their colleagues who remain on the job allow the deterioration to continue and this, it seems to me, is the greater disservice to the children.

It appears that the major arguments concerning the adverse effects of strikes on children are more emotional than logical. If, however, there is the slightest possibility that damage has been done or adverse effects have taken place, it is incumbent on those in the teaching profession to research and investigate the problem.

The future of strike and work stoppages

In an excellent article entitled "Looking Beyond Strikes" by Andrews,³ several interesting predictions are made about the future

¹ Koontz, op. cit., p. 436.

² ibid.

³ Andrews, J. Edward, Jr., "Looking Beyond the Strikes." Childhood Education, XLV (April, 1969), pp. 454-56.

involvement of teachers in education. It is hypothesized that as teachers and school boards gain "experience and maturity" in the use of the collective bargaining model, "the collective power of teachers will be used in ways that will make the strike in public education useless and needless."

Andrews predicts that the NEA and AFT will eventually merge and become one organization. This merger will eliminate the competition for teacher allegiances and the need to show "overt toughness" will diminish. The political power of teachers will increase and the strike will "probably not be an effective tool for use in education." Andrews¹ writes:

. . . collective action by teachers will shift from the sidewalks to the legislatures. Realistically, teachers will be able to exert far more power in the political arena than they have in the pseudo-political arena of strike activities.

Perhaps the achievement of such political action will dictate that the operational school system model be changed. Such a model must provide for positive and unified rather than divisive relationships among all members of the professional staff and the ultimate control of the public school must rest with the schools' owners, the public.

Strikes will become "as archaic in public education as they are in other areas of our economy."² Teachers will become involved in the political arena and evolve into a powerful legislative body. "Such activity will increase the power of teachers beyond the present level and insure the real involvement of teachers in educational decision-making. The ultimate result will be a substantive

¹loc. cit., p. 454.

²loc. cit., p. 456.

improvement of educational opportunity for all children."¹

It is not logical to suppress teacher bargaining in an effort to eliminate the problem of strikes or work stoppages in public education. Change is inevitable and institutions must adjust accordingly. Doherty and Oberer² recommend a possible solution to the strike problem when they write:

What we need are techniques for resolving teacher bargaining impasses which will minimize strikes. Merely outlawing strikes is not enough, because, as we have seen, this does not prevent strikes, but only renders them illegal. And if we are to have strikes by teachers anyway, there is a strong argument for legalizing them in order to maintain respect for the law--particularly in the case of teachers since they are apt to serve as models for their students, either in keeping or breaking the law.

Wolcott³ agrees with the concept of improved impasse techniques and proposes that statutory impasse machinery will "be more effective if either (a) the recommendations of third-party interveners are binding on both parties, or (b) employer organizations are permitted, where the employer refuses to accept those recommendations, to engage in self-help." Doherty and Oberer⁴ are more specific when they write:

¹ ibid.

² Doherty and Oberer, op. cit., p. 104.

³ Wolcott, Donald, "Selective Comments on Legislation Governing Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools." Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools, (Ed.) Robert E. Doherty, A Publication of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, January, 1967, p. 3.

⁴ op. cit., p. 104.

The strike should be declared illegal, and impasse-resolving procedures provided, including the final step of arbitration or fact finding with recommendations; however, in the event the school board refuses to abide by the decision of the arbitration body or recommendations of the fact finders, the teachers should then have the right to strike.

In summary, the forecast for the future includes: (1) a decrease in the effectiveness and use of strikes and work stoppages in education, (2) a possible merger of NEA and AFT, (3) improved teacher-board relations, (4) greater political power and legislative involvement by teachers, (5) a greater involvement by teachers in educational decision making, (6) legislative action toward improved impasse-resolution, and (7) improved relations between educators and the general public.

Participative Management Theory

In Chapter I it was suggested that perhaps the key to the resolution of conflict situations in education could be found in the research that has been done in labor-management relations and the behavioral sciences.

To recapitulate, Dr. Rensis Likert and his staff at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, have done extensive research to investigate the effectiveness of various management systems. Their findings support the theory that participative management creates an organizational climate which develops people who are more highly motivated, who have positive attitudes, and who have greater job satisfaction. All of these variables add up to greater productivity, lower costs, and higher profits. The success

of participative management techniques can be attributed to the fundamental concern that is shown for the dignity and worth of the human component at all levels of the organization.

Theorists who have influenced modern management

"In his book Motivation and Personality 1954," writes Weisborn,¹ "Abraham Maslow describes a 'need hierarchy' suggesting that motivation proceeds up a ladder of human need. His ideas seem to suggest that 'a satisfied need is not a motivator,' and that people do their best only in situations offering more than good pay and benefits--a chance for growth and improvement." One of the most important aspects of the participative management theory is that it is concerned with the "growth and involvement" of individuals within the organization. It is concerned with satisfying basic needs which will enable people to have the psychological freedom to participate and become involved in creative interaction with others.

According to Weisborn,² "Frederick Herzberg in Work and the Nature of Man (1966), confirmed and elaborated upon his earlier Motivation Hygiene Theory. Fringe benefits, working conditions, etc., are 'hygiene factors,' essential but not motivating. Responsibility achievement, recognition and growth opportunities are factors which motivate people to perform better." It is interesting to note that

¹Weisborn, Marvin R., "What, Not Again! Manage People Better?" Think, (January-February, 1970) 2-9.

²ibid.

both Maslow and Herzberg consider good pay and fringe benefits as "essential"; however, they are not the only factors to be considered. The satisfaction of economic needs is only the first step toward guiding people to maximum social, emotional, and psychological health.

Douglas Mc Gregor and Rensis Likert have had a great impact on modern management theory. Weisborn¹ has discussed and compared their theories as follows:

The late Douglas McGregor's, The Human Side of Enterprise (1960) is probably the most widely-read book in its field in this century. McGregor, a psychologist, college president (Antioch), and management professor at MIT, cut through jargon to describe two sets of contrasting "assumptions" about man and his relation to work. In consequence, "Theory X" (men are willful, lazy, capricious and in need of constant watching), and "Theory Y" (men like work, seek responsibility, are capable of self control) have become part of management language. The latter theory, McGregor argued, more nearly corresponded to the evidence derived from research into human capability. Before his death in 1964, McGregor often lamented that Theory Y was commonly mistaken to mean "soft" management, when he in fact believed that high management standards and goals were implicit.

Rensis Likert showed that an organization is a complex system in which leadership, motivation, decision making, communication and control tend to vary together. Likert maintains that these can be measured, and over a stretch of time related closely to production and profit. He described four organizational model systems.

Likert's "System 1" manager, a dictatorial type, might be said to hold Theory X assumptions; his "System 4" manager, who seeks group consensus, would probably believe in Theory Y. In New Patterns of Management (1961) and The Human Organization (1967), Likert suggested radical changes in structure, behavior, and the collection and use of management data by those who would tap the full potential of their employees. His proposal that the value of people be measured and managed as carefully as land, buildings, and machinery has led to work, now in progress, on a revolutionary human asset accounting system.

¹ibid.

Measuring organizational performance

Traditionally companies regularly secure measurements which deal with such end result variables as production, sales, profits, equipment, and inventories. Very little, if any, attention has been given to measuring "intervening factors," which significantly influence the end result variables just mentioned. The factors that have been neglected include such qualities of the human organization that staff the company as its loyalty, skills, motivations, and capacity for effective decision-making, communication, and interaction.

In 1958, Likert¹ wrote: "(1) The traditional theory of management, which dominates current concepts as to what should be measured, largely ignores motivational and other human behavior variables. (2) Until recently the social sciences were not developed enough to provide methods for measuring the quality of the human organization."

Since that time Dr. Likert has pioneered the development of instruments which are capable of measuring a variety of organizational variables. Motivation, communication, decision-making, and leadership processes are a few of the variables that can now be measured. Profiles of organizational characteristics can be plotted and evaluated to determine how individuals at all levels within the organization perceive interaction, leadership, and management systems

¹Likert, Rensis, "Measuring Organizational Performance" Harvard Business Review, XXXVI (March-April, 1958), 41-50.

that are being used. This kind of measurement is valuable because it provides feedback to managers indicating how people feel they are treated, motivated, and involved. If weaknesses are detected, management systems can be shifted and corrective measures can be taken to improve the situation. Periodic checks can be made to see if perceptions have been changed and the problem has been corrected. This kind of measurement is extremely valuable in checking the psychological, emotional, and attitudinal health of an organization.

Participative group management (System 4)

According to Likert:¹ "All component parts of any system of management must be consistent with each of the other parts and reflects the system's basic philosophy. In an authoritative form of organization, decisions are made at the top; in a participative form, they are made widely throughout the organization." Likert has categorized various approaches to management into four major "systems." They can be described as follows: (1) System 1 or exploitive-authoritative style of management, (2) System 2 or benevolent-authoritative management, (3) System 3 or consultative management, and (4) System 4 or participative-group management.

On a horizontal continuum, with System 1 on the extreme left to System 4 on the extreme right, the four systems, really blend into

¹Likert, New Patterns in Management, op. cit., p. 222.

one another and make one continuum with many intermediate patterns.

Likert¹ writes:

When all the different management systems which involve at least a moderate degree of control or influence are examined, it becomes evident that they can be ordered . . . along a continuum involving the kinds of controls and motivational forces used and the kinds of attitudinal responses evoked. When these different forms of organization are so arrayed, a significant observation emerges: all the many operating procedures and the many performance characteristics of the different management systems form an orderly pattern along every horizontal dimension.

As one examines the operating characteristics and performance qualities of the different forms of organization, two facts emerge.²

First is that to function at its best each system of organization requires personalities, skills, and characteristic ways of interacting on the part of leaders and members which fit that particular system. For instance, authoritarian organizations require dependent personalities on the part of all except those in control (Argyris, 1957c). Participative organizations require emotionally mature personalities. (Morse and Reimer, 1956; Tannenbaum and Allport, 1956; Vroom, 1960c).

The second fact about these different forms of organization is that each tends to produce people suited to function well within that system. Each system tends to mold people in its own image. Authoritarian organizations tend to develop dependent people and few leaders. Participative organizations tend to develop emotionally mature persons capable of effective interaction, initiative, and leadership.

System 4 or participative-group management is the system called for by the newer modern management theory. Since it is possible to measure organizational characteristics, feedback information can be used to assess how well the newer theory is being applied. Periodic measurement of intervening and end-result variables can point to and

¹loc. cit., p. 234.

²loc. cit., p. 235-36.

suggest ways of modifying procedures to achieve desired performance characteristics and levels of performance.

Causal, intervening, and end-result variables

Since part of the statistical analysis used in this study measures and compares causal variables it is appropriate to discuss these variables at this point. Likert¹ defines the three classifications of variables as follows:

"Causal" variables include the structure of the organization and management's policies, decisions, business and leadership strategies, skills, and behavior.

The "intervening" variables reflect the internal state and health of the organization, e.g., the loyalties, attitudes, motivations, performance goals, and perceptions of all members and their collective capacity for effective interaction, communication, and decision-making.

The "end-result" variables are the dependent variables which reflect the achievements of the organization, such as its productivity, cost, scrap loss, and earnings.

According to Likert² the "causal" variables are the key to organizational improvement. When an organization is seeking to make a shift more toward System 4, the effort to change should be focused initially on causal variables. There is a close interrelationship between all three categories of variables. Changes brought about in the causal variables will lead in turn to changes in the intervening and end-result variables. For example, if a company decides to move toward System 4 management, it must change certain policies.

¹Likert, The Human Organization, op. cit., p. 27.

²loc. cit., p. 143.

leadership strategies, and behaviors (causal variables). If such changes are more supportive and involve people in decision-making, etc., then loyalties, attitudes, motivations, and perceptions will change (intervening variables). These changes in turn will be reflected in lower costs, higher earnings, and greater productivity (end-result variables). The interrelationships between causal, intervening, and end-result variables are very complex.

What about the future of organizational theory and research?

Likert and Bowers¹ write:

The available and growing evidence justifies the view that further research very probably will demonstrate strong and consistent relationships among the causal, intervening, and end-result variables; that certain leadership styles and management systems consistently will be found more highly motivating and yielding better organizational performance than others.

If this proves to be the case, the emergence of more valid and effective organizational theory and improved management systems will have a wide spread impact on all kinds of administration: education, hospitals, business, and government.

Summary

The survey of the related literature indicates that there is great concern over the status of employer-employee relations in public education. Legislative enactments and judicial decisions pertaining to labor-management relations in the private sector have

¹Likert, Renis, Bowers, David, "Organizational Theory and Human Resource Accounting," American Psychologist, XXIV (June, 1969), 585-592.

provided the legal precedents needed for teachers and other public employees to enter into collective negotiations with their employers. Teachers' organizations have adopted the collective bargaining model as the most direct and efficient method of resolving the classical questions of wages, hours and conditions of employment. Teachers' organizations have also demanded appropriate representation and active, not token, involvement in the planning and implementation of educational policies and procedures.

The application of modern management techniques could be the answer to improving employer-employee relations in education. Participative management theory accepts and encourages active involvement of all people in an organization in the planning and decision-making process. This system of management helps to satisfy the basic needs that people have to achieve, to be recognized, to have responsibility, and to have growth opportunities. Research has shown that people who are employed in organizations that use participative management have better attitudes, are more highly motivated, and have greater job satisfaction. With these considerations in mind the reader's attention will now be directed to the research procedures that were used in this investigation.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This investigation was a field-study involving a sample of all board members, superintendents, administrative staff personnel, principals and a fifteen per cent random sample of teachers in each of twenty school districts in the state of Michigan. The purpose of this investigation was to compare the management systems, as perceived by school personnel at different levels of the educational hierarchy, between ten school districts that have been involved in "work stoppages" during the 1969-70 school year and ten school districts that had never been involved in "work stoppages." Management systems were measured by five anonymous, self-administered Profile of a School (POS) questionnaires, which were selected on the basis of their relatedness to the hypotheses of this study.

The Variables

Two independent variables (the cause) were identified in this investigation as: (1) the management system being used in the districts, and (2) the influence of teacher negotiations under the provisions of Public Act 379. The dependent variables (the effect) were identified as: (1) involvement in a work stoppage, and (2) non-involvement in a work stoppage.

Samples and Populations

The population in this investigation represented twenty school districts located in the state of Michigan. Participating districts were located in seven counties which spread across the middle and southern sections of the state. They were also located around and near most of the major metropolitan areas, such as Ann Arbor, Battle Creek, Detroit, Flint, Lansing, and Pontiac. To protect the anonymity of participating districts and respondents, exact locations and district names were not cited. All participating districts were identified by the following code numbers: (1) The ten work stoppage districts are coded with the numbers 1 through 10; (2) The ten non-work stoppage districts are coded with the numbers 11 through 20. District code numbers were explained at this point so the reader would not be confused when reading tables and appendices.

Since fifteen per cent of all teachers in each district were randomly selected as recipients; and since all board members, superintendents, administrative staff, principals, and teachers were also asked to respond, it is felt that the basic assumptions of normality and homogeneity within the population have been controlled and are warranted in this study.

In an effort to control for intervening variables; such as social, cultural, racial, and economic differences between groups, each work stoppage district was matched with a non-work stoppage district of similar pupil size and geographical location. When

possible, consideration was also given to matching districts with similar millage rates, state equalized valuation, and average teachers' salaries. It is assumed that the population is representative of populations in other districts of similar size and demographic characteristics in the state of Michigan.

The total numbers of recipients in each group in each district are listed in Table 1. The total numbers of recipients in each group in both work stoppage and non-work stoppage groups are listed in Table 2. Tables 3 and 4 present selected criteria for the determination of comparability for work stoppage and non-work stoppage school districts.

Table 1

Recipients in Work Stoppage Districts											
	District Code										Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
*EM	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	69
S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
AA	2	1	1	5	1	2	1	5	5	5	28
P	12	4	5	6	5	6	5	13	9	6	71
T	45	18	16	32	22	29	21	66	36	21	306
Total	67	31	30	51	36	44	35	92	58	40	484

Recipients in Non-Work Stoppage Districts											
	District Code										Total
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
*EM	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	69
S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
AA	1	3	2	2	2	0	3	6	1	3	23
P	3	5	7	6	13	2	10	13	4	7	70
T	15	21	20	25	39	11	65	52	15	27	290
Total	27	37	37	41	61	21	86	79	28	45	462

*EM = Board Members
 AA = Administrative Assistants
 T = Teachers
 S = Superintendents
 P = Principals

Table 2

Total Number of Recipients in Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage Districts			
	Work Stoppage	Non-Work Stoppage	Total
Board Members	69	69	138
Superintendents	10	10	20
Administrative Assistants	28	23	51
Principals	71	70	141
Teachers	306	290	596
<u>Total N</u>	484	462	946

Table 3

Selected Criteria for the Determination
of Comparability for Work Stoppage and
Non-Work Stoppage School Districts

Work Stoppage Districts:

	Number of Pupils	Average Teachers Salary	State Equalized Valuation	Millage Rates
1	6,349	9,023	12,200	26.78
2	2,432	7,976	19,845	18.87
3	2,686	7,958	10,823	16.20
4	5,117	8,260	8,486	16.53
5	3,364	8,924	10,382	23.05
6	4,936	8,338	9,955	10.28
7	3,330	10,418	33,472	23.09
8	8,973	9,882	21,025	22.15
9	4,582	8,145	23,566	22.30
10	<u>3,182</u>	<u>8,823</u>	<u>8,605</u>	<u>26.85</u>
	44,951	87,747	158,359	206.91
Average	4,495	8,774.70	15,835.90	20.69

Table 4

Selected Criteria for the Determination
of Comparability for Work Stoppage and
Non-Work Stoppage School Districts

Non-Work Stoppage Districts:

	Number of Pupils	Average Teachers Salary	State Equalized Valuation	Millage Rates
11	2,041	9,093	16,492	20.22
12	3,378	8,911	10,390	23.70
13	3,603	9,356	8,867	11.28
14	3,177	8,806	14,362	36.89
15	6,440	9,038	11,775	16.90
16	1,746	8,229	6,346	15.50
17	9,977	10,149	10,297	35.90
18	8,249	10,305	11,047	24.20
19	2,404	8,429	8,581	22.45
20	<u>4,653</u>	<u>8,798</u>	<u>17,329</u>	<u>16.28</u>
	45,668	91,114	115,486	223.32
Average	4,567	9,111.40	11,548.60	22.33

Instrumentation

The data gathering instruments used in this study were developed by Dr. Rensis Likert and Jane Gibson Likert. The instruments are adapted from the Profile of Organizational Characteristics (POC) forms that have been widely used in measuring organizational variables and management systems in business and industry. An example of the POC form and the rationale for its use can be found in Dr. Likert's, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value.¹

Recently, Dr. Likert prepared several Profile of a School (POS) questionnaires to be used in measuring management systems and organizational variables as perceived by: (1) board members, (2) superintendents, (3) administrative assistants, (4) principals, (5) teachers. The POS questionnaires are unique, because each of the forms is specifically designed to measure the perceptions of personnel at each level of the educational hierarchy. For example, there is a specific form for board members, a specific form for superintendents, and so on. Each form provides information on how the individual perceives himself and others within the organization. A sample page from one of the Profile of a School forms is included in the Appendix. (Exhibit 1)

Respondents were asked to mark an "N" (N=NOW) response on each item or question on the form. The response was placed on a twenty point continuum at the place which best fit his response to the

¹op. cit., pp. 197-211.

answer. The continuum is also divided into four parts which represent the four management systems. System 1 (authoritative) was located on the extreme left and System 4 (participative group management) was located on the extreme right. The researcher inquired about the possibility of the response set phenomenon when all items had System 1 on the left and System 4 on the right. Dr. Al Siepert, of the Institute for Social Research, explained that similar questionnaires had been developed where System 1 and System 4 were alternated at various points to control for response set. It was found, however, that there were no significant differences in responses when systems were alternated and when they were not.

It should be pointed out that Dr. Likert suggested that a second response be solicited from respondents who had been in their present position for three or more years. Respondents were asked to mark a "P" (P=Previously) on each continuum. This request was made to see if there were any perceived differences between "P" and "N" responses on each question. The "P" responses were not analyzed in this study for the following reasons: (1) they were not included as part of the analysis in the original proposal, (2) many of the respondents who had been in their present position for three or more years neglected, or ignored the request, (3) a number of respondents completed the "N" response and only partially answered the "P" responses, and (4) there is some question about the accuracy and validity of recalled perceptions over such a long period of time. Recalled perceptions can be influenced by a large number of

intervening variables which may affect such a response. For instance, the selective forgetting or remembering phenomenon could be operating when such a response was made. Intervening variables, such as increased district size, consolidation, unification, teacher militancy, student unrest, millage defeats, and many more, could account for differences in "past" and "now" responses. It is difficult, if not impossible, to control for all of these variables.

Reliability of the instruments

In a recent study done by Donald R. Miller in six school districts in California, reliability coefficients were computed on each of the five questionnaires. The Spearman-Brown formula was used to compute the coefficients of reliability for all items and causal groups identified in each questionnaire. Dr. Rensis Likert provided the summary of coefficients that are found in the Appendix (Exhibit 2). The results of these computations show that each of the instruments have demonstrated a relatively high level of reliability. The instruments were selected for use in this investigation because of their established reliability and because of their suitability and applicability to the problem being investigated.

Statistical Hypotheses

In general, it was hypothesized that non-work stoppage respondents would perceive the management systems being used in their school districts to be more toward participative management (System 4) than respondents in work stoppage districts. Specifically, the statistical hypotheses tested at each level of the educational hierarchy can be expressed as follows:

Null hypothesis: No difference will be found in perceived management systems between work stoppage and non-work stoppage groups.

Symbolically: $H_0: M_1 = M_2$

Legend: M_1 = work stoppage group mean;

M_2 = non-work stoppage group mean.

Alternate hypothesis: The work stoppage group mean score will be less than the non-work stoppage group mean score.

Symbolically: $H_1: M_1 < M_2$

Legend: M_1 = work stoppage group mean;

M_2 = non-work stoppage group mean.

Symbolically the statistical hypotheses for this study are written as follows:

Board Members	$H_{01} = M_1 = M_2$	$H_1 = M_1 < M_2$
Superintendents	$H_{02} = M_1 = M_2$	$H_2 = M_1 < M_2$
Administrative Assistants	$H_{03} = M_1 = M_2$	$H_3 = M_1 < M_2$
Principals	$H_{04} = M_1 = M_2$	$H_4 = M_1 < M_2$
Teachers	$H_{05} = M_1 = M_2$	$H_5 = M_1 < M_2$

Procedures

Preliminary planning

Prior to commencement of data gathering, some preliminary planning was necessary. The State Department of Education provided a list of all districts that had been involved in work stoppages during the 1969-70 school year. At that time a total of thirty-nine districts had been involved in work stoppages ranging from one day to twenty-one days. These work stoppages affected some 11,491 teachers and 273,240 students. Thirty-four of those districts were affiliated with MEA and five were affiliated with MFT. The total number of days of work stoppages at that time for thirty-eight districts was three hundred days. One of the districts was involved in a work stoppage at the time the report was filed and it was not included in the average. Three hundred days of work stoppages averaged 7.89 days for each of the thirty-eight districts.

Fifteen of the districts on the work stoppage list met the criteria established for work stoppage districts. They all had been involved in five or more days of work stoppages during the 1969-70 school year, and they all had a student enrollment between 2,000 and 10,000 students. Ten districts were randomly selected from those districts that qualified. The remaining five districts were randomly selected and ordered as alternates in the event that any of the first ten districts elected not to participate in the study. Two of the original districts did not participate and it became necessary to use the first two alternate districts.

The ten non-work stoppage districts were selected after the superintendents in the work stoppage districts had agreed to participate in the study. With their help each work stoppage district was matched with a non-work stoppage district of similar geographic and demographic characteristics. Each non-work stoppage district met the criteria established for that group. None of the districts had ever been involved in a work stoppage, and they had a student enrollment between 2,000 and 10,000 students. Table 5 provides statistics concerning both groups.

Table 5
Statistics for Work Stoppage
and Non-Work Stoppage School Districts

District Code	Students	Teachers	School Days Out
1	6,349	285	21
2	2,432	110	13
3	2,686	95	6
4	5,117	195	7
5	3,364	125	20
6	4,936	175	12
7	3,330	165	19
8	8,973	385	19
9	4,582	225	12
10	3,182	140	16
Total	44,951	1,900	145
Average	4,495	190	14.5
<hr/>			
11	2,041	99	0
12	3,378	144	0
13	3,603	125	0
14	3,177	166	0
15	6,440	263	0
16	1,746	73	0
17	9,977	430	0
18	8,249	350	0
19	2,404	99	0
20	4,653	183	0
Total	45,668	1,932	0
Average	4,567	193	

Procedures used in gathering data

Prior to visiting each of the superintendents to ask permission to distribute the POS forms in their districts, envelopes were prepared which contained copies of each of the questionnaires, the respondent data form, and the form letter which would be sent to each recipient. A copy of the form letter is included in the Appendix (Exhibit 3).

This researcher visited each district and made a personal contact with each superintendent. In three districts the superintendents were not available and the assistant superintendent approved the distribution of questionnaires. During these meetings, the purpose of the study was carefully explained and questions pertaining to the questionnaires, data analysis, anonymity, and the method of distribution and collection of data were answered. At first several of the superintendents were apprehensive about distributing questionnaires at the time when negotiating teams were starting collective negotiations. They did not want the faculty organizations to think that this study was directed by their boards of education and administrators. Three of the superintendents granted approval after the purpose of the study had been explained and approved by their faculty club presidents. It should be pointed out that all of the superintendents were most helpful and cooperative. For instance, they granted permission to distribute questionnaires and follow-up letters to recipients through their district mail services. They also provided district directories from which the names of board members,

administrative staff, principals, and teachers could be obtained.

After permission was granted in all districts the researcher prepared the questionnaires for each recipient. Each recipient received an envelope containing the respondent data form, a POS form, a personally addressed form letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope in which to return the questionnaire directly to the researcher. POS questionnaires were coded with a district number so they could be assigned to the proper district when they were returned. After all the recipient forms were prepared and addressed, the researcher visited each district again and distributed the questionnaires. Two weeks after the questionnaires had been delivered the researcher prepared and delivered a follow-up letter to the recipient in each district. Since there was no way of knowing which recipients had responded, the follow-up letter served the dual purpose of thanking those who had responded and encouraging those who had not responded to do so as soon as possible. A copy of the follow-up letter is found in the Appendix (Exhibit 4).

It was not possible for this researcher to personally contact each of the recipients in this study, therefore, direct mailing of questionnaires was necessary. This procedure raised concern that there might be a low rate of returns. In this regard Bramlett¹ cites Travers who writes:

¹Bramlett, op. cit., p. 70. citing Travers, Robert M.W., An Introduction to Educational Research, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1958, p. 248.

The central difficulty in all direct-mail techniques is that the percentage of returns is small. A questionnaire of some interest to the recipient may be expected to show a 20 per cent return even when conditions are favorable. If no respondents are contacted a second or third time, the return may be increased to 30 per cent. Only rarely does it reach 40 per cent.

The lowest overall return came from board members. This was predicted by several of the superintendents. The overall percentage of returns for each of the five groups of respondents were as follows: (1) board members, 50 per cent, (2) superintendents, 95 per cent, (3) administrative staff, 86 per cent, (4) principals, 69 per cent, and (5) teachers, 61 per cent. A breakdown of percentage of respondent returns by group and district are presented on the following Tables, 6, 7, 8.

Table 6

Respondent Returns from Work Stoppage Districts											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Board Members	3	4	3	6	5	2	3	7	6	1	40
Superintendents	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Administrative Assistants	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	3	5	5	24
Principals	10	3	4	4	5	2	3	12	6	6	55
Teachers	31	11	9	23	13	18	13	39	22	9	188

Total Returns and Percentage of Responses for Work Stoppage Districts										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Respondents	47	20	18	37	25	24	26	62	40	22
Recipients	67	31	30	51	36	44	35	92	58	40
Percentage of Returns	70	65	60	73	69	55	60	67	69	55

Percentage of Returns for Each Work Stoppage Group			
	Respondents	Recipients	Percentage
Board Members	40	69	58
Superintendents	9	10	90
Administrative Assistants	24	28	85
Principals	55	71	77
Teachers	188	306	61

Table 7

Respondent Returns from Non-Work Stoppage Districts											
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
Board Members	4	2	0	4	6	3	3	2	1	4	29
Superintendents	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Administrative Assistants	0	3	1	2	2	0	2	6	1	3	20
Principals	1	4	2	3	4	0	8	11	4	6	43
Teachers	6	14	10	9	24	6	48	30	11	16	174

Total Returns and Percentages of Responses for Non-Work Stoppage Districts										
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Respondents	12	24	14	19	37	10	62	50	18	30
Recipients	27	37	37	40	62	21	86	79	28	45
Percentage of Returns	44	65	38	48	60	48	72	63	64	67

Percentage of Returns for Each Non-Work Stoppage Group			
	Respondents	Recipients	Percentage
Board Members	29	69	42
Superintendents	10	10	100
Administrative Assistants	20	23	87
Principals	43	70	61
Teachers	174	290	60

Table 8

Overall Returns and Percentages for Each Group			
Board Members:			
	Recipients	Respondents	Percentage of Returns
WSD	69	40	58
NWSD	69	29	42
	<u>138</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>50</u>
Superintendents:			
	Recipients	Respondents	Percentage of Returns
WSD	10	9	90
NWSD	10	10	100
	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>95</u>
Administrative Assistants:			
	Recipients	Respondents	Percentage of Returns
WSD	28	24	86
NWSD	23	20	87
	<u>51</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>86</u>
Principals:			
	Recipients	Respondents	Percentage of Returns
WSD	71	55	77
NWSD	70	43	61
	<u>141</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>70</u>
Teachers:			
	Recipients	Respondents	Percentage of Returns
WSD	306	188	61
NWSD	290	174	60
	<u>596</u>	<u>362</u>	<u>61</u>
Total Number of Recipients 946			
Total Number of Respondents 592			
Total Percentage Returned 63%			

Following the data analysis each superintendent was sent a summary of the research findings. The summary included grouped mean profiles for each of the five POS forms for both work stoppage and non-work stoppage districts. In addition, a district profile of group means for each POS form was sent so superintendents could compare their individual district profiles with work stoppage and non-work stoppage profiles. The decision to provide individual district profiles was made after several of the superintendents requested this information as "meaningful" and "valuable" feedback. Care was taken to protect the anonymity of respondents. For instance, if a district had only one administrative staff member, the profile from that member was not sent.

Data Analysis

Scoring of the data on each of the data gathering questionnaires was accomplished by giving quantitative values to each response. Responses were marked at some point on a 20 point continuum. If the response was placed at point 10, the score value was 10, if it was placed at point 18, the score value was 18, and so on. Score values for each item or question could then be totaled and divided by the number of responses for that item to get a group mean for that item.

Essentially the data were analyzed by computing grouped mean scores for each item on each of the five POS forms and comparing grouped means between work stoppage and non-work stoppage districts. The "t" test was used to determine the significance of differences

between means for work stoppage and non-work stoppage districts on all items in each of the five POS forms. The "t" test is a commonly used inferential test to determine the probability of differences between means occurring by chance.

The following paradigm in Table 9 illustrates the basic item analysis comparisons and probability levels of means between work stoppage and non-work stoppage groups.

The paradigm in Table 9 illustrates how item and over-all or grand mean scores were analyzed and compared between work stoppage and non-work stoppage groups. The following abbreviations were used on each of the tables and should be clarified:

WDS = Work Stoppage Districts
NWSD = Non-Work Stoppage Districts
Mean = Item and/or grand mean scores
S.D. = Standard deviation scores
"t" = "t" values
NS = Not significant

Table 9

Paradigm for Item Analysis					
Mean Comparisons Between					
Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage Groups					
Question	WSD	Mean	S.D.	"t"	P
	NWSD				
1.	WSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
	NWSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	WSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
	NWSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	WSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
	NWSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
(Etc.)					
Grand Mean Score	WSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
	NWSD	_____	_____	_____	_____
Profile of a School Form		Number of Items			
Board Member		49			
Superintendent		60			
Administrative Assistant		45			
Principal		63			
Teacher		55			

The second method of analysis used in this investigation was to compare grouped mean scores of "causal items." To review, "causal variables" were described in Chapter II as variables which include the structure of the organization and management's policy, decisions, leadership strategies, skill, philosophy, and values reflected in behavior. Dr. Likert suggests that causal variables are the "key to organizational change." Because of the close inter-relationship between causal, intervening, and end-result variables, changes brought about in management's policies, decisions, strategies, behaviors, etc., will lead, in turn, to changes in intervening and end-result variables.

Dr. Likert identified and grouped questions or items which were "causal" in nature on each of the five POS forms. Nine causal groups were selected as relevant to this investigation. The analysis of causal groups (1-9) was done by computing a causal group mean of combined item means in each causal group. The "t" test was used to determine the significance of differences between causal group means in work stoppage and non-work stoppage districts. The paradigm in Table 10 illustrates the basic comparisons of causal group means and the probability levels between means.

Table 10

Paradigm for Nine Causal Groups Mean Comparisons between Work Stoppage and Non-Work Stoppage Groups					
Causal Groups:	WSD	Mean	S.D.	"t"	P
	NWSD				
Board Member Form:					
1. To superintendent	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—		
2. To principal	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—		
Superintendent Form:					
3. From board					
4. To principal					
Administrative Assistant Form:					
5. From superintendent					
6. To principal					
Principal Form:					
7. From superintendent					
8. To teachers					
Teacher Form:					
9. From principals					

Dr. Likert identified and grouped causal items on each of the five POS forms as follows:

Board of Education Form:

Causal Group 1: Causal items to the superintendent (Downward)

1. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by the superintendent?
4. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to the superintendent?
7. How much confidence and trust do you have in the superintendent of schools?
13. To what extent do you behave in ways that encourage the superintendent of schools to discuss important problems with you?
14. How often do you seek and use the ideas and opinions of the superintendent of schools?
35. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system between you and the superintendent of schools?
39. At what level are decisions made about instructional and curricular matters?
40. At what level are decisions made about administrative matters?
41. At what level are decisions made about discipline and other non-academic matters?
44. How are decisions made in your school system?

Causal Group 2: Causal items to the principal (Downward)

3. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by the principal?
6. How do you seek to be friendly and supportive to the principal?
9. How much confidence and trust do you have in the principal?
39. At what level are decisions made about instructional and curricular matters?

40. At what level are decisions made about administration matters?
41. At what level are decisions made about discipline and other non-academic matters?
44. How are decisions made in your school system?

Superintendent Form:

Causal Group 3: Causal items from board members (Upward)

35. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between you and your school board?
55. How often do you see the board's behavior as friendly and supportive?
56. How much confidence and trust does the board have in you?
57. To what extent does the board behave in ways that encourage you to discuss important things about your work with them?
58. How often does the board seek to use your ideas and opinions?
60. How much is the board interested in your success?

Causal Group 4: Causal items to principal (Downward)

3. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by your principals?
6. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to your principals?
9. How much confidence and trust do you have in your principals?
14. To what extent do you behave in ways that encourage your principals to discuss important things about their work with you?
16. How often do you seek to use your principals' ideas and opinions as to instructional and curricular matters?
17. How often do you seek to use your principals' ideas and opinions as to administrative matters?

34. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between you and your principals?
39. At what level are decisions made about instructional and curricular matters?
40. At what level are decisions made about administrative matters?
41. At what level are decisions made about discipline and other non-academic matters?
43. To what extent are principals involved in major decisions related to their work?
45. How are decisions made in your school system?

Administrative Assistant Form

Causal Group 5: Causal items from superintendent (Upward)

26. How often do you see the behavior of your superintendent of schools as friendly and supportive?
27. How much confidence and trust does your superintendent have in you?
30. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about problems in your area of specialization?
34. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?
40. How are decisions made in your school?
41. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?

Causal Group 6: Causal items to principal (Downward)

2. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by principals?
5. How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to principals?
7. How much confidence and trust do you have in principals?
10. How often do you seek and use principals ideas about your area of specialization?

12. How much say do you think principals should have about academic matters?
13. How much say do you think principals should have about non-academic school matters?
22. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student activities, etc.?
23. To what extent are principals involved in major decisions related to their work?

Principal Form

Causal Group 7: Causal items from superintendent (Upward)

39. How often do you see the behavior of your superintendent of schools as friendly and supportive?
40. How much confidence and trust does your superintendent have in you?
46. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about instructional and curricular matters?
48. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about discipline and other non-academic matters?
54. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?
57. How are decisions made in your school system?
58. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?

Causal Group 8: Causal items to teachers (Downward)

1. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by teachers?
3. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to teachers?
5. How much confidence and trust do you have in your teachers?
11. How often do you seek and use your teachers' ideas about academic matters?

12. How often do you seek and use your teachers' ideas about non-academic school matters?
15. How much say do you think teachers should have about academic matters?
16. How much say do you think teachers should have about non-academic matters?
28. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?
31. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plan, teaching methods, student activities, etc.?
32. To what extent are teachers involved in major decisions related to their work?

Teacher Form

Causal Group 9: Causal items from principal (Upward)

25. How often do you see your principal's behavior as friendly and supportive?
26. How much confidence and trust does your principal have in you?
32. How often are your ideas sought and used by the principal about academic matters?
33. How often are your ideas sought and used by the principal about non-academic school matters?
45. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?
48. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student behavior, student activities, etc.?
49. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?
50. How much does your principal really try to help you with your problems?

Summary

In Chapter III salient factors pertaining to the research procedures used in this investigation were presented. The independent and dependent variables were identified, and the samples and populations in work stoppage and non-work stoppage groups were described. The five Profile of a School questionnaires used as the data gathering instruments were explained, and the theoretical hypotheses were reviewed and stated symbolically. Important procedures concerning preliminary planning and gathering of data were noted, and the chapter concluded with a description of the data analysis procedures that were used in reporting research findings.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA
and
DISCUSSION

The purpose of Chapter IV is to present and discuss the statistical analysis of the raw data obtained from the five Profile of a School questionnaires used in this investigation. Data were analyzed and reported in terms of whether or not hypothesized differences would be found to exist between the computed mean scores of non-work stoppage districts (NWS) and work stoppage districts (WSD) in the state of Michigan.

Computations were made possible by assigning numerical values to responses placed at various points along a twenty point continuum which accompanied each of the questions on each questionnaire. Each continuum was also divided into four equal segments, each of which represents Dr. Likert's four major management systems. The four management systems can be described as ranging from "authoritative" or System 1 management on the extreme left of the continuum to "participative group" or System 4 management on the extreme right of the continuum. Numerical values for each of the four management systems can be described as follows:

- System 1: Exploitive - authoritative management.
1 to 5 numerical range
- System 2: Benevolent - authoritative management.
6 to 10 numerical range

System 3: Consultative management.
11 to 15 numerical range

System 4: Participative group management.
16 to 20 numerical range

Responses were totaled between work stoppage (WSD) and non-work stoppage (NWSD) board members, superintendents, administrative assistants, principals and teachers. Mean scores (M), standard deviations (S.D.), "t" values ("t"), and probability levels (P) were computed, compared, and analyzed between groups to determine whether or not hypothesized differences did exist. Derived mean scores which were numerically low in the 1 to 5 range on the continuum indicated that respondents perceived the management employed in their districts to be authoritative in nature or System 1. Accordingly, derived mean scores which were numerically high in the 16 to 20 range on the continuum indicated that respondents perceived the management employed in their districts to be participative in nature or System 4.

The "t" test was used to determine the significance of differences between derived means or continuum scores of work stoppage and non-work stoppage groups. Since non-work stoppage mean scores were hypothesized to be higher or more toward participative, System 4, management than work stoppage mean scores, it was appropriate to consider the stated hypotheses as being directional. Derived "t" values were, therefore, compared by using one-tailed significance levels on the standard table of "t" values. Derived one-tailed "t" values equal to or beyond the .05 level of significance were

considered to support the stated hypothesis and were deemed sufficient to reject the null hypothesis.

Negative "t" values indicated that non-work stoppage mean scores were higher than work stoppage mean scores. Therefore, negative "t" values were considered to support the direction of the stated hypotheses. Accordingly, positive "t" values indicated that work stoppage mean scores were higher than non-work stoppage mean scores. Therefore, positive "t" values were not considered to support the direction of the stated hypotheses.

The hypotheses related to each question, to over-all or grand mean results, and causal groups related to each questionnaire were presented, analyzed, and discussed in the following order:

1. Board Member Form,
2. Superintendent Form,
3. Administrative Assistant Form,
4. Principal Form,
- and 5. Teacher Form.

It should be noted that following the table presenting the analysis of data for each question a table was included which isolated and presented individual questions which reached accepted significance levels and supported the predicted hypothesis. This table included the question, group means, the system level attained, and the system description which was included above the continuum for each question to guide the respondent in determining where his response should be located. It was felt that this information was necessary to clarify significant differences that were found to exist between groups on individual questions.

Board Member Related Hypotheses

Individual question analysis

The hypothesis related to individual questions pertaining to board members stated that non-work stoppage board members would perceive the management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative management, System 4, than board members in work stoppage school districts. The data analysis for individual questions on the Profile of a School, Board Member Form, follows in Table 11.

Table 11
 Analysis of Data for Each Question
 Regarding Board Members

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD					
How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by:							
1. the superintendent of schools?	WSD	16.60	3.07			- .287	NS
	NWSD	16.79	1.98				
2. the top administrative staff?	WSD	15.92	3.46			- .135	NS
	NWSD	16.03	2.90				
3. the principals?	WSD	14.39	4.17			- .316	NS
	NWSD	14.72	4.16				
How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to:							
4. the superintendent of schools?	WSD	16.87	2.78			- .594	NS
	NWSD	17.24	2.09				
5. the top administrative staff?	WSD	16.47	2.97			- .804	NS
	NWSD	17.03	2.49				
6. the principals?	WSD	15.77	3.43			- .732	NS
	NWSD	16.37	3.14				
How much confidence and trust do you have in:							
7. the superintendent of schools?	WSD	17.02	2.88			-1.206	NS
	NWSD	17.79	2.09				
8. the top administrative staff?	WSD	15.75	3.73			-1.786	.05
	NWSD	17.21	2.46				

Table 11 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	t'	P
			NWSD				
9. the principals?		WSD	14.38	3.79		-1.355	NS
		NWSD	15.55	2.98			
10. the superintendent of schools?		WSD	15.23	3.29		-1.251	NS
		NWSD	16.21	2.85			
11. the top administrative staff?		WSD	14.72	3.26		-1.686	.05
		NWSD	16.07	2.90			
12. the principals?		WSD	13.40	3.71		-1.095	NS
		NWSD	14.42	3.59			
13. To what extent do you try to behave in ways that encourage the superintendent of schools to discuss important problems with you?		WSD	17.34	2.29		1.093	NS
		NWSD	16.68	2.56			
How often do you seek and use ideas and opinions of:							
14. the superintendent of schools?		WSD	16.71	3.26		.807	NS
		NWSD	16.06	3.16			
15. the top administrative staff?		WSD	15.00	4.44		.112	NS
		NWSD	14.88	3.18			
How free does your superintendent feel to talk to you about:							
16. instructional and curricular matters?		WSD	16.23	3.61		.142	NS
		NWSD	16.10	3.74			
17. administrative matters?		WSD	16.46	3.19		- .105	NS
		NWSD	16.55	3.69			

Table 11 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
18. discipline and other non-academic matters?	WSD		16.20	3.56	.197	NS
	NWSD		16.00	4.66		
What is the general attitude toward your school as a place to work of:						
19. the superintendent of schools?	WSD		15.48	3.06	-1.385	NS
	NWSD		16.51	2.81		
20. the top administrative staff?	WSD		14.97	3.84	-1.775	.05
	NWSD		16.53	2.82		
21. the principals?	WSD		14.44	3.77	-1.251	NS
	NWSD		15.55	3.13		
What is the direction of the flow of information about:						
22. instructional and curricular matters?	WSD		15.32	3.64	- .854	NS
	NWSD		16.13	3.92		
23. administrative matters?	WSD		13.13	4.78	-1.589	NS
	NWSD		14.93	4.05		
24. How does the superintendent of schools view communica- tions from you?	WSD		16.69	2.75	.089	NS
	NWSD		16.62	3.43		
25. How do your principals view communications from you?	WSD		14.10	3.17	.101	NS
	NWSD		14.00	3.90		
26. How does the top administra- tive staff view communica- tions from you?	WSD		15.03	3.59	-1.780	.05
	NWSD		16.56	2.51		

Table 11 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	$\frac{t}{c}$	P
			NWSD				
How accurate is upward communication:							
27. from the superintendent of schools?	WSD	16.43	2.62			-1.257	NS
	NWSD	17.17	1.83				
28. from the top administrative staff?	WSD	15.75	3.25			-1.798	.05
	NWSD	17.03	1.74				
29. from the principals?	WSD	14.71	3.49			-1.398	NS
	NWSD	15.81	2.27				
How well do you know the problems faced by:							
30. the superintendent of schools?	WSD	14.68	4.39			-1.006	NS
	NWSD	15.64	2.72				
31. the top administrative staff?	WSD	13.10	4.99			-1.304	NS
	NWSD	14.61	3.60				
32. the principals?	WSD	11.73	4.87			-1.125	NS
	NWSD	13.11	4.69				
33. How much do you superintendent and the top administrative staff feel that you are interested in their success?	WSD	16.47	2.77			-.699	NS
	NWSD	16.93	2.49				
34. How much do principals feel that you are interested in their success?	WSD	14.84	3.66			.285	NS
	NWSD	14.58	3.66				

What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system:

Table 11 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD					
35. between you and the superintendent of schools?	WSD		16.37	3.11		-1.007	NS
	NWSD		17.06	2.21			
36. members of the top administrative staff?	WSD		15.45	3.42		-1.877	.05
	NWSD		16.85	2.21			
37. among school board members?	WSD		16.17	3.31		.050	NS
	NWSD		16.13	3.05			
38. In your school system, is it "every man for himself" or does the school board, the superintendent of schools, the top administrative staff, the principals, and the members of the staff work as a team?	WSD		15.60	3.20		-3.451	.001
	NWSD		17.86	1.59			
At what level are decisions made about:							
39. instructional and curricular matters?	WSD		12.05	4.50		-2.970	.005
	NWSD		15.00	3.09			
40. administrative matters?	WSD		10.26	4.45		- .344	NS
	NWSD		10.62	3.77			
41. discipline and other non-academic matters?	WSD		13.42	4.01		- .911	NS
	NWSD		14.27	3.31			
42. To what extent are decision-makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization?	WSD		14.78	3.43		.545	NS
	NWSD		14.31	3.41			
43. To what extent is the top administrative staff involved in decisions related to their work?	WSD		17.00	1.72		-1.818	.05
	NWSD		17.72	1.36			

Table 11 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	t	P
	WSD	NWSD				
44. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD		12.76	3.46	- .624	NS
	NWSD		13.27	3.02		
In general, what does the decision-making process contribute to the desire to do a good job by:						
45. the superintendent of schools?	WSD		17.39	2.37	.234	NS
	NWSD		17.29	1.52		
46. the top administrative staff?	WSD		16.31	2.65	- .544	NS
	NWSD		16.64	2.00		
47. the principals?	WSD		15.28	3.21	.048	NS
	NWSD		15.24	3.44		
48. Who holds high performance goals for your school system?	WSD		14.51	3.99	- .338	NS
	NWSD		14.85	4.01		
49. Who feels responsible for achieving high performance goals in your school system?	WSD		14.47	3.28	-1.683	.05
	NWSD		15.81	2.94		

Reference to Table 11 shows that the questionnaire had a total of forty-nine questions. Thirty-seven questions had a negative "t" value which supported the directionality of the predicted hypothesis. Ten questions reached the .05 level of significance and beyond and supported the stated hypothesis. The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between non-work stoppage and work stoppage board members is supported by the data on all other questions. It can be said, however, that a significant difference was found to exist, as predicted, between board member groups, and that the null hypothesis can be rejected in the questions presented in Table 12.

Table 12
 Questions Which Supported
 The Stated Hypothesis
 Between Board Member Groups

8. How much confidence and trust do you have in the top administrative staff?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.75	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	17.21	4	"A very great deal"

11. How much confidence and trust does the top administrative staff have in you?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.72	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	16.07	4	"A very great deal"

Table 12 (Continued)

20. What is the general attitude of the top administrative staff toward your school as a place to work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.97	3	"Usually like it"
NWSD	16.53	4	"Like it very much"

26. How does the top administrative staff view communications from you?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.03	3	"Usually accepted, sometimes cautiously."
NWSD	16.56	4	"Almost always accepted. If not, openly and candidly questioned."

28. How accurate is upward communication from the top administrative staff?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.75	3	"Fairly accurate"
NWSD	17.03	4	"Almost always accurate"

36. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system between you and members of the top administrative staff?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.45	3	"Moderate interaction; often with fair amount of confidence and trust."
NWSD	16.85	4	"Extensive, friendly interaction with high degree of confidence and trust."

Table 12 (Continued)

38. In your school system, is it "every man for himself" or does the school board, the superintendent of schools, the top administrative staff, the principals, and the members of the staff work as a team?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.60	3	"A moderate amount of cooperative teamwork"
NWSD	17.86	4	"A very substantial amount of cooperative teamwork"

39. At what level are decisions made about instructional and curricular matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.05	3	"Broad policy by Board, superintendent, and staff. More specific decisions made at lower levels."
NWSD	15.00	3	Same as above.

43. To what extent is the top administrative staff involved in decisions related to their work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	17.00	4	"Freely involved in decisions related to their work"
NWSD	17.72	4	Same as above.

49. Who feels responsible for achieving high performance goals in your school?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.47	3	"School Board, superintendent and most of his staff and principals and some teachers"
NWSD	15.81	3	Same as above.

Grand mean analysis

The hypothesis related to over-all or grand mean scores for all questions on the questionnaire pertaining to board members stated that non-work stoppage board members would perceive the over-all management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative management, System 4, than board members in work stoppage school districts. Data analysis of over-all or grand mean scores on the Profile of a School, Board Member Form, follows in Table 13.

Table 13
Analysis of Data for Grand Mean
Scores Between Board Member Groups

Comparison Groups	Grand Mean	S.D.	"t"	P
Work Stoppage Board Members	15.19	3.83	-5.105	.001
Non-Work Stoppage Board Members	15.85	3.37		

Reference to Table 13 shows that there is substantial agreement with the stated hypothesis that non-work stoppage board members would perceive the over-all management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage board members. This significant result can be attributed to the fact that 75.5 percent of the questions on the Board Member Form had a negative "t" value which supported the direction of the stated hypothesis. The data support that the null hypothesis may be rejected beyond the .001 level of significance.

Causal group analysis

Two causal groups were identified and analyzed on the Profile of a School, Board Member Form. Causal Group 1 can be described as causal items to the superintendent downward from board members. Causal Group 2 can be described as causal items to the principal downward from board members.

The hypothesis related to board member causal groups stated that non-work stoppage board members would perceive the management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage board members.

The results of the analysis of data for questions related to Causal Group 1 are presented in Table 14.

Table 14
 Analysis of Data for Causal Group 1:
 Causal Items to the Superintendent (Downward)
 From Board Members

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	t'	P
	WSD	NWSD				
1. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by the superintendent of schools?	WSD	16.60	3.07	- .287	NS	
	NWSD	16.79	1.98			
4. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to the superintendent of schools?	WSD	16.87	2.78	- .594	NS	
	NWSD	17.24	2.09			
7. How much confidence and trust do you have in the superintendent of schools?	WSD	17.02	2.88	-1.206	NS	
	NWSD	17.79	2.09			
13. To what extent do you try to behave in ways that encourage the superintendent of schools to discuss important problems with you?	WSD	17.34	2.29	1.093	NS	
	NWSD	16.68	2.56			
14. How often do you seek and use the ideas of the superintendent of schools?	WSD	16.72	3.26	.807	NS	
	NWSD	16.06	3.16			
35. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system between you and the superintendent of schools?	WSD	16.37	3.11	-1.007	NS	
	NWSD	17.06	2.21			
39. At what level are decisions made about instructional and curricular matters?	WSD	12.05	4.50	-2.970	.005	
	NWSD	15.00	3.09			
40. At what level are decisions made about administrative matters?	WSD	10.26	4.45	- .344	NS	
	NWSD	10.62	3.77			

Table 14 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S. D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
41. At what level are decisions made about discipline and other non-academic school matters?	WSD	13.42	4.01		- .911	NS
	NWSD	14.27	3.31			
44. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD	12.76	3.46		- .624	NS
	NWSD	13.27	3.02			
TOTALS: Causal Group 1						
	Work Stoppage Districts	14.98	4.20		-1.642	NS
	Non Work Stoppage Districts	15.48	3.50			

Reference to Table 14 shows that no significant difference was found to exist between non-work stoppage and work stoppage board members in relation to Causal Group 1, causal items to the superintendent downward from board members. The data indicate that board members in both groups appear to perceive their relationship with the superintendent to be similar in nature.

The null hypothesis, that there is no significant difference between board member groups in relation to Causal Group 1, is supported by the data. It is not possible to reject the null hypothesis at or beyond the .05 level; therefore, in terms of Causal Group 1, board member groups may be assumed to be homogeneous in their perceived relations with superintendents.

The results of the analysis of data for questions related to Causal Group 2 are presented in Table 15.

Table 15
 Analysis of Data for
 Causal Group 2: Causal Items to the Principal
 (Downward) from Board Members

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	t'	P
	WSD	NWSD				
3. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by the principals?	WSD	14.39	4.17		-.316	NS
	NWSD	14.72	4.16			
6. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to the principals?	WSD	15.77	3.43		-.732	NS
	NWSD	16.37	3.14			
9. How much confidence and trust do you have in the principals?	WSD	14.38	3.79		-1.355	NS
	NWSD	15.55	2.98			
39. At what level are decisions made about instructional and curricular matters?	WSD	12.05	4.50		-2.970	.005
	NWSD	15.00	3.09			
40. At what level are decisions made about administrative matters?	WSD	10.26	4.45		-.344	NS
	NWSD	10.62	3.77			
41. At what level are decisions made about discipline and other non-academic school matters?	WSD	13.42	4.01		-.911	NS
	NWSD	14.27	3.31			
44. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD	12.76	3.46		-.624	NS
	NWSD	13.27	3.02			
TOTALS: Causal Group 2						
Work Stoppage Districts			13.31	4.32		
Non-Work Stoppage Districts			14.26	3.80	-2.484	.01

Reference to Table 15 shows that the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .01 level of significance. The data pertaining to Causal Group 2 supported the stated hypothesis that a significant difference was found to exist between board member groups. Non-work stoppage board members perceive their relations with principals to be more participative in nature than work stoppage board members.

Superintendent Related Hypotheses

Individual question analysis

The hypothesis related to individual questions pertaining to superintendents stated that non-work stoppage superintendents would perceive the management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative management, System 4, than superintendents in work stoppage districts. The data analysis for individual questions in the Profile of a School, Superintendent Form, follows in Table 16.

Table 16
 Analysis of Data for Each Question
 Regarding Superintendents

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD					
How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by:							
1. your school board?	WSD		16.88	1.44		.795	NS
	NWSD		16.11	2.33			
2. your staff?	WSD		8.33	1.82		-3.030	.005
	NWSD		12.33	3.26			
3. your principals?	WSD		14.88	2.92		-.792	NS
	NWSD		16.11	3.28			
How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to:							
4. your school board?	WSD		17.11	1.36		-.671	NS
	NWSD		17.60	1.62			
5. your staff?	WSD		14.11	3.84		-.110	NS
	NWSD		14.30	3.22			
6. your principals?	WSD		17.55	2.26		-.497	NS
	NWSD		18.00	1.41			
How much confidence and trust do you have in:							
7. your school board?	WSD		17.00	3.01		-.484	NS
	NWSD		17.60	2.10			
8. your staff?	WSD		11.55	2.54		-1.946	.05
	NWSD		14.20	3.02			

Table 16 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
9. your principals?	WSD		15.22	4.21	- .529	NS
	NWSD		16.10	2.50		
How much confidence and trust do the following have in you:						
10. your school board?	WSD		16.77	1.03	1.569	NS
	NWSD		15.70	1.67		
11. your staff?	WSD		10.50	3.24	-1.342	NS
	NWSD		12.60	3.00		
12. your principals?	WSD		16.33	3.52	.931	NS
	NWSD		14.90	2.80		
13. To what extent do you try to behave in ways that encourage your staff to discuss important things about their work with you?	WSD		13.00	2.44	-1.785	.05
	NWSD		15.50	3.23		
14. To what extent do you try to behave in ways that encourage your principals to discuss important things about their work with you?	WSD		17.22	2.24	.106	NS
	NWSD		17.10	2.38		
15. How often do you seek and use your staff's ideas and opinions?	WSD		12.88	3.17	-2.306	.025
	NWSD		16.10	2.58		
How often do you seek and use your principals' ideas and opinions as to:						
16. instructional and curricular matters?	WSD		18.11	1.44	3.220	.005
	NWSD		15.50	1.85		
17. administrative matters?	WSD		17.66	1.76	2.219	.025
	NWSD		15.50	2.20		

Table 16 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
18. discipline and other non-academic school matters?	WSD		17.22	2.65	1.466	NS
	NWSD		14.90	3.72		
19. What is the general attitude of principals toward your school system as a place to work?	WSD		14.00	3.88	-.734	NS
	NWSD		15.20	2.82		
20. What is the general attitude of your staff toward your school system as a place to work?	WSD		10.77	3.04	-3.006	.005
	NWSD		14.80	2.48		
How free do your principals feel to talk to you about:						
21. academic matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, their work, etc.?	WSD		17.22	2.78	.737	NS
	NWSD		16.30	2.36		
22. non-academic school matters, such as student behavior, emotional problems of students, discipline, student activities, etc.?	WSD		17.11	3.07	.314	NS
	NWSD		16.70	2.28		
How free does your staff feel to talk to you about:						
23. academic matters?	WSD		12.88	3.34	-.859	NS
	NWSD		14.20	2.99		
24. non-academic school matters?	WSD		10.77	3.61	-2.131	.025
	NWSD		14.00	2.60		
What is the direction of the flow of information about:						
25. instructional and curricular matters?	WSD		13.77	3.55	-1.308	NS
	NWSD		15.60	2.10		

Table 16 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	t'	P
		NWSD				
26. administrative matters:	WSD	12.22	2.97		-1.224	NS
	NWSD	14.50	4.47			
27. How do your principals view communications from you?	WSD	15.77	3.32		- .250	NS
	NWSD	16.10	2.02			
28. How does your staff view communications from you?	WSD	9.33	3.43		-3.086	.005
	NWSD	14.00	2.94			
How accurate is upward communication:						
29. from your principals?	WSD	15.33	3.85		- .646	NS
	NWSD	16.30	2.19			
30. from your staff?	WSD	11.44	3.97		-1.637	NS
	NWSD	14.20	2.95			
How well do you know the problems faced by:						
31. your principals?	WSD	16.66	2.44		1.762	.05
	NWSD	14.10	3.41			
32. your staff?	WSD	13.88	2.72		.178	NS
	NWSD	13.60	3.63			
33. How much do your principals and staff feel that you are interested in their success?	WSD	12.88	3.41		-1.087	NS
	NWSD	14.50	2.72			
What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?						
34. between you and your principals	WSD	16.00	5.16		- .310	NS
	NWSD	16.60	2.49			

Table 16 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
35. between you and your school board?	WSD	17.00	1.56		-1.627	NS
	NWSD	18.10	1.22			
36. among the members of your staff?	WSD	10.33	3.19		-2.356	.025
	NWSD	14.00	3.22			
37. among school board members?	WSD	14.88	4.43		.959	NS
	NWSD	16.60	2.87			
38. In your school system, is it "every man for himself" or do you, your principals, members of your staff, and members of the school board work as a team?	WSD	14.66	3.91		-1.190	NS
	NWSD	16.60	2.76			
At what level are decisions made about:						
39. instructional and curricular matters?	WSD	12.88	4.12		-1.174	NS
	NWSD	15.00	3.31			
40. administrative matters?	WSD	10.66	5.24		-1.003	NS
	NWSD	12.80	3.45			
41. discipline and other non-academic school matters?	WSD	15.00	3.59		.958	NS
	NWSD	13.40	3.29			
42. To what extent are decision-makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization?	WSD	15.11	3.44		.074	NS
	NWSD	15.00	2.64			
43. To what extent are principals involved in major decisions related to their work?	WSD	17.88	2.02		.667	NS
	NWSD	17.30	1.55			

Table 16 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD					
44. To what extent is your staff involved in decisions related to their work?	WSD		15.44	2.31		.034	NS
	NWSD		15.40	2.41			
45. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD		13.66	1.88		-2.176	.025
	NWSD		15.30	1.18			
46. How much do your principals feel that you are really trying to help them with their problems?	WSD		14.00	5.12		-1.298	NS
	NWSD		16.50	2.50			
47. How much does your staff feel that you are really trying to help them with their problems?	WSD		7.66	2.58		-3.850	.001
	NWSD		13.60	3.63			
In general, what does the decision-making process contribute to the desire to do a good job by:							
48. principals?	WSD		16.55	3.59		- .250	NS
	NWSD		16.90	2.02			
49. your staff?	WSD		11.55	4.39		-1.642	NS
	NWSD		14.60	3.23			
50. To what extent do you feel that your principals behave in a friendly and supportive manner?	WSD		15.44	4.96		- .869	NS
	NWSD		17.00	1.94			
51. To what extent do you feel that your staff behave in a friendly and supportive manner?	WSD		9.00	2.74		-2.708	.01
	NWSD		13.30	3.68			
52. Who holds high performance goals in your school system?	WSD		13.33	4.37		-1.630	NS
	NWSD		16.10				

Table 16 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD					
53. Who feels responsible for achieving high performance goals in your school system?	WSD		12.66	4.13		-1.633	NS
	NWSD		15.50	3.00			
54. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals in your school?	WSD		11.77	3.35		-3.054	.005
	NWSD		15.80	1.98			
55. How often do you see the board's behavior as friendly and supportive?	WSD		17.44	1.42		- .925	NS
	NWSD		18.10	1.51			
56. How much confidence and trust does the board have in you?	WSD		17.66	1.69		1.095	NS
	NWSD		16.70	1.90			
57. To what extent does the board behave in ways that encourage you to discuss important things about your work with them?	WSD		17.11	1.59		-1.584	NS
	NWSD		18.20	1.24			
58. How often does the board seek and use your ideas and opinions?	WSD		17.55	1.57		.152	NS
	NWSD		17.40	2.37			
59. How well does the board know the problems faced by you and your staff?	WSD		14.77	4.49		- .191	NS
	NWSD		15.10	3.38			
60. How much is the board interested in your success?	WSD		17.66	1.24		.221	NS
	NWSD		17.50	1.68			

Reference to Table 16 shows that the questionnaire had a total of sixty questions. Forty-two questions had a negative "t" value which supported the direction of the stated hypothesis. Twelve questions reached the .05 level of significance and beyond and supported the stated hypothesis. The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between non-work stoppage and work stoppage superintendents is supported by the data on all other questions. It should be pointed out that questions 16, 17, and 31 had a positive "t" value which reached the .05 level of significance. These questions were significant in the opposite direction of the predicted hypothesis. It can be said that a significant difference was found to exist, as predicted, between superintendent groups and the null hypothesis can be rejected at the .05 level of significance and beyond on the questions presented in Table 17.

Table 17
Questions which Supported
the Stated Hypothesis
Between Superintendent Groups

2. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by your staff?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	8.33	2	"Sometimes"
NWSD	12.33	3	"Often"
8. How much confidence and trust do you have in your staff?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	11.55	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	14.20	3	"A considerable amount"
13. To what extent do you try to behave in ways that encourage your staff to discuss important things about their work with you?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.00	3	"Moderate extent"
NWSD	15.00	3	"Moderate extent"
15. How often do you seek and use your staff's ideas and opinions?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.88	3	"Often"
NWSD	16.10	4	"Very frequently"
20. What is the general attitude of your staff toward your school system as a place to work?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	10.77	2	"Sometimes dislike it, sometimes like it"
NWSD	14.80	3	"Usually like it"
24. How free does your staff feel to talk to you about academic matters?			

Table 17 (Continued)

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	10.77	2	"Slightly free"
NWSD	14.00	3	"Quite free"

28. How does your staff view communications from you?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	9.33	2	"Some accepted, some viewed with suspicion"
NWSD	14.10	3	"Usually accepted, sometimes cautiously"

36. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system among the members of your staff?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	10.33	2	"Little interaction, each maintains distance from others"
NWSD	14.00	3	"Moderate interaction; often with fair amount of confidence and trust"

45. How are decisions made in your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.66	3	"Decisions are made at the top after consultation with appropriate lower levels?"
NWSD	15.30	3	Same as above.

47. How much does your staff feel that you are trying to help them with their problems?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	7.66	2	"Somewhat"
NWSD	13.60	3	"Quite a bit"

51. To what extent do you feel that your staff behave in a friendly and supportive manner?

Table 17 (Continued)

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	9.00	2	"Sometimes"
NWSD	13.30	3	"Often"
54. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals in your school?			
WSD	11.77	3	"Some resistance and some cooperation"
NWSD	15.80	3	Same as above

Grand mean analysis

The hypothesis related to over-all or grand mean scores for all questions on the questionnaire pertaining to superintendents stated that non-work stoppage superintendents would perceive the over-all management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative management, System 4, than superintendents in work stoppage school districts. Data analysis of over-all or grand mean scores on the Profile of a School, Board Member Form, follows in Table 18.

Table 18

Analysis of Data for Grand Mean
Scores Between Superintendent Groups

Comparison Groups	Grand Mean	S.D.	"t"	P
Work Stoppage Superintendents	14.41	4.22		
Non-Work Stoppage Superintendents	15.54	3.03	-5.215	.001

Reference to Table 16 shows that there is substantial agreement with the predicted hypothesis that non-work stoppage superintendents would perceive the over-all management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage superintendents. This significant result can be attributed to the fact that forty-two or 70 percent of the questions had a negative "t" value which supported the direction of the predicted hypothesis.

The data support that the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .001 level of significance and beyond.

Causal group analysis

Two causal groups were identified and analyzed on the Profile of a School, Superintendent Form. Causal Group 3 can be described as causal items from board members upward to superintendents. Causal Group 3 analyzes questions related to the upward perceptions of superintendent groups concerning their relations with board members. Causal Group 4 can be described as causal items to principals downward from superintendents. Causal Group 4 analyzes questions related to the downward perceptions of superintendents concerning their relations with principals.

The hypothesis related to superintendent causal groups stated that non-work stoppage superintendents would perceive the management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage superintendents.

The results of the analysis of data for Causal Group 3 are presented as follows in Table 19.

Table 19
 Analysis of Data for
 Causal Group 3: Causal Items from
 Board Members to Superintendents
 (Upward)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	$\frac{U-t}{t}$	P
	WSD	NWSD				
35. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system between you and the school board?	WSD		17.00	1.56	-1.672	NS
	NWSD		18.10	1.22		
55. How often do you see the board's behavior as friendly and supportive?	WSD		17.44	1.42	- .925	NS
	NWSD		18.10	1.51		
56. How much confidence and trust does the board have in you?	WSD		17.66	1.69	1.095	NS
	NWSD		16.70	1.90		
57. To what extent does the board behave in ways that encourage you to discuss important things about your work with them?	WSD		17.11	1.59	-1.584	NS
	NWSD		18.20	1.24		
58. How often does the board seek to use your ideas and opinions?	WSD		17.55	1.57	.152	NS
	NWSD		17.40	2.37		
60. How much is the board interested in your success?	WSD		17.66	1.24	.211	NS
	NWSD		17.50	1.68		
TOTALS: Causal Group 3						
		Work Stoppage Districts	17.40	1.54	.822	NS
		Non-Work Stoppage Districts	17.66	1.78		

Reference to Table 19 shows that there is no significant difference between non-work stoppage and work stoppage superintendents in relation to Causal Group 3, causal items from board members downward to superintendents. The data indicate that superintendents in both groups appear to perceive their relationship with board members to be similar in nature.

The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between superintendent groups in relation to Causal Group 3 was supported by the data. It is not possible to reject the null hypothesis at or beyond the .05 level; therefore, in terms of Causal Group 3, superintendent groups may be assumed to be homogeneous in their perceived relations with board members.

The results of the analysis of data for Causal Group 4 are presented as follows in Table 20.

Table 20
 Analysis of Data for
 Causal Group 4: Causal Items to Principals
 (Downward) From Superintendents

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	t	P
			NWSD				
3. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by your principals?		WSD	14.88	2.92	- .792	NS	
		NWSD	16.11	3.28			
6. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to your principals?		WSD	17.55	2.26	- .497	NS	
		NWSD	18.00	1.41			
9. How much confidence and trust do you have in your principals?		WSD	15.22	4.21	- .529	NS	
		NWSD	16.10	2.50			
14. To what extent do you try to behave in ways that encourage your principals to discuss important things about their work with you?		WSD	17.22	2.24	.107	NS	
		NWSD	17.10	2.38			
16. How often do you seek and use your principals' ideas and opinions as to instructional and curricular matters?		WSD	18.11	1.44	3.220	.005	
		NWSD	15.50	1.85			
17. How often do you seek and use your principals' ideas and opinions as to administrative matters?		WSD	17.66	1.76	2.219	.025	
		NWSD	15.50	2.20			
18. How often do you seek and use your principals' ideas and opinions as to discipline and other non-academic school matters?		WSD	17.22	2.65	1.466	NS	
		NWSD	14.90	3.72			
34. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system between you and your principals?		WSD	16.00	5.16	- .310	NS	
		NWSD	16.60	2.49			

Table 20 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
39. At what level are decisions made about instructional and curricular matters?	WSD	12.88	4.18		-1.174	NS
	NWSD	15.00	3.31			
40. At what level are decisions made about administrative matters?	WSD	10.66	5.24		-1.003	NS
	NWSD	12.80	3.45			
41. At what level are decisions made about discipline and other non-academic school matters?	WSD	15.00	3.59		.958	NS
	NWSD	13.40	3.29			
43. To what extent are principals involved in major decisions related to their work?	WSD	17.88	2.02		.667	NS
	NWSD	17.30	1.55			
45. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD	13.66	1.88		-2.176	.025
	NWSD	15.30	1.18			
TOTALS:	Causal Group 4:					
	Work Stoppage Districts		15.69	3.94	.089	NS
	Non-Work Stoppage Districts		15.64	2.99		

Reference to Table 20 shows that there is no significant difference between non-work stoppage and work stoppage superintendents in relation to Causal Group 4, causal items to principals downward from superintendents. The data indicate that superintendents in both groups appear to perceive their relationship with principals to be similar in nature.

The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between superintendent groups in relation to Causal Group 4 is supported by the data. It is not possible to reject the null hypothesis at or beyond the .05 level; therefore, in terms of Causal Group 4, superintendent groups may be assumed to be homogeneous in their perceived relations with principals.

Administrative Assistant Related Hypotheses

Individual question analysis

The hypothesis related to individual questions pertaining to administrative assistants, central or district office personnel, stated that non-work stoppage administrative assistants would perceive the management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than administrative assistants in work stoppage districts.

The analysis of data for individual questions on the Profile of a School, Administrative Staff Form, follows on Table 21.

Table 21
 Analysis of Data for Individual Questions
 Regarding Administrative Staff

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S. D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by:						
1. your superintendent?	WSD		15.95	2.99	-1.003	NS
	NWSD		16.95	3.47		
2. principals?	WSD		15.50	2.30	.206	NS
	NWSD		15.30	3.88		
3. other staff members?	WSD		14.56	2.60	.828	NS
	NWSD		13.70	3.98		
How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to:						
4. your superintendent?	WSD		17.37	1.88	-1.080	NS
	NWSD		18.05	2.20		
5. your principals?	WSD		16.70	2.54	- .191	NS
	NWSD		16.85	2.51		
6. other staff members?	WSD		16.47	2.30	0.000	NS
	NWSD		16.47	2.34		
7. How much confidence and trust do you have in principals?	WSD		15.25	2.71	- .927	NS
	NWSD		16.10	3.23		
8. How much confidence and trust do principals have in you?	WSD		14.62	2.05	.153	NS
	NWSD		14.50	3.00		
9. How free do principals feel to talk to you about your area of specialization?	WSD		16.20	2.06	- .262	NS
	NWSD		16.41	2.93		

Table 21 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
10. How often do you seek and use principals' ideas about your area of specialization?	WSD	13.50	3.77	- .833	NS	
	NWSD	14.47	3.29			
11. How often do you seek and use other staff members' ideas about your area of specialization?	WSD	14.00	3.40	- .260	NS	
	NWSD	14.29	3.41			
How much say do you think principals should have about:						
12. academic matters?	WSD	16.58	2.08	-1.063	NS	
	NWSD	17.35	2.42			
13. non-academic school matters?	WSD	14.58	3.16	-1.316	NS	
	NWSD	15.88	2.86			
How much say do you think administrative staff should have about:						
14. academic matters?	WSD	16.20	2.27	-1.372	NS	
	NWSD	17.17	2.03			
15. non-academic school matters?	WSD	16.16	2.37	-1.261	NS	
	NWSD	17.11	2.24			
16. How well do you know the problems faced by principals?	WSD	14.83	2.59	-1.193	NS	
	NWSD	15.75	2.36			
17. How much do principals feel that you are interested in their success?	WSD	14.08	2.67	- .500	NS	
	NWSD	14.55	3.41			
18. How much do principals feel that you are really trying to help them with their problems?	WSD	14.04	2.79	- .560	NS	
	NWSD	14.55	3.10			

Table 21 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
What is the direction of the flow of information about:						
19. academic matters?	WSD	13.62	3.93		-2.284	.025
	NWSD	15.90	2.07			
20. non-academic school matters?	WSD	12.87	3.62		-2.311	.025
	NWSD	15.22	2.48			
21. How do principals view communications from the administrative staff?	WSD	13.91	3.41		-1.086	NS
	NWSD	14.95	2.65			
22. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student activities, etc.?	WSD	14.33	2.92		-2.179	.025
	NWSD	16.10	2.21			
23. To what extent are principals involved in major decisions related to their work?	WSD	16.37	2.17		-1.913	.05
	NWSD	17.50	1.53			
24. In general, how much does the decision-making process contribute to the desire of principals to do a good job?	WSD	16.20	2.15		-1.302	NS
	NWSD	17.00	1.76			
25. In general, how much does the decision-making process contribute to your desire to do a good job?	WSD	16.79	2.69		-1.238	NS
	NWSD	17.70	1.92			
26. How often do you see the behavior of your superintendent of schools as friendly and supportive?	WSD	15.66	3.34		-2.178	.025
	NWSD	17.70	2.59			
27. How much confidence and trust does your superintendent have in you?	WSD	16.41	2.79		-.461	NS
	NWSD	16.80	2.65			

Table 21 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
28. How much confidence and trust do you have in your superintendent?	WSD		15.70	4.03	-1.462	NS
	NWSD		17.35	3.11		
29. How free do you feel to talk to your superintendent about matters related to your work?	WSD		17.70	3.19	- .331	NS
	NWSD		18.00	2.56		
30. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about problems in the area of your specialization?	WSD		16.29	3.69	- .008	NS
	NWSD		16.30	3.82		
31. How often are your ideas sought and used by your principals about problems in the area of your specialization?	WSD		14.66	2.92	- .935	NS
	NWSD		15.55	3.24		
32. How well does your superintendent know the problems you face?	WSD		14.58	3.89	-1.101	NS
	NWSD		15.85	3.51		
33. How much do you feel that your superintendent is interested in your success?	WSD		16.08	3.34	-1.008	NS
	NWSD		17.15	3.52		
34. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?	WSD		12.79	3.94	-3.334	.001
	NWSD		16.55	3.24		
35. In your school system is it "every man for himself" or do the superintendent, staff, principals and teachers work as a team?	WSD		13.95	2.82	-3.751	.001
	NWSD		17.05	2.47		
36. What is your general attitude toward your school system as a place to work?	WSD		15.83	3.67	-2.412	.025
	NWSD		18.20	2.44		
37. How do you view communications from the superintendent?	WSD		15.25	3.46	-1.564	NS
	NWSD		17.00	3.78		

Table 21 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
38. How accurate is upward communication in your school system?	WSD	13.41	2.09		-3.688	.001
	NWSD	16.00	2.46			
39. How much does your superintendent really try to help you with your problems?	WSD	14.50	4.73		-1.061	NS
	NWSD	15.95	3.99			
40. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD	13.45	3.58		-2.935	.005
	NWSD	16.36	2.51			
41. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?	WSD	16.75	3.16		-1.516	NS
	NWSD	18.00	1.89			
42. To what extent are decision-makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization?	WSD	13.58	4.00		-2.199	.025
	NWSD	15.95	2.72			
43. Who holds high performance goals for your school system?	WSD	12.60	4.74		-1.923	.05
	NWSD	15.05	2.89			
44. Who feels responsible for seeing that high performance goals are achieved in your school system?	WSD	12.17	4.48		-1.305	NS
	NWSD	13.94	4.00			
45. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals?	WSD	13.34	3.54		-.697	NS
	NWSD	14.10	3.29			

Reference to Table 21 shows that the questionnaire had a total of forty-five questions. Forty-one questions had a negative "t" value, which supported the directionality of the predicted hypothesis. Twelve questions reached the .05 level of significance and beyond and supported the stated hypotheses. The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between non-work stoppage and work stoppage groups is supported by the data on all other questions. It can be said that a significant difference was found to exist, as predicted, between administrative assistant groups; and the null hypothesis can be rejected at the .05 level of significance and beyond on the questions presented in Table 22.

Table 22
 Questions which Supported
 the Stated Hypothesis
 between Administrative Assistant Groups

19. What is the direction and flow of information about academic matters?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.62	3	"Down and up"
NWSD	15.90	3	"Down and up"
20. What is the direction and flow of information about non-academic school matters?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.87	3	"Down and up"
NWSD	15.22	3	"Down and up"
22. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student activities, etc.?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.33	3	"Broad policy by board, superintendent and staff. More specific decisions made at lower levels."
NWSD	16.10	4	"Throughout school system: principals, teachers, and students participating in decisions affecting them."
23. To what extent are principals involved in major decisions related to their work?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	16.37	4	"Fully involved in decisions related to their work"
NWSD	17.50	4	Same as above.

Table 22 (Continued)

26. How often do you see the superintendent of schools as friendly and supportive?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.66	3	"Often"
NWSD	17.70	4	"Almost always"

34. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.79	3	"Moderate interaction, often with fair amount of confidence and trust"
NWSD	16.55	4	"Extensive, friendly interaction with high degree of confidence and trust"

35. In your school system is it "every man for himself" or do the superintendent and his staff, principals and teachers work as a team?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.95	3	"A moderate amount of cooperative teamwork"
NWSD	17.05	4	"A very substantial amount of cooperative teamwork"

36. What is the general attitude toward your school system as a place to work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.83	3	"Usually like it"
NWSD	18.20	4	"Like it very much"

38. How accurate is upward communication in your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.41	3	"Fairly accurate"
NWSD	16.00	4	"Almost always accurate"

Table 22 (Continued)

40. How are decisions made in your school system?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.45	3	"Decisions are made at top after consultation with appropriate lower levels"
NWSD	16.36	4	"Lower levels involved in decisions affecting them; decisions usually made through consensus"
42. To what extent are decision-makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.58	3	"Moderately aware"
NWSD	15.95	3	"Moderately aware"
43. Who holds high performance goals for your school system?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.60	3	"School board, superintendent and most of his staff, principals and some teachers"
NWSD	15.05	3	Same as above.

Grand mean analysis

The hypothesis for over-all or grand mean scores for individual questions on the questionnaire pertaining to administrative assistants stated that non-work stoppage administrative assistants would perceive the over-all management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative management, System 4, than work stoppage administrative assistants. Data analysis of over-all or grand mean scores on the Profile of a School, Administrative Assistant Form, follows on Table 23.

Table 23

Analysis of Data for Grand Mean
Scores regarding Administrative Assistants

Comparison Groups	Grand Mean	S. D.	"t"	P
Work Stoppage Administrative Assistants	15.01	3.46	-7.839	.001
Non-Work Stoppage Administrative Assistants	16.20	3.16		

Reference to Table 23 shows that there is substantial agreement with the stated hypothesis that non-work stoppage administrative assistants would perceive the over-all management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage administrative assistants. This significant result can be attributed to the fact that 91.1 percent of the questions had a negative "t" value which supported the direction of the stated hypothesis.

The data support that the null hypothesis may be rejected beyond the .001 level of significance.

Causal group analysis

Two causal groups were identified and analyzed on the Profile of a School, Administrative Assistant Form. Causal Group 5 can be described as causal items from superintendents upward to administrative assistants. Causal Group 5 analyzes questions which reflect the upward perceptions of administrative assistants regarding their relations with superintendents. Causal Group 6 can be described as causal items to principals downward from administrative assistants. Causal Group 6 analyzes questions which reflect the downward perceptions of administrative assistants regarding their relations with principals.

The hypothesis related to administrative assistant causal groups stated that non-work stoppage administrative assistants would perceive the management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage administrative assistants.

The results of the analysis of data for questions related to Causal Group 5 are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Analysis of Data for Causal Group 5:
Causal Items from Superintendent
(Downward) to Administrative Assistants

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
26. How often do you see the behavior of your superintendent as friendly and supportive?	WSD	15.66	3.34		-2.238	.025
	NWSD	17.70	2.59			
27. How much confidence and trust does your superintendent have in you?	WSD	16.41	2.79		- .461	NS
	NWSD	16.80	2.65			
30. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about problems in the area of your specialization?	WSD	16.29	3.69		- .008	NS
	NWSD	16.30	3.82			
34. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?	WSD	12.79	3.94		-3.334	.001
	NWSD	16.55	3.24			
40. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD	13.45	3.58		-2.935	.005
	NWSD	16.36	2.51			
41. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?	WSD	16.75	3.16		-1.516	NS
	NWSD	18.00	1.89			
TOTALS: Causal Group 5: Causal items from superintendents						
	Work Stoppage Districts	15.22	3.76		-4.080	.001
	Non-Work Stoppage Districts	16.95	2.93			

Reference to Table 24 shows that the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .001 level of significance and beyond. The data pertaining to Causal Group 5 support the stated hypothesis that a significant difference would be found to exist between administrative assistant groups. Non-work stoppage administrative assistants perceive their relations with superintendents to be more participative in nature than work stoppage administrative assistants.

The results of the analysis of data for Causal Group 6 are presented in Table 25.

Table 25
 Analysis of Data for
 Causal Group 6: Causal Items to Principals
 from Administrative Assistants

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
2. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by principals?	WSD		15.50	2.30	.206	NS
	NWSD		15.30	3.88		
5. How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to principals?	WSD		16.70	2.54	- .191	NS
	NWSD		16.85	2.51		
7. How much confidence and trust do you have in principals?	WSD		15.25	2.71	- .927	NS
	NWSD		16.10	3.23		
10. How often do you seek to use principals' ideas about your area of specialization?	WSD		13.50	3.77	- .833	NS
	NWSD		14.47	3.29		
12. How much say do you think principals should have about academic matters?	WSD		16.58	2.08	-1.063	NS
	NWSD		17.35	2.42		
13. How much say do you think principals should have about non-academic school matters?	WSD		14.58	3.16	-1.316	NS
	NWSD		15.88	2.86		
22. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student activities, etc.?	WSD		14.33	2.92	-2.179	.025
	NWSD		16.10	2.21		
23. To what extent are principals involved in major decisions related to their work?	WSD		16.37	2.17	-1.913	.05
	NWSD		17.50	1.53		
TOTALS: Causal Group 6:						
	Work Stoppage Districts		15.35	2.96	-2.655	.005
	Non-Work Stoppage Districts		16.21	2.98		

Reference to Table 25 shows that the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .005 level of significance. The data pertaining to Causal Group 6 supported the stated hypothesis that a significant difference would be found to exist between administrative assistant groups. Non-work stoppage administrative assistants perceive their relations with principals to be more participative in nature than work stoppage administrative assistants.

Principal Related Hypotheses

Individual question analysis

The hypothesis related to individual questions pertaining to principals stated that non-work stoppage principals would perceive the management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than principals in work stoppage districts.

The analysis of data for individual questions on the Profile of a School, Principal Form, follows on Table 26.

Table 26
 Analysis of Data for Individual Questions
 Regarding Principals

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by:						
1. teachers?	WSD	14.41	2.41			
	NWSD	15.00	2.58	-1.316	NS	
2. students?	WSD	14.27	3.15			
	NWSD	14.35	2.67	-.129	NS	
How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to:						
3. teachers?	WSD	15.61	2.40			
	NWSD	16.63	2.64	-1.943	.05	
4. students?	WSD	15.61	2.82			
	NWSD	15.75	3.26	-.218	NS	
5. How much confidence and trust do you have in your teachers?	WSD	14.62	3.11			
	NWSD	16.17	2.50	-2.586	.01	
6. How much confidence and trust do your teachers have in you?	WSD	13.66	3.57			
	NWSD	14.50	2.99	-1.462	NS	
How free do your teachers feel to talk to you about:						
7. academic matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, their work, etc.?	WSD	15.38	2.69			
	NWSD	15.57	2.68	-.340	NS	

Table 26 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
8. non-academic school matters, such as student behavior, emotional problems of students, discipline, student activities, etc.?	WSD		15.87	2.61	-1.088	NS
	NWSD		16.45	2.50		
How free do your students feel to talk to you about?						
9. academic matters?	WSD		13.00	3.09	-1.084	NS
	NWSD		13.76	3.74		
10. non-academic school matters?	WSD		14.03	2.97	-1.221	NS
	NWSD		14.76	2.82		
How often do you seek and use your teachers' ideas about:						
11. academic matters?	WSD		14.69	2.73	- .647	NS
	NWSD		15.30	2.31		
12. non-academic school matters?	WSD		14.18	3.13	-2.564	.01
	NWSD		15.66	2.24		
How often do you seek and use students' ideas about:						
13. academic matters?	WSD		8.70	3.65	-1.581	NS
	NWSD		10.02	4.48		
14. non-academic school matters?	WSD		10.59	3.59	-1.214	NS
	NWSD		11.54	3.97		
How much say do you think teachers should have about:						
15. academic matters?	WSD		14.87	2.42	-2.110	.025
	NWSD		15.90	2.31		

Table 26 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	" <u>t</u> "	P
	WSD	NWSD				
16. non-academic school matters?	WSD		14.10	2.97	-1.806	.05
	NWSD		15.19	2.84		
How much say do you think students should have about?						
17. academic matters?	WSD		10.51	3.20	- .948	NS
	NWSD		11.13	3.12		
18. non-academic school matters?	WSD		11.86	3.28	- .595	NS
	NWSD		12.27	3.37		
19. What is the general attitude of teachers toward your school as a place to work?	WSD		14.74	3.57	-1.986	.05
	NWSD		15.74	2.26		
What is the direction of the flow of information about:						
20. academic matters?	WSD		13.13	3.39	-1.902	.05
	NWSD		14.38	2.81		
21. non-academic school matters?	WSD		13.30	3.51	-2.025	.025
	NWSD		14.67	2.64		
22. How do teachers view communications from you and the administration?	WSD		12.86	3.44	-2.702	.005
	NWSD		14.65	2.86		
23. How accurate is upward communication in your school?	WSD		13.31	2.65	-1.392	NS
	NWSD		14.04	2.39		
How well do you know the problems faced by:						
24. your teachers?	WSD		14.89	2.58	- .541	NS
	NWSD		15.20	3.02		

Table 26(Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
25. your students?	WSD		13.92	2.96	-1.343	NS
	NWSD		14.72	2.81		
26. How much do your teachers feel that you are interested in their success?	WSD		14.10	2.93	-2.314	.025
	NWSD		15.44	2.66		
27. How much do your students feel that you are interested in their success?	WSD		14.00	3.06	- .656	NS
	NWSD		14.39	2.65		
28. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?	WSD		14.61	2.63	-1.878	.05
	NWSD		15.58	2.35		
29. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school among teachers?	WSD		14.87	2.78	- .587	NS
	NWSD		15.20	2.67		
30. In your school, is it "every man for himself" or do principal, teachers and students work as a team?	WSD		14.50	2.74	- .936	NS
	NWSD		15.00	2.40		
31. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student activities, etc.?	WSD		13.64	2.94	-1.898	.05
	NWSD		14.67	2.15		
32. To what extent are teachers involved in major decisions related to their work?	WSD		14.81	2.48	-1.933	.05
	NWSD		15.69	1.78		
33. In general, how much does the decision-making process contribute to the desire of teachers to do a good job?	WSD		14.75	2.53	- .373	NS
	NWSD		14.95	2.65		
34. In general, how much does the decision-making process contribute to the desire of students to do a good job?	WSD		13.30	2.99	- .734	NS
	NWSD		13.76	3.01		

Table 26 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
35. How much do your teachers feel that you are really trying to help them with their problems?	WSD	13.81	2.90		- .761	NS
	NWSD	14.27	2.93			
36. Who holds high performance goals for your school?	WSD	13.64	3.41		-2.521	.01
	NWSD	15.26	2.55			
37. Who feels responsible for achieving high performance goals for your school?	WSD	12.98	3.56		-1.332	NS
	NWSD	13.90	2.92			
38. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals in your school?	WSD	14.15	2.75		-1.757	.05
	NWSD	15.09	2.25			
39. How often do you see the behavior of your superintendent of schools as friendly and supportive?	WSD	13.60	4.96		-1.994	.05
	NWSD	15.35	2.98			
40. How much confidence and trust does your superintendent have in you?	WSD	13.66	3.57		-1.656	NS
	NWSD	14.85	3.27			
41. How much confidence and trust do you have in your superintendent?	WSD	14.13	4.33		-1.989	.05
	NWSD	15.71	3.01			
How free do you feel to talk to your superintendent about:						
42. instructional matters, such as textbook selection; instructional policies?	WSD	15.03	4.07		-1.896	.05
	NWSD	16.48	3.15			
43. administrative matters, such as budget, hiring of teachers?	WSD	14.60	4.44		-1.734	.05
	NWSD	16.09	3.74			

Table 26 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
			NWSD				
How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to:							
44. your superintendent?		WSD	15.74	3.27		-2.855	.005
		NWSD	17.34	1.80			
45. other principals?		WSD	16.67	2.62		-1.865	.05
		NWSD	17.54	1.65			
How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about:							
46. instructional and curricular matters?		WSD	12.60	4.44		-1.392	NS
		NWSD	13.79	3.76			
47. administrative matters?		WSD	12.01	4.54		-1.805	.05
		NWSD	13.58	3.79			
48. discipline and other non-academic matters?		WSD	12.56	4.16		- .906	NS
		NWSD	13.37	4.38			
49. What is the direction of the flow of information in your school system?		WSD	13.01	3.75		-3.394	.001
		NWSD	15.41	2.99			
50. How do you view communications from the superintendent?		WSD	14.67	3.99		-1.489	NS
		NWSD	15.74	2.73			
51. How accurate is upward communication in your school system?		WSD	14.40	2.43		- .234	NS
		NWSD	14.51	2.08			
52. How well does your superintendent know the problems you face?		WSD	12.09	4.64		-1.367	NS
		NWSD	13.27	3.51			

Table 26 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
53. How much do you feel that your superintendent is interested in your success?	WSD	13.77	4.19		-1.725	.05
	NWSD	15.11	3.14			
54. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?	WSD	12.70	3.76		-3.889	.001
	NWSD	15.25	2.23			
55. In your school system is it "every man for himself" or do the superintendent, principals and teachers work as a team?	WSD	12.77	3.74		-4.041	.001
	NWSD	15.39	2.16			
56. What is the general attitude toward your school system as a place to work?	WSD	14.33	3.89		-4.046	.001
	NWSD	17.33	2.44			
57. How are decisions made in your school?	WSD	12.05	3.69		-3.725	.001
	NWSD	14.69	2.92			
58. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?	WSD	14.49	3.12		-3.093	.005
	NWSD	16.21	1.90			
59. To what extent are decision-makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization?	WSD	12.98	3.56		-2.915	.005
	NWSD	14.92	2.59			
60. How much does the superintendent really try to help you with your problems?	WSD	13.05	4.61		-2.269	.025
	NWSD	14.92	2.84			
61. Who holds high performance goals for your school system?	WSD	14.00	2.93		-3.380	.001
	NWSD	15.88	2.26			
62. Who feels responsible for seeing that high performance goals are achieved in your school system?	WSD	13.41	2.67		-2.987	.005
	NWSD	15.00	2.34			

Table 26 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
63. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals in your school system?	WSD		13.73	2.78	-2.807	.005
	NWSD		15.19	2.01		

Reference to Table 26 shows that the questionnaire had a total of sixty-three questions. Every question on the questionnaire had a negative "t" value which supported the directionality of the stated hypothesis. Thirty-four questions reached the .05 level of significance and beyond and supported the stated hypothesis. The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between non-work stoppage and work stoppage principal groups was supported by the data on the remaining twenty-nine questions. It can be said, however, that a significant difference was found to exist, as predicted, between principal groups and the null hypothesis can be rejected at the .05 level of significance and beyond on the questions presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Questions which Supported
the Predicted Hypothesis
between Principal Groups

3. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to teachers?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.61	3	"Often"
NWSD	16.63	4	"Almost always"

5. How much confidence and trust do you have in your teachers?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.62	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	16.17	4	"A very great deal"

12. How often do you seek and use your teachers' ideas about non-academic school matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.18	3	"Often"
NWSD	15.66	3	"Often"

15. How much say do you think teachers should have about academic matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.87	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	15.90	3	"A considerable amount"

16. How much say do you think teachers should have about non-academic school matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.10	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	15.19	3	"A considerable amount"

Table 26 (Continued)

19. What is the general attitude of teachers toward your school as a place to work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.74	3	"Usually like it"
NWSD	15.74	3	"Usually like it"

20. What is the direction of the flow of information about academic matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.13	3	"Down and up"
NWSD	14.38	3	"Down and up"

21. What is the direction of the flow of information about non-academic school matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.30	3	"Down and up"
NWSD	14.67	3	"Down and up"

22. How do teachers view communications from you and the administration?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.86	3	"Usually accepted; sometimes cautiously"
NWSD	14.65	3	Same as above

26. How much do your teachers feel that you are interested in their success?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.10	3	"Quite interested"
NWSD	15.44	3	"Quite interested"

Table 27 (Continued)

28. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.61	3	"Moderate interaction; often with fair amount of confidence and trust"
NWSD	15.58	3	Same as above
31. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student activities, etc.?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.64	3	"Broad policy by Board, superintendent and staff. More specific decisions made at lower levels"
NWSD	14.69	3	Same as above
32. To what extent are teachers involved in major decisions related to their work?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.81	3	"Usually consulted but ordinarily not involved in decisions related to their work"
NWSD	15.69	3	Same as above
36. Who holds high performance goals for your school?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.64	3	"Principal, most teachers, and some students"
NWSD	15.26	3	Same as above
38. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals in your school system?			
<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.15	3	"Some resistance, and some cooperation"
NWSD	15.09	3	Same as above

Table 27 (Continued)

39. How often do you see the behavior of your superintendent of schools as friendly and supportive?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.60	3	"Often"
NWSD	15.35	3	"Often"

41. How much confidence and trust do you have in your superintendent?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.13	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	15.71	3	"A considerable amount"

42. How free do you feel to talk to your superintendent about instruction matters, such as textbook selection; instructional policies?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.03	3	"Quite free"
NWSD	16.48	4	"Very free"

43. How free do you feel to talk to your superintendent about administrative matters, such as hiring of teachers?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.60	3	"Quite free"
NWSD	16.09	4	"Very free"

44. How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to your superintendent?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	15.74	3	"Often"
NWSD	17.34	4	"Almost always"

45. How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to other principals?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	16.67	4	"Almost always"
NWSD	17.54	4	"Almost always"

47. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about administrative matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.01	3	"Very frequently"
NWSD	13.58	3	"Very frequently"

49. What is the direction and flow of information in your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.01	3	"Down and up"
NWSD	15.41	3	"Down and up"

53. How much do you feel that your superintendent is interested in your success?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.77	3	"Quite interested"
NWSD	15.11	3	"Quite interested"

54. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.70	3	"Moderate interaction; often with a fair amount of confidence and trust"
NWSD	15.25	3	Same as above

55. In your school system is it "every man for himself" or do the superintendent, principals and teachers work as a team?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.77	3	"A moderate amount of cooperative team work?"
NWSD	15.39	3	Same as above

Table 27 (Continued)

56. What is the general attitude toward your school system as a place to work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.33	3	"Usually like it"
NWSD	17.33	4	"Like it very much"

57. How are decisions made in your school?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.05	3	"Decisions are made at the top after consultation with appropriate lower levels"
NWSD	14.69	3	Same as above

58. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.49	3	"Usually consulted, but ordinarily not involved in decisions related to my work"
NWSD	16.21	4	"Fully involved in decisions related to my work"

59. To what extent are decision-makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.98	3	"Moderately aware"
NWSD	14.92	3	"Moderately aware"

60. How much does the superintendent really try to help you with your problems?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.05	3	"Quite a bit"
NWSD	14.92	3	"Quite a bit"

Table 27 (Continued)

61. Who holds high performance goals for your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.00	3	"School board, superintendent and most of his staff, principals and some teachers"
NWSD	15.88	3	Same as above

62. Who feels responsible for seeing that high performance goals are achieved in your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.41	3	"School board, superintendent and most of his staff, principals and some teachers"
NWSD	15.00	3	Same as above

63. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals in your school system?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.73	3	"Some resistance and some cooperation"
NWSD	15.19	3	Same as above

Grand mean analysis

The hypothesis for over-all or grand mean scores for all questions on the questionnaire pertaining to principals stated that non-work stoppage principals would perceive the over-all management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than principals in work stoppage school districts. Data analysis of over-all or grand mean scores on the Profile of a School, Principal Form, is presented on Table 28.

Table 28
Analysis of Data for Grand Mean
Scores regarding Principals

Comparison Groups	Grand Mean	S.D.	"t"	P
Work Stoppage Principals	13.77	3.59	-12.978	.001
Non-Work Stoppage Principals	14.91	3.12		

Reference to Table 28 shows that there is substantial agreement with the stated hypothesis that non-work stoppage principals would perceive the over-all management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage principals. This significant result can be attributed to the fact that 100 percent of the questions had a negative "t" value which supported the direction of the stated hypothesis.

The data support that the null hypothesis may be rejected beyond the .001 level of significance.

Causal group analysis

Two causal groups were identified and analyzed on the Profile of a School, Principal Form. Causal Group 7 can be described as causal items from superintendents upward to principals. Causal Group 7 analyzes questions which reflect the upward perceptions of principals regarding their relations with superintendents. Causal Group 8 can be described as causal items to teachers downward from principals. Causal Group 8 analyzes questions which reflect the downward perceptions of principals regarding their relations with teachers.

The hypothesis related to principal causal groups predicted that non-work stoppage principals would perceive the management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage principals.

The results of the analysis of data for questions related to Causal Group 7 are presented in Table 29.

Table 29

Analysis of Data for Causal Group 7:
Causal Items from Superintendents
(Upward) to Principals

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
39. How often do you see the behavior of your superintendent of schools as friendly and supportive?	WSD		13.60	4.96	-1.757	.05
	NWSD		15.35	2.98		
40. How much confidence and trust does your superintendent have in you?	WSD		13.66	3.57	-1.656	NS
	NWSD		14.86	3.27		
46. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about instructional and curricular matters?	WSD		12.60	4.44	-1.392	NS
	NWSD		13.79	3.76		
47. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about administrative matters?	WSD		12.01	4.54	-1.805	.05
	NWSD		13.58	3.79		
48. How often are your ideas sought and used by your superintendent about discipline and other non-academic matters?	WSD		12.56	4.16	- .906	NS
	NWSD		13.37	4.38		
54. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school system?	WSD		12.70	3.76	-3.889	.001
	NWSD		15.25	2.23		
57. How are decisions made in your school system?	WSD		12.05	3.69	-3.725	.001
	NWSD		14.69	2.92		
58. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?	WSD		14.49	3.12	-3.093	.005
	NWSD		16.21	1.90		

Table 29 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
TOTALS:	Causal Group 7					
	Work Stoppage Districts		12.95	4.16	-6.045	.001
	Non-Work Stoppage Districts		14.64	3.37		

Reference to Table 29 shows that the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .001 level of significance and beyond. The data pertaining to Causal Group 7 support the stated hypothesis that a significant difference would be found to exist between principal groups. Non-work stoppage principals perceive their relations with superintendents to be more participative in nature than work stoppage principals.

The results of the data analysis for Causal Group 8 are presented in Table 30.

Table 30
 Analysis of Data for
 Causal Group 8: Causal Items to Teachers
 (Downward) from Principals

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
			NWSD				
1. How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by teachers?		WSD	14.41	2.41		-1.316	NS
		NWSD	15.00	2.58			
3. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to teachers?		WSD	15.61	2.40		-1.943	.05
		NWSD	16.63	2.64			
5. How much confidence and trust do you have in teachers?		WSD	14.62	3.11		-2.586	.01
		NWSD	16.17	2.50			
11. How often do you seek and use your teachers' ideas about academic matters?		WSD	14.69	2.73		- .647	NS
		NWSD	15.30	2.31			
12. How often do you seek and use your teachers' ideas about non-academic school matters?		WSD	14.18	3.13		-2.564	.01
		NWSD	15.66	2.24			
15. How much say do you think teachers should have about academic matters?		WSD	14.87	2.42		-2.110	.025
		NWSD	15.90	2.31			
16. How much say do you think teachers should have about non-academic school matters?		WSD	14.10	2.97		-1.806	.05
		NWSD	15.19	2.84			
28. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?		WSD	14.61	2.63		-1.878	.05
		NWSD	15.58	2.35			

Table 30 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
			NWSD				
31. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student activities, etc.	WSD		13.64	2.94		-1.898	.05
	NWSD		14.67	2.15			
32. To what extent are teachers involved in major decisions related to their work?	WSD		14.81	2.48		-1.933	.05
	NWSD		15.69	1.78			
TOTALS: Causal Group 8:							
Work Stoppage Districts			14.58	2.78		-5.780	.001
Non-Work Stoppage Districts			15.57	2.44			

Reference to Table 30 shows that the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .001 level of significance and beyond. The data pertaining to Causal Group 8 support the stated hypothesis that a significant relationship would be found to exist between principal groups. Non-work stoppage principals perceive their relations with teachers to be more participative in nature than work stoppage principals.

Teacher Related Hypothesis

Individual question analysis

The hypothesis related to individual questions pertaining to teachers predicted that non-work stoppage teachers would perceive the management system in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than teachers in work stoppage districts.

The analysis of data for individual questions on the Profile of a School, Teacher Form, follows on Table 31.

Table 31
 Analysis of Data for Individual Questions
 Regarding Teachers

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
			NWSD				
1. How often is your behavior seen by your students as friendly and supportive?		WSD	15.19	2.92		- .125	NS
		NWSD	15.23	3.07			
2. How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to your students?		WSD	16.39	2.51		1.365	NS
		NWSD	16.00	2.86			
3. How much confidence and trust do you have in your students?		WSD	14.88	2.89		.796	NS
		NWSD	14.63	3.00			
4. How much confidence and trust do your students have in you?		WSD	15.14	2.75		.239	NS
		NWSD	15.07	2.75			
5. How much do your students feel that you are interested in their success as students?		WSD	15.42	3.04		- .780	NS
		NWSD	15.67	2.97			
How free do your students feel to talk to you about:							
6. academic matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, their work, etc.?		WSD	15.06	3.64		- .052	NS
		NWSD	15.08	3.63			
7. non-academic school matters, such as student behavior, emotional problems of students, discipline, student activities, etc.?		WSD	14.86	3.60		.406	NS
		NWSD	14.70	3.85			
How often do you seek and use your students' ideas about:							
8. academic matters?		WSD	12.29	3.89		1.034	NS
		NWSD	11.87	3.75			

Table 31 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD					
9. non-academic school matters?	WSD		11.46	4.42		- .675	NS
	NWSD		11.77	4.19			
10. How much do your students feel that you are really trying to help them with their problems?	WSD		14.10	3.30		-1.361	NS
	NWSD		14.57	3.18			
How much say do you think students should have about:							
11. academic matters?	WSD		11.53	3.37		1.153	NS
	NWSD		11.11	3.45			
12. non-academic school matters?	WSD		13.24	3.35		.626	NS
	NWSD		13.00	3.78			
13. To what extent are students involved in major decisions affecting them?	WSD		12.38	3.65		- .587	NS
	NWSD		12.60	3.38			
14. What is the general attitude of students toward your school?	WSD		12.86	3.81		-1.524	NS
	NWSD		13.47	3.74			
15. How accurate is information given to you by your students concerning class, school, or personal matters?	WSD		13.79	2.77		- .441	NS
	NWSD		13.93	3.21			
How do students view communications from:							
16. you?	WSD		16.14	2.78		- .703	NS
	NWSD		16.34	2.58			
17. the principal?	WSD		14.02	4.52		-1.452	NS
	NWSD		14.68	4.02			

Table 31 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
18. How well do you know the problems faced by your students in their school work?	WSD		14.59	3.27	- .208	NS
	NWSD		14.60	3.48		
19. What is the character and amount of interaction in your classes?	WSD		15.87	2.43	.037	NS
	NWSD		15.86	2.68		
20. In your classes, is it "every man for himself" or do students work cooperatively as a team?	WSD		14.23	3.53	.321	NS
	NWSD		14.11	3.47		
21. How much influence do students have in decisions concerning the subjects they study?	WSD		9.45	3.87	- .094	NS
	NWSD		9.49	4.10		
22. How much influence do you think students should have in decisions concerning the subjects they study?	WSD		11.84	3.70	1.420	NS
	NWSD		11.27	3.86		
23. To what extent does having influence on decisions concerning the subjects to be studied make students want to work harder?	WSD		13.01	4.03	2.342	.01
	NWSD		12.00	4.05		
24. What does the class decision-making process contribute to the desire of students to do a good job?	WSD		14.22	3.37	2.531	.01
	NWSD		13.29	3.53		
25. How often do you see your principals's behavior as friendly and supportive?	WSD		13.66	5.04	-2.529	.01
	NWSD		14.93	4.42		
26. How much confidence and trust does your principal have in you?	WSD		14.63	3.88	-2.524	.01
	NWSD		15.56	2.93		
27. How much confidence and trust do you have in your principal?	WSD		13.75	5.20	-2.108	.025
	NWSD		14.82	4.32		

Table 31 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
How free do you feel to talk to your principal about:						
28. academic matters?	WSD		15.30	5.02	-1.524	NS
	NWSD		16.04	4.07		
29. non-academic school matters?	WSD		14.26	5.71	-1.198	NS
	NWSD		14.95	5.10		
How often do you try to be friendly and supportive to:						
30. your principal?	WSD		16.17	3.74	-1.104	NS
	NWSD		16.58	3.25		
31. other teachers?	WSD		17.02	2.49	.433	NS
	NWSD		16.90	2.76		
How often are your ideas sought and used by the principal about:						
32. academic matters?	WSD		10.31	5.17	-1.771	.05
	NWSD		11.26	4.99		
33. non-academic school matters?	WSD		9.52	5.29	-2.132	.025
	NWSD		10.69	5.05		
How much say do you think teachers should have about:						
34. academic matters?	WSD		16.75	2.63	1.476	NS
	NWSD		16.35	2.50		
35. non-academic school matters?	WSD		15.11	3.33	.056	NS
	NWSD		15.09	3.35		

Table 31 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
			NWSD				
How often are students' ideas sought and used by the principal about:							
36. academic matters?	WSD		8.33	4.67		-.161	NS
	NWSD		8.41	4.64			
37. non-academic school matters?	WSD		9.37	4.99		-.595	NS
	NWSD		9.69	5.02			
38. How much do you feel that your principal is interested in your success?	WSD		13.61	5.06		-2.170	.025
	NWSD		14.71	4.47			
39. What is the general attitude of teachers toward your school as a place to work?	WSD		12.37	4.36		-4.554	.001
	NWSD		14.47	4.36			
What is the direction of the flow of information about:							
40. academic matters?	WSD		11.32	5.34		-1.303	NS
	NWSD		12.01	4.57			
41. non-academic school matters?	WSD		11.91	5.43		-.452	NS
	NWSD		12.16	4.78			
42. How do you view communications from your principal?	WSD		14.53	4.56		-.842	NS
	NWSD		14.91	3.94			
43. How accurate is upward communication?	WSD		13.67	3.31		-1.421	NS
	NWSD		14.14	2.82			
44. How well does your principal know the problems faced by teachers?	WSD		12.63	5.04		-1.725	.05
	NWSD		13.52	4.71			
45. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?	WSD		12.90	4.77		-2.218	.025
	NWSD		13.97	4.32			

Table 31 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
46. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school among teachers?	WSD		15.01	2.99	.532	NS
	NWSD		14.84	3.04		
47. In your school is it "every man for himself" or do principal, teachers, and students work as a team?	WSD		13.35	3.91	-.928	NS
	NWSD		13.74	4.05		
48. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student behavior, student activities, etc.?	WSD		11.67	4.42	-3.867	.001
	NWSD		13.36	3.81		
49. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?	WSD		13.23	4.38	-3.330	.001
	NWSD		14.68	3.80		
50. How much does your principal really try to help you with your problems?	WSD		12.45	5.39	-2.149	.025
	NWSD		13.62	4.90		
51. In general, how much does the decision-making process contribute to the desire of teachers to do a good job?	WSD		14.89	4.45	-1.324	NS
	NWSD		15.45	3.44		
52. In general, how much does the decision-making process contribute to the desire of students to do a good job?	WSD		13.50	3.96	.220	NS
	NWSD		13.41	3.61		
53. Who holds high performance goals for your school?	WSD		14.45	3.38	-.237	NS
	NWSD		14.54	3.46		
54. Who feels responsible for achieving high performance goals?	WSD		13.74	3.17	-1.100	NS
	NWSD		14.14	3.37		
55. How much resistance is there to achieving high performance goals in your school?	WSD		13.53	4.11	-1.623	NS
	NWSD		14.23	3.60		

Reference to Table 31 shows that the questionnaire had a total of fifty-five questions. Thirty-eight of the questions on the questionnaire had a negative "t" value which supported the directionality of the stated hypothesis. Twelve questions reached the .05 level of significance and beyond and supported the stated hypothesis. The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between non-work stoppage and work stoppage teacher groups is supported by the data on the remaining questions. Questions 23 and 24 had a positive "t" value which reached the .01 level of significance. These questions were significant in the opposite direction of the stated hypothesis. It can be said, however, that a significant difference was found to exist, as predicted, between teacher groups and the null hypothesis can be rejected at the .05 level of significance and beyond on the questions presented in Table 32.

Table 32

Questions which Supported
the Predicted Hypothesis
between Teacher Groups

25. How often do you see your principals behavior as friendly and supportive?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.66	3	"Often"
NWSD	14.93	3	"Often"

26. How much confidence and trust does your principal have in you?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	14.63	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	15.56	3	"A considerable amount"

27. How much confidence and trust do you have in your principal?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.75	3	"A considerable amount"
NWSD	14.82	3	"A considerable amount"

32. How often are your ideas sought and used by the principal about academic matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	10.31	2	"Sometimes"
NWSD	11.26	3	"Often"

33. How often are your ideas sought and used by the principal about non-academic school matters?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	9.52	2	"Sometimes"
NWSD	10.69	2	"Sometimes"

Table 32 (Continued)

38. How much do you feel that your principal is interested in your success?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.61	3	"Quite interested"
NWSD	14.71	3	"Quite interested"

39. What is the general attitude of teachers toward your school as a place to work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.37	3	"Usually like it"
NWSD	14.47	3	"Usually like it"

44. How well does your principal know the problems faced by teachers?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.63	3	"Quite well"
NWSD	13.52	3	"Quite well"

45. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.90	3	"Moderate interaction, often with a fair amount of confidence and trust"
NWSD	13.97	3	Same as above

48. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student behavior, student activities, etc.?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	11.67	3	"Broad policy by board, superintendent and staff. More specific decisions made at lower levels."
NWSD	13.67	3	Same as above

Table 32 (Continued)

49. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	13.23	3	"Usually consulted, but ordinarily not involved in decisions related to my work"
NWSD	14.68	3	Same as above

50. How much does your principal really try to help you with your problems?

<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>
WSD	12.45	3	"Quite a bit"
NWSD	13.62	3	"Quite a bit"

Grand mean analysis

The hypothesis for over-all or grand mean scores for all questions on the questionnaire pertaining to teachers stated that non-work stoppage teachers would perceive the over-all management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than principals in work stoppage school districts. Data analysis of over-all or grand mean scores on the Profile of a School, Teacher Form, is presented on Table 33.

Table 33
Analysis of Data for Grand Mean
Scores regarding Teachers

Comparison Groups	Grand Mean	S.D.	"t"	P
Work Stoppage Teachers	13.54	4.47	-5.614	.001
Non-Work Stoppage Teachers	13.89	4.23		

Reference to Table 33 shows there is substantial agreement with the stated hypothesis that non-work stoppage teachers would perceive the over-all management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage teachers. This significant result can be attributed to the fact that 69 percent of the questions had a negative "t" value which supported the direction of the stated hypothesis.

The data support that the null hypothesis may be rejected beyond the .001 level of significance.

Causal group analysis

The final causal group was identified and analyzed on the Profile of a School, Teacher Form. Causal Group 9 can be described as causal items from the principal upward to teachers. Causal Group 9 analyzes questions which reflect the upward perceptions of teachers regarding their relations with principals.

The hypothesis related to the teacher causal group stated that non-work stoppage teachers would perceive the management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage teachers.

The results of the analysis of data for questions related to Causal Group 9 are presented in Table 34.

Table 34

Analysis of Data for Causal Group 9:
Causal Items from Principals
(Upward) to Teachers

Question	Comparison Groups:		MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
	WSD	NWSD				
25. How often do you see your principal's behavior as friendly and supportive?	WSD		13.66	5.04	-2.529	.01
	NWSD		14.93	4.42		
26. How much confidence and trust does your principal have in you?	WSD		14.63	3.88	-2.524	.01
	NWSD		15.56	2.93		
32. How often are your ideas sought and used by the principal about academic matters?	WSD		10.31	5.17	-1.771	.05
	NWSD		11.26	4.99		
33. How often are your ideas sought and used by the principal about non-academic school matters?	WSD		9.52	5.29	-2.132	.025
	NWSD		10.69	5.05		
45. What is the character and amount of interaction in your school between principal and teachers?	WSD		12.90	4.77	-2.218	.025
	NWSD		13.97	4.32		
48. At what level are decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student behavior, student activities, etc.?	WSD		11.67	4.42	-3.867	.001
	NWSD		13.36	3.81		
49. To what extent are you involved in major decisions related to your work?	WSD		13.23	4.38	-3.330	.001
	NWSD		14.68	3.80		
50. How much does your principal really try to help you with your problems?	WSD		12.45	5.29	-2.149	.025
	NWSD		13.62	4.90		

Table 34 (Continued)

Question	Comparison Groups:	WSD	MEAN	S.D.	"t"	P
		NWSD				
TOTALS:	Causal Group 9					
	Work Stoppage Districts		12.29	5.08		
	Non-Work Stoppage Districts		13.51	4.62	-6.720	.001

Reference to Table 34 shows the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .001 level of significance and beyond. The data pertaining to Causal Group 9 support the stated hypothesis that a significant difference would be found to exist between principal groups. Non-work stoppage teachers perceive their relations with principals to be more participative in nature than work stoppage teachers.

Summary

In the analysis of data for individual questions, significant differences were found to exist which supported the stated hypothesis between non-work stoppage and work stoppage groups on a number of questions on each of the five Profile of a School questionnaires used in this investigation. The null hypothesis was rejected, at the .05 level of significance and beyond, on 20.4 percent of the questions on the Board Member Form; on 20 percent of the questions on the Superintendent Form; on 26.6 percent of the questions on the Administrative Assistant Form; on 53.9 percent of the questions on the Principal Form; and on 21.8 percent of the questions on the Teacher Form. Over all, 272 questions were analyzed and a significant difference was found to exist which indicated that non-work stoppage respondents perceived the management employed in their districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, on 80 questions or 29.4 percent of the total number of questions analyzed.

In the analysis of data for over-all or grand mean scores, a significant difference was found to exist which supported the stated hypothesis on each of the five Profile of a School questionnaires. The null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 level of significance and beyond between grand mean scores on each questionnaire. Non-work stoppage respondents perceived the over-all management employed in their school districts to be more toward participative group management, System 4, than work stoppage respondents.

These significant differences are reflected in the fact that non-work stoppage respondents had a higher mean score on 75.5 percent of the questions on the Board Member Form; on 70 percent of the questions on the Superintendent Form; on 91 percent of the questions on the Administrative Assistant Form; on 100 percent of the questions on the Principal Form; and on 69 percent of the questions on the Teacher Form.

In the analysis of data for causal groups which were identified in this investigation; significant differences were found to exist, as hypothesized, between non-work stoppage and work stoppage groups on six of the nine causal groups.

The data indicate that the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level of significance and beyond on the following causal groups; therefore, it is assumed that the comparison groups are homogeneous.

Causal Group 1, Causal items to the superintendent from board members. (Downward)

Causal Group 3, Causal items from board members to superintendents. (Upward)

Causal Group 4, Causal items to principals from superintendents. (Downward)

The data indicate that the null hypothesis could be rejected at .05 level of significance and beyond on the following causal groups; therefore, it is assumed that the comparison groups are not homogeneous.

Causal Group 2, Causal items to the principal from board members. (Downward)

Causal Group 5. Causal items from superintendents to administrative assistants. (Upward)

Causal Group 6, Causal items to principals from administrative assistants. (Downward)

Causal Group 7, Causal items from superintendents to principals. (Upward)

Causal Group 8, Causal items to teachers from principals. (Downward)

Causal Group 9, Causal items from principals to teachers. (Upward)

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS; IMPLICATIONS; LIMITATIONS; RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH; AND SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Conclusions and Interpretations

The null hypothesis that no significant difference would be found to exist between work stoppage and non-work stoppage comparison groups was rejected on eighty or 29.4 per cent of the total number of individual questions analyzed in the five Profile of a School questionnaires that were used in this investigation. It can be concluded that non-work stoppage respondents perceived significantly more participative group or System 4 management on those questions which reached accepted significance levels. The data support the following conclusions and interpretations in each of the questionnaires:

Board Member Form: Specifically, the data support the following conclusions that non-work stoppage board members, as compared to work stoppage board members, believe to a significantly greater degree that:

1. they have more confidence and trust in their top administrative staff.
2. their top administrative staff members have more confidence and trust in them.
3. their top administrative staff members have a better general attitude toward their school system as a place to work.

4. their top administrative staff accepts downward communication more openly and candidly.

5. communication from the top administrative staff is more accurate.

6. the character and amount of interaction in their school districts with members of the top administrative staff is extensive and friendly with a high degree of confidence and trust.

7. there is more cooperative teamwork in their school districts.

8. there is greater involvement in their school districts in the decision-making process in instructional and curricular matters.

9. their top administrative staff is more freely involved in decisions related to their work.

10. there is more involvement of staff members at all levels in achieving high performance goals.

Superintendent Form: Specifically, the data support the following conclusions that non-work stoppage superintendents, as compared to work stoppage superintendents, believe to a significantly greater degree that:

1. staff members view their behavior to be friendly and supportive more often.

2. they have more confidence and trust in their staff.

3. they try more often to behave in ways that encourage their staff to discuss important things about their work with them.

4. they seek and use their staffs' ideas and opinions more often.

5. their staff members have a better general attitude toward their school systems as a place to work.
6. their staff feels more free to talk about academic matters.
7. their staff members view downward communications with more acceptance.
8. there is a higher amount of interaction in their school systems among staff members.
9. their staff members are more involved in the decision-making process.
10. their staff members feel that they try more often to help them with their problems.
11. their staff members try more often to behave in ways that are friendly and supportive.
12. there is less resistance in their school systems toward achieving high performance goals.

Administrative Assistant Form: Specifically, the data support the following conclusions that non-work stoppage administrative staff members, as compared to work stoppage administrative staff members, believe to a significantly greater degree that:

1. the direction and flow of information about academic and non-academic school matters is more downward and upward.
2. there is more involvement at all levels in decisions related to school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, and student activities.
3. principals are more involved in decisions related to their work.

4. the superintendent of schools is more friendly and supportive.
5. the character and amount of interaction in their school systems is more extensive and friendly with a high degree of confidence and trust.
6. there is more cooperative teamwork in their school systems.
7. there is a better general attitude toward their school systems as a place to work.
8. upward communication in their school systems is more accurate.
9. decision makers are more aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization.
10. there is more involvement on the part of school board members, the superintendent and his staff, principals and some teachers in attaining high performance goals.

Principal Form: Specifically, the data support the following conclusions that non-work stoppage principals, as compared to work stoppage principals, believe to a significantly greater degree that:

1. they seek more often to be friendly and supportive to teachers.
2. they have more confidence and trust in teachers.
3. they try more often to seek and use teachers' ideas about academic and non-academic school matters.
4. teachers should have more say about non-academic school matters.

5. teachers have a better general attitude toward their schools as a place to work.

6. there is more involvement both downward and upward in the direction and flow of information about academic and non-academic school matters.

7. teachers usually accept, sometimes cautiously, downward communications from principals and the administration.

8. teachers are more interested in their success as principals.

9. the character and amount of interaction in their schools between principals and teachers to be more moderate; often with a fair amount of confidence and trust.

10. there is more involvement at all levels in decisions related to school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, and student activities.

11. teachers are more involved in major decisions; teachers are usually consulted but not ordinarily involved in decisions related to their work.

12. the principal, most teachers, and some students are more concerned about achieving high performance goals in their schools.

13. there is less resistance toward achieving high performance goals in their schools.

14. the behavior of the superintendent of schools is friendly and supportive more often.

15. they have more confidence and trust in their superintendents of schools.

16. they feel more free to talk to their superintendents about instructional matters, such as textbook selection, instructional policies, etc.

17. they feel more free to talk to their superintendents about administrative matters, such as hiring of teachers, etc.

18. they are friendly and supportive to their superintendents more often.

19. they are friendly and supportive to other principals more often.

20. their superintendents seek and use their ideas about administrative matters more often.

21. the direction and flow of information in their school systems is more downward and upward.

22. the character and amount of interaction in their school systems is a more moderate kind of interaction; often with a fair amount of confidence and trust.

23. there is a moderate amount of cooperative teamwork in their school systems between superintendents, principals and teachers.

24. there is a better general attitude toward their school systems as a place to work.

25. there is more involvement at various levels in the decision-making process; decisions are generally made at the top after appropriate consultation with lower levels.

26. they are more involved in major decisions related to their work.

27. decision-makers are significantly more aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in the organization.

28. superintendents try harder to help them with their problems.

29. their school boards, superintendents and their staff, principals and some teachers are more involved in holding high performance goals in their school systems.

30. their school boards, superintendents and their staff, principals and some teachers are more responsible for seeing that high performance goals are achieved in their school systems.

Teacher Form: Specifically, the data support the following conclusions that non-work stoppage teachers, as compared to work stoppage teachers, believe to a significantly greater degree that:

1. their principals' behavior is more friendly and supportive.
2. their principals have more confidence and trust in them.
3. they have more confidence and trust in their principals.
4. their ideas are sought and used more often by their principals in academic and non-academic school matters.
5. their principals are more interested in their success.
6. they have a better general attitude toward their school systems as a place to work.
7. their principals have a better understanding of the problems faced by teachers.

8. the character and amount of interaction in their school systems between principals and teachers is a more moderate kind of interaction, often with a fair amount of confidence and trust.

9. they are more involved in decisions made about school matters, such as course content, instructional plans, teaching methods, student behavior and student activities.

10. they are more involved in major decisions related to their work.

11. their principals are more willing to try and help them with their problems.

In the overall or grand mean analysis of data between comparison groups the null hypotheses were rejected at the .001 level of significance and beyond on each of the five Profile of a School questionnaires. Generally, it can be concluded that non-work stoppage respondents, as compared to work stoppage respondents, believe to a significantly greater degree that the overall management employed in their districts is more toward participative group management or System 4.

In the analysis of data for the nine Causal Groups identified in this investigation the null hypothesis was accepted on Causal Groups 1, 3, and 4. The null hypothesis was rejected on Causal Groups 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The data support the following conclusions:

1. Board members in both comparison groups believe their behavior to be perceived by superintendents as being similar in nature.

2. Non-work stoppage board members, as compared to work stoppage board members, believe to a significantly greater degree that their behavior is perceived by principals to be more participative in nature.

3. Superintendents in both comparison groups perceive the behavior of board members as being similar in nature.

4. Superintendents in both comparison groups believe their behavior to be perceived by principals as being similar in nature.

5. Non-work stoppage administrative assistants, as compared to work stoppage administrative assistants, believe to a significantly greater degree that the behavior of superintendents is more participative in nature.

6. Non-work stoppage administrative assistants, as compared to work stoppage administrative assistants, believe to a significantly greater degree that their behavior is perceived by principals to be more participative in nature.

7. Non-work stoppage principals, as compared to work stoppage principals, believe to a significantly greater degree that the behavior of superintendents is more participative in nature.

8. Non-work stoppage principals, as compared to work stoppage principals, believe to a significantly greater degree that their behavior is perceived by teachers as being more participative in nature.

9. Non-work stoppage teachers, as compared to work stoppage teachers, believe to a significantly greater degree that the behavior of principals is more participative in nature.

Since significant differences were found to exist which supported the stated hypotheses in each of the five Profile of a School questionnaires, it can be concluded that non-work stoppage respondents, as compared to work stoppage respondents, perceive themselves to be involved in more participative or System 4 kinds of management. In general, non-work stoppage respondents perceive themselves in varying degrees, to: (1) be more involved in the decision-making process; (2) enjoy greater levels of confidence and trust in their interpersonal relations with each other, their subordinates, and superordinates; (3) view upward and downward communication as being accurate; and (4) to have a better general attitude about their school districts as a place to work.

Implications

This study has attempted to provide empirical data related to and concerning the significance of hypothesized differences in management practices and behaviors being used in selected non-work stoppage and work stoppage school districts in the state of Michigan. Since significant differences were found to exist which supported the directionality of the stated hypotheses, it is felt that the results of this investigation have important implications for current and future management practices in education.

A major challenge to educational leaders in both the administrative and teaching ranks during the decade of the '70's will be to find ways of improving and evaluating the organizational health

of their school districts. The key to improved organizational health in education could lie in the adoption of the principle of supportive relationships through the implementation of participative group or System 4 management practices. Significant improvement in the organizational climate of numerous business and industrial organizations have been noted in the research done by Dr. Rensis likert and his staff at the University of Michigan. Desired shifts toward participative group or System 4 management practices have been made which have resulted in improved relationships, better attitudes, lower absence and turnover, and higher profits.

Any attempt to shift toward System 4 management practices must consider the close interrelationships of causal, intervening, and end-result variables. Dr. Likert has written:¹

When an organization is seeking to make such a shift the efforts to change should be focused initially on the causal variables. Changes brought about in the causal variables will lead in turn to changes in the intervening and end result variables. Attempts to bring the desired shift in the management system by concentrating on the intervening variables directly will result usually in disappointment and failure.

Efforts to change an organization toward System 4 also need to deal with all those organizational procedures which bind an organization to its present management system. Training in group interaction skills and similar efforts to move an organization toward System 4 are likely to yield disappointing results if steps are not taken to shift all operating procedures toward a System 4 pattern.

¹Likert, Rensis, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967, pp. 143.

Changes in causal variables, which include the structure of the organization and management policies, decisions, business and leadership strategies, skills and behaviors, may be necessary if desired shifts toward System 4 are to be implemented. Accordingly, changes in causal variables should produce desired changes in intervening variables, such as improved loyalties, attitudes, motivations, performance goals, and perceptions of all members and their collective capacity for more effective interaction, communication, and decision-making. Effective changes in causal and intervening variables should lead in turn to improved end-result variables. In education improved end-result variables could lead to lower absence and turnover, more positive interpersonal relations between teachers and administrators, and more effective teaching. Desired shifts in management practices and changes in causal, intervening, and end-result variables may call for dynamic departures from traditional organizational structure and leadership strategies. Such changes will necessitate a willingness on the part of board members, superintendents, administrators, and teachers to accept new and emerging roles and responsibilities.

The results of this study have implications for those who are involved in the training of administrators and teachers. School districts operating under the conditions of teacher negotiations will have special need for personnel who are well trained and have a conceptual understanding of effective modern management theory. The situation calls for the training of administrators and teachers

who are capable of assuming leadership positions; who have a substantial understanding of the problem connected with leadership, organizational performance, motivations and behavior; and who have the capacity to work with staff members under adverse conditions in an amicable manner without harboring resentment.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations to this investigation which should be acknowledged and discussed. First, this investigation was limited to ten work stoppage and ten non-work stoppage school districts in the state of Michigan, each of which had a student enrollment of not less than two thousand and not more than ten thousand students. Second, this was a field study and the variance of many variables is large in such a study, especially when compared to the variance in variables in controlled laboratory experiments. Although attempts were made to control for intervening variables by matching work stoppage and non-work stoppage districts of similar size, social, economic, and geographic characteristics, it was not possible to control for such variables as: prejudiced attitudes, conservatism, liberalism, and individual school district policies, practices and procedures. It is assumed, however, that the population is representative of other school districts in the state of Michigan of similar size and demographic characteristics. Third, this study was "ex post facto" in nature; that is to say that variables such as the management practices being used in the

school districts, involvement or non-involvement in work stoppages, and the influence of teachers negotiations under the provisions of Public Act 379 had already occurred at the time the data were collected. In "ex post facto" field studies statements of causal relationships between independent and dependent variables are considered much weaker than they would be under controlled laboratory or experimental research conditions.

Recommendations for Further Research

The significant differences which were found to exist in this investigation seem to suggest the following recommendations to further investigate the impact and influence of the collective negotiations process on educational management practices and behaviors.

1. Several comparative studies could be made to determine if significant differences exist in terms of management systems being used when respondents are classified as to (1) age; (2) sex; (3) preparation and background; (4) years of experience, and (5) grade level taught (i.e., elementary, junior high, senior high, etc.).

2. Several comparative studies could be made to determine if significant differences exist in terms of management systems being used when school districts are classified as to (1) student enrollment; (2) assessed valuation; (3) racial mixture; and (4) varying geographic and demographic characteristics (i.e., urban, suburban, rural, etc.).

3. A longitudinal study of similar design to this investigation is recommended in a state that has not yet enacted legislation calling for teachers' negotiations. Pre-negotiation base line data could be compared to data obtained after negotiations had been implemented. Pre- and-post negotiation comparisons could give some valuable clues as to the nature of shifts in management practices and changes in the perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of individuals involved. Such a study could be the remedy to the "ex post facto" limitation of this study.

The significant differences that were found to exist in this investigation suggest that further research is important. Ultimately it is hoped that additional research will lead to the adoption and implementation of more enlightened management practices which would lead in turn to improved and more stable employer-employee relations in education.

Summary of the Study

Since the enactment of PA 379 which provided for teacher negotiations in the state of Michigan, many questions have been raised concerning the impact of work stoppages, teacher demands, and the negotiations process on the educational system. An important question to consider is what effect these variables have had on the policies and procedures used by management and the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of individuals involved at various levels

of the educational hierarchy. The intent of this study was to compare management systems and organizational profiles of selected work stoppage and non-work stoppage school districts in the state to investigate the significance of differences that were found to exist.

Five hypotheses were formulated, one for each level of the organizational hierarchy, which predicted that: (1) board members; (2) superintendents; (3) administrative assistants; (4) principals; and (5) teachers employed in non-work stoppage districts would perceive the management systems being used in their school districts to be more toward System 4 or participative group management than respondents employed in work stoppage school districts.

This investigation was a field study involving a sample of all board members, superintendents, administrative assistants and principals and a fifteen percent random sample of all teachers employed in ten work stoppage and ten non-work stoppage school districts. Districts were selected on the basis of the following criteria: (1) each district must have a student enrollment of not less than two thousand and not more than ten thousand students; (2) non-work stoppage school districts must never have been involved in a work stoppage; and (3) work stoppage school districts must have been involved in a work stoppage during the 1969-70 school year. Work stoppage districts were randomly selected from a list of districts which met the above mentioned criteria. Each work stoppage district was then matched with a non-work stoppage district of similar student

size and similar geographic and demographic characteristics. Participating districts represented seven counties which spread across the middle and southern sections of the state. Most districts were located around and near most of the major metropolitan sections of the state. To protect the anonymity of participating districts and respondents, exact names and locations were not cited. It is assumed, however, that the population is representative of populations in school districts of similar size and demographic characteristics in the state of Michigan.

Profiles of organizational characteristics were obtained through the use of five anonymous, self-administered Profile of a School questionnaires, which were selected on the basis of their relatedness and applicability to the hypotheses which were presented. These questionnaires were authored and developed by Dr. Rensis Likert of the University of Michigan. Dr. Likert gave his permission to use the five questionnaires in this investigation. The over-all percentage of returns from each respondent group was as follows: (1) board members - 50 percent; (2) superintendents - 95 percent; (3) administrative assistants - 86 percent; (4) principals - 70 percent; and (5) teachers - 61 percent. A total of 946 questionnaires were distributed and 592 or 63 percent of the questionnaires were returned.

The "t" test was used to determine the significance of differences that were found to exist between scores of comparison groups. Since the stated hypotheses were directional in nature,

it was considered appropriate to compare derived "t" values with one-tailed probability levels found on a standard "t" table. The null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of probability or lower.

Significant differences were found to exist which supported the directionality of the stated hypothesis on at least 20 percent of the individual questions on each of the five questionnaires. It should be noted that a significant difference was found to exist which supported the hypothesis on 53 percent of the questions on the Profile of a School, Principal Form. Specifically, it can be concluded that respondents, especially principals, in non-work stoppage school districts do perceive more participative management practices and behaviors on those individual questions which reached appropriate significance levels.

In the analysis of data for over-all or grand mean scores for all questions on each of the questionnaires the null hypothesis was rejected at the .001 on each of the five questionnaires. Therefore, it can be concluded that the over-all management systems used in non-work stoppage school districts were perceived to be significantly more participative or System 4 in nature than in work stoppage districts.

Significant differences were found to exist which supported the stated hypotheses in six of the nine Causal Groups identified in this investigation. The data support the following conclusions that:

1. Board members in both comparison groups believed their

behavior to be perceived by superintendents as being similar or in the System 3 range; however, superintendents in both groups perceived the behavior of board members to be in the System 4 range. Therefore, it can be concluded that the behavior of board members was perceived to be more participative by superintendents than board members themselves had realized.

2. Superintendents in both comparison groups believed their behavior to be perceived by principals as being similar or in the System 3 range; however, non-work stoppage principals, as compared to work stoppage principals, perceived the behavior of superintendents to be significantly more participative in nature. Therefore, it can be concluded that work stoppage superintendents believed their behavior to be perceived as being more participative by principals than work stoppage principals themselves had indicated.

3. Non-work stoppage superintendents, as compared to work stoppage superintendents believed their behavior to be perceived as being significantly more participative, or System 4, in nature by their top administrative assistants.

4. Non-work stoppage administrative assistants, as compared to work stoppage administrative assistants, believed their behavior to be perceived as significantly more participative, or System 4, in nature by principals.

5. Non-work stoppage principals, as compared to work stoppage principals, believed their behavior to be perceived as being significantly more participative in nature by teachers. Non-work stoppage teachers, as compared to work stoppage teachers, agreed; however,

both teacher groups indicated that they perceived the behavior of principals to be somewhat less participative in nature than principals themselves had indicated.

Since the data indicate that non-work stoppage respondents at all levels perceived more participative management practices being used in their school districts, it is recommended that school districts adopt the principle of supportive relationships through the implementation of more participative management practices. Desired shifts toward System 4 have been noted and recorded in business and industry. Positive changes in management practices, policies, and procedures (causal variables) should lead to improved attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and motivations, (intervening variables) which, in turn, should improve interpersonal relations between teachers and administrators (end-result variables). Such changes will call for dynamic changes in the organizational structure and a willingness on the part of individuals at all levels to accept and share their new and emerging roles, responsibilities, and powers.

The major limitation of this study was its "ex post facto" nature; therefore, it was not possible to draw specific causal relationships between independent and dependent variables. It is recommended that continued research be done to investigate the impact and influence of the collective negotiations process and involvement and/or non-involvement in work stoppages on current and future educational management practices, attitudes, and behaviors under a variety of conditions.

Continued research should attempt to identify those factors and conditions which will best encourage and allow individuals at all levels the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process and become involved in the implementation and planning of new and innovative policies, procedures and programs. Ultimately, it is hoped that an organizational model will evolve which will respect the unique value of all individuals in the organization and allow them to develop to their maximum potential as they live, work, and function toward an end of self-actualization.

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT 1

A Sample Page from a
Profile of a School Form

	System 1	System 2	System 3	System 4	Item No.
	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost always	
How often is your behavior seen as friendly and supportive by:					
a. the superintendent of schools?	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	1
b. the top administrative staff?	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	2
c. the principals?	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	3
How often do you seek to be friendly and supportive to:	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost always	
a. the superintendent of schools?	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	4
b. the top administrative staff?	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	5
c. the principals?	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	6

EXHIBIT 2

ESTIMATED RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS
BASE ON CALIFORNIA DATA FURNISHED
BY DR. RENSIS LIKERT

August 7, 1970

Board Member Form: N = 25

\bar{M} intercorrelation r = roughly .3
for 49 items = roughly .83

Superintendent Form: N = 25

Causal items from board members
Questions 35 and 55-60 or 7 items = .95
Causal items to principal = 13 (but delete
39-41) = 10 items = .85
For all items intercorrelation r = .90

Administrative Staff Form: N = 83

Causal items from superintendents = \bar{M} intercorrelation
r = .55 for 6 items = .88
Causal items to principal = \bar{M} intercorrelation
r = .3 for 8 items = .77
For all items = \bar{M} intercorrelation r = .2 = .91

Principal Form: N = 66

Causal items from superintendent \bar{M} intercorrelation
r approximately = .6 for 7 items = .91
Causal items to teachers \bar{M} intercorrelation
r approximately = .2 for 10 items = .71
For all items
Part I = 38 items intercorrelation
r approximately = .15 for 38 items = .88
Part II = 22 items M intercorrelation
r approximately = .5 for 22 items = .95

Teacher Form: N = 400

Causal from principal \bar{M} intercorrelation r
approximately = .4 for 8 items = .84
For all items
Part I = 24 items \bar{M} intercorrelation
r approximately = .25 = .87
Part II = 28 items \bar{M} intercorrelation
r approximately = .4 = .96

EXHIBIT 3

LETTER REQUESTING RECIPIENTS
TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

School of Education
Department of School Services

Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dear _____:

Enclosed you will find a respondent data sheet and a questionnaire which asks you to describe the management system that is presently being used in your school district. You have been selected to represent your district in a research project that I am presently conducting as a part of an advanced research study in education at Western Michigan University.

Please take the fifteen minutes or so that is required to complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible. A stamped envelope has been provided for your convenience. Please remember that your response will be completely anonymous. Do not return this letter.

The project has been explained to your superintendent and these materials have been distributed with his approval. Similar questionnaires have been sent to board members, the superintendent, administrative staff personnel, principals, and ten percent of the teaching staff within the district. It is important that your questionnaire be completed and returned to insure accurate analysis of the data.

Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Philip D. Haynes

Philip D. Haynes
Department of Educational Leadership
Western Michigan University

PDH:s

EXHIBIT 4

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO
RECIPIENTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Department of School Services

Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dear Colleague:

Recently you were asked to complete a questionnaire and return it to me. I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank those of you that have acknowledged my request.

If you have not returned your questionnaire at this time, it is not too late. Since the reliability and validity of my study can be strengthened by a higher percentage of returns, I would like to make an additional appeal that you respond as soon as possible. If your questionnaire has been misplaced, please contact me at the address listed below and I will mail you another immediately.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

/s/ Philip D. Haynes

Philip D. Haynes
Department of Educational Leadership
3102 Sangren Hall
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, James E. Jr., "Interest and Role of the State Education Department With Respect to Employer-Employee Relations." Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools. (Ed.) Robert E. Doherty, A Publication of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, January 1967. Pp. iii + 145.
- Andrews, Edward J. Jr., "Looking Beyond the Strikes." Childhood Education, XLV (April 1969), 454 - 456.
- Barnhart, C.L. (Ed.), The American College Dictionary. New York: Random House, 1964. Pp. vii + 1443.
- Bramlett, Troy E., "The Relationship of Public Act 379 to the Elementary School Principal's Role Behavior in Kalamazoo County Michigan." Unpublished Doctors dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, April 1970. Pp. i + 124.
- Carlton, Patrick W., "Attitudes of Certificated Instructional Personnel in North Carolina Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiations and Sanctions." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXX, (October 1969).
- Doherty, Robert E., Egner, Joan R., Lowe, William T., (Ed.) The Changing Employment Relationship in the Public Schools: Implications for Quality Education. New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1966. Pp. v + 42.
- Doherty, Robert E., Oberer, Walter E., Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining: A Changing of the Guard. New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. 1967. Pp. vii + 139.
- Heald, James E., Moore, Samuel A., The Teacher and Administrative Relationships in School Systems. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968. Pp. vii + 256.
- Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1967. Pp. vii + 739.
- Koontz, Elizabeth D., "NEA Views on Teacher Strikes." Childhood Education, XLV (April 1969), 435 + 36.

- Lieberman, Myron, Moskow, Michael H., Collective Negotiations for Teachers; An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966. Pp. v + 745.
- Likert, Rensis, Bowers, David, "Organizational Theory and Human Resource Accounting." American Psychologist, XXIV (June 1969), 585 - 592.
- Likert, Rensis, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967. Pp. vii + 258.
- Likert, Rensis, "Measuring Organizational Performance." Harvard Business Review, XXXVI (March-April 1958), 41 - 50.
- Likert, Rensis, New Patterns in Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961. Pp. vii + 279.
- Moskow, Michael H., Teachers and Unions: The Applicability of Collective Bargaining to Public Education. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania, 1966. Pp. v + 288.
- O'Hare, Marvin George, "Collective Negotiations as Perceived by Iowa Teachers and Superintendents." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXX (October 1969), 1349-A.
- Oker, Robert Lee, "A Study of Teachers in St. Louis County, Missouri, School Districts Toward Negotiation." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXX (October 1969), 1372-A.
- _____, "Present Scope of Teacher Negotiations: Employment Relations in Higher Education." Phi Delta Kappan, LI (September 1969), 60.
- Risley, Robert F., Employer-Employee Relations in Public Education, (Ed.) Robert E. Doherty, A Publication of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, January, 1967. Pp. iii + 145.
- Schmidt, Charles T. Jr., Parker, Hyman, Repas, Robert, A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education. Published for the School of Industrial Relations, Michigan State University, 1967. Pp. vi + 85.
- _____, The School Administrator and Negotiation. Washington, D.C.: A Publication of the American Association of School Administrators, 1968. Pp. 5 - 84.

- Smith, Stuart C., Collective Negotiations in Education: A Review of the Literature. ERIC/CEA Supplement, Center of Advanced Study in Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968. Pp. 1 - 8.
- Stinnett, T.M., Kleinmann, Jack H., Ware, Marhta L., Professional Negotiation in Public Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966. Pp. vi + 309.
- _____, "Teacher Strikes in Perspective." NEA Research Bulletin, XLVI (December 1968), 113 - 116.
- Travers, Robert M.W., An Introduction to Educational Research: New York: The MacMillan Company, 1958. Pp. xvii + 466.
- Weisborn, Marvin R., "What, Not Again! Manage People Better?" Think, (January-February 1970), 2 - 9.
- Wolcott, Donald, "Selective Comments on Legislation Governing Employer-Employee Relations in Public Schools." Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools, (Ed.) Robert E Doherty, A Publication of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, January 1967, 3 - 5.