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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The problem of teacher union militancy in public education is an issue confronting current educational leaders, and an issue which will likely confront future leaders in public education. The purpose of this study was to address the problem of teacher union militancy by conducting a field test of a conceptual model designed to include consideration of the impact of militant teacher unions on leader opinion and success.

The field test conducted was accomplished by investigating the probability of variance in opinion among Michigan school principals on the leadership constructs of "consideration" and "structure," as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Principals were differentiated by: (a) perceived "success" as determined by superordinate selection and categorization and (b) the teacher union militancy component of the organizational climate of the district in which they are employed, as differentiated by rating on a Teacher Union Militancy Index which was developed for this study.

The investigation provided a field test of a conceptual model, which was designed to explain the leader opinion of school principals in school districts with organizational climates characterized by differing levels of teacher union militancy. This model was developed as an alternative to the organizational models which are
commonly used to explain leader behavior in educational organizations (Getzels and Guba, 1957; Boles and Davenport, 1975; Hoy and Miskel, 1978). These traditional models do not consider the impact that unionization has on behavior in an organization. Because the educational organizations of the nation, and of Michigan particular, are increasingly subject to the influence of militant teacher unions, a revised model is appropriate.

Data were collected by mailed response packets addressed to the superintendent in each of forty districts rated "more militant" and forty districts rated "less militant" from a population of 207 Michigan school districts. Districts had a pupil population of more than 2,000 and fewer than 10,000 pupils. The superintendent of each surveyed district was requested to select two principals. One whom he would most likely recommend and one whom he would least likely recommend. Each principal responded by anonymously returning a completed Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and a survey of demographic and opinion information. Data were gathered during the Spring of 1979.

The study focused on possible selection criteria for school principals, particularly in districts marked by a high level of teacher union militancy. The possibility of discerning variance in opinion, on the leadership constructs of "consideration" or "structure," between two groups of principals differentiated by "success" is important. When coupled with the variable of teacher union militancy this possible variance gives rise to the prospect of establishing selection criteria which are specific to the organizational climate within which the principal must function.
Background of the Problem

Increasingly the organizational structure of public school is based on the industrial model of labor management relations. This organizational structure is characterized by a strong union affiliation on the part of the work force and the existence of formal contractual agreements regulating the wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Increasingly conflict resolution is sought by means of formal mechanisms. The early development of this trend was well documented by Moskow (1966) and by Liebermann and Moskow (1966). Early studies of the process of unionization in public education were conducted by Cole (1969) who did an extensive case study of the New York experience and Corwin (1970) who conducted a field study involving over 1500 respondents from twenty-eight school organizations.

The rapid growth of militant unionism was in a sense remarkable. As late as 1967, Harmon Ziegler was reporting, on the basis of research conducted through the Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Institute of Community Studies, University of Oregon, that the "increasing political conservatism of teachers would certainly reduce their sympathy toward unions; [and] the continual anti-union propaganda on the part of the associations probably strengthens and magnifies this process" (p. 87). While this sentiment may have represented the thinking of many educators away from the urban population centers of the eastern seaboard, within a decade teacher militancy was felt in virtually every corner of the nation (Public Service Research Council, 1980). In that same decade the teacher associations threw off their mantle of conservatism. The American
Federation of Teachers became the fastest growing union in the AFL-CIO, and the National Education Association and its affiliates became one of the most powerful and militant union organizations in the nation.

Teacher militancy and the growth of unionization in public education were aided and abetted by an avalanche of pro-union legislation governing collective bargaining in public schools. Traditionally both the common law and statutory law, where any was written, prevented the unionization of public workers and held job actions against the sovereign power of the government to be illegal. Although some negotiated labor agreements did exist in some urban centers prior to 1965, these were negotiated in the absence of legislation governing the process, and the initial agreements were upheld only after lengthy litigation (Cole, 1969).

In 1965 public employment relations legislation was introduced in at least fifteen states and was enacted into law in at least six (Moskow, 1966). By 1976 thirty states had enacted legislation either specific to or inclusive of teacher contract negotiations. Within the next two years four more states passed Public Employment Relations Acts (Zirkel, 1978). By the mid-1970's teacher unionism and teacher militancy were accepted facts everywhere except in the last bastions of social conservatism.

With the unionization of the teaching force, militant action on the part of teachers increased geometrically. Prior to the 1960s militant action by teachers was virtually unknown. Although sporadic job actions did occur as early as 1946, these were, by any definition, aberrational. Noone (1970) reported that in the years between 1940
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and the end of 1959 there were only fifteen major work stoppages involving public school teachers, but during the six years following 1959 there were thirty-six strikes.

Data collected and reported by Metz, Noell and Wheeler (1978) indicated an average of 133 teacher strikes per year in the years 1967 through 1976. In 1967 the lowest total number of strikes (seventy-six) occurred, while the year 1975 saw 218 teacher strikes idle 182,000 teachers. While the majority of strikes occurred in the states most oriented to employee unionism, by the 1970s it was evident that the unionization of teachers and their increased militancy were neither localized nor temporary phenomena.

The massive change in the organization of public schools with respect to labor/management relations has affected both the organizational climate of schools and the leaders of schools. Noone (1970) explored the changing balance of power between teacher organizations and school boards. He noted that "some teacher groups are still weak vis-a-vis their school boards, many are increasing their strength, and some have already demonstrated that they are their school boards' equal" (p. 9). As the union-school board power balance establishes a climate for the operation of the school, it is logical to assume that school leaders are subject to the influence of that climate. This relationship was discussed by Wiggens (1971) in the context of a systems approach to school organization. He maintained that the principal of a school could expect to find that his/her behavior was moderated by the school climate. Research exploring the relationship between the behavior of leaders in an organization and the climate of
the organization was reviewed and critiqued by Thomas (1977). While the research was inconclusive, it demonstrated that relationships between leader behavior and climate did exist.

The question that remains for further research then is, what kinds of behaviors are influenced or moderated by what kinds of variables in organizational climate?

Early work in the assessment of organizational climate in schools was undertaken by Halpin and Croft (1962). Working to measure the impact of organizational climate in elementary schools, Halpin and Croft (1962) developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) which provided a means of classifying schools on a continuum of climate, from open to closed. Open climate schools were characterized by a high degree of trust, esprit, and genuine commitment to work. Closed climate schools were characterized by a high degree of non-productive activity, impersonality, and frustration.

The organizational climate of schools has been demonstrated to be an important factor in facilitating positive relationships throughout an organization (Garland and O'Reilly, 1976). Crandall (1976) found that there was significant difference in attitudes about negotiations and conflict resolution in situations in which contracts were settled peacefully as contrasted with situations in which third party assistance was needed to reach settlement. Kinsey (1976) measured the organizational climate of twenty-seven school districts two years after the advent of collective bargaining in each, and again after ten years of collective bargaining experience, and found that the climate had become significantly more
closed after more experience with collective bargaining.

Kirschenstein (1977) surveyed a sample of California school administrators and found that most administrators surveyed expressed insecurity over most facets of the collective bargaining process. The most important aspect of the change wrought by formal negotiations was reported to be the widespread belief that their administrative power was diminished. Other studies confirm this perception of a climate with a changed power relationship. For example, Gee (1977) surveyed a sample of school superintendents and principals in districts in the state of Iowa. Districts were classified as small, medium, or large. Gee found that superintendents as well as principals in districts of each size felt similar limitations on their abilities to manage, due to the advent of collective bargaining.

Teachers, secondary principals, and superintendents in eighty school districts in twelve counties of New York state were surveyed by Wyszomirski (1977) to determine whether there was agreement among their perceptions of the impact of collective bargaining on the role of the secondary principal. Although the research indicated that there was some disagreement over the relative importance of various facets of the process, all three groups viewed collective bargaining as having a major impact on the role of the secondary principal.

It is evident that labor-management relations in public education have been subject to profound change in recent years. In much of the nation this change process is well under way while in other areas it is still at an early stage. While it has been recognized that this change has had a major impact on the role of
school principals and other school leaders, little research has addressed the effect that labor-union militancy, as a situational variable moderating leader opinion, has had.

It is easily conceivable that, as the organizational climates of schools become more militant, different opinions, or predispositions for behavior, will be necessary for success than were necessary in the more traditional and less militant setting. Other researchers have attempted to measure organizational climate and treat it holistically as a variable. A few, as indicated by Roberts (1977), suggested further research addressing specifically the union militancy component of organizational climate as it relates to organizational success and/or leader behavior.

Assumptions

This research rested on several assumptions. To enable the reader to understand the underlying assumptions they are listed and discussed below.

Assumptions About Militancy

It was assumed that union militancy develops at various rates in different locations, dependent upon local situations. It was thus assumed that it was plausible to attempt to measure and differentiate different levels of teacher union militancy in various locations within the state of Michigan. This assumption is consistent with the research reported by Tannenbaum (1965), Noone (1970), and the observations of McGregor (1966).
It was also assumed that measures of the relationship existing between the union and the host organization provide a more valid index of union militancy than would measures of membership attitude or opinion. Research reported on labor unions indicates that the membership of most unions is largely passive as long as the leaders of the union are sufficiently militant to achieve the goals desired by the membership. Tannenbaum (1965) reported that active participation in union business is typically limited to five to ten percent of the membership.

Tannenbaum (1965) wrote, "... the relationship of dependency and conflict with the management is the core of union action. The major task of the union is to maximize benefits won from management" (p. 710). It was assumed herein that successful bargaining and that job actions are the products of militant union leaders articulating and acting upon underlying member dissatisfaction and militancy.

Militancy was assumed to be an organizationally bound characteristic, with little differentiation by sub-unit or hierarchical level within the organization. Research by Drexler (1977) sampled a variety of organizations in several different occupational areas. This investigation found that organizational climate is generic to organizations rather than to occupational sub-units or hierarchical levels.

A premise underlying the development of the index for determination of the level of teacher union militancy used in this research was that after thirteen years of collective bargaining
history in Michigan, "more militant" teacher unions have been successful in upgrading their wages and conditions of employment while "less militant" unions have not generated sufficient collective identity and power to make gains of the same magnitude. This premise is supported by research into militant activity (Cole, 1969), which indicated that teacher militancy has been rewarded by higher salaries and improved conditions of employment. The potential flaw in the index is that the latent militancy which may be presumed to exist in each district may blossom forth in manifest fashion even though historical and demographic data do not indicate that the district should be classified as militant. It was assumed that the sample size used was sufficiently large to mask such aberrations.

Assumptions About Leader Behavior

This research assumed that a primary role of school principals is supervision and that the activity of supervision can be measured on the two major dimensions of "structure" and "consideration."

Supervision was assumed to be a generic activity. It was assumed that principals in different assignments and different levels may be expected to have different cognitive skills, but that the supervisory skills and behaviors necessary will not be differentiated by position.

It was assumed that the Leader Opinion Questionnaire developed by Fleishman (1960) is a valid instrument for measuring the "structuring" and "considering" opinions of school principals. This
instrument is based on the premise that individuals in leader roles may be expected to behave in accordance with their beliefs about effective leader behavior. The assumptions basic to the instrument are incorporated here.

Assumptions About Leader Success

Superordinates' willingness to categorize subordinates who are in leadership positions was assumed to be a function of the subordinates' perceived success. Thus it was assumed that measuring the success of principals through categorization by superintendents is possible. It was further assumed that the "halo effect," or tendency of a single trait to dominate a superintendent's rating, could be reduced as a contaminant by requiring the superintendent to project or predict the future success of the rated principal. Success may be subject to organizational climate.

Concepts and Definitions

A number of specific concepts and definitions are integral to this study. Such basic concepts and definitions are discussed briefly below.

Organizational Climate

An organization is a structure of relationships among people with a defined mission.

Organizational climate refers to the character of the relationships within an organization, particularly as different levels
of the hierarchy within the organization interrelate.

Militancy is a condition of organizational climate which exists when members of an organization in subordinate positions consistently demand greater benefits for their employment by the organization, are prone to engage in collective action to gain their demands, and tend to use institutional rather than personal channels of communication to gain resolution of intraorganizational conflicts. Militancy is thus a critical factor in labor management relations.

Labor Management Relations

Labor management relations concern the process of mediating conflict concerning assignment of benefits and responsibilities between superordinate and subordinate levels of the hierarchy within an organization. The labor management relations process often includes either individual or collective negotiations of a more or less formal nature to determine the distribution of benefits and assignment of responsibilities.

Collective negotiations are bargaining activities conducted between representatives of the superordinate levels. The terms "negotiations" and "bargaining," used below, both mean collective negotiations as defined here.

A union is an agency of organization members in subordinate positions, organized for the purpose of engaging in the labor management relations process. The term union as used here includes both those teacher organizations affiliated with American Federation of Teacher AFL-CIO and those affiliated with the National Education
The failure of the bargaining process results in an impasse which may lead organization members to engage in actions disruptive of the organization's purpose. The term "work stoppage" connotes any of a series of actions which involve the refusal of employees to carry on the mission of the organization; strikes, sick outs, blackboard flus, limited strikes, sanctions, etc.

As the labor management relations of an organization develop, formal mechanisms for resolution of intraorganizational conflict are developed. The grievance procedure is the most common such mechanism. The grievance procedure, which is usually explicated in a contractual agreement, is a specific method for resolving routine intraorganizational and/or superordinate/subordinate interhierarchical conflicts. This mechanism may move the final resolution to a different level of the organization's hierarchy or it may move resolution to an impartial third party.

**Principal**

A school principal is a school administrator having a primary task of supervising teachers. Supervision is the process of helping subordinates perform assigned tasks effectively and efficiently (Boles, 1978).

**Leader Behavior**

Leader behavior is the complex of actions taken by a leader to accomplish the mission for which his/her position is responsible.
Two primary dimensions of this complex of actions are "consideration" and "structure." "Consideration" is the extent to which an individual's on-the-job relationships with subordinates are characterized by trust, openness, respect for others' ideas, and consideration of their feelings. "Structure" is the tendency of a superior to engage in behavior which defines necessary tasks and structures the roles of subordinates in terms of goal attainment.

Success

Success, defined from the viewpoint of the performer, is individual performance within an organization which results in an expected outcome necessary for the accomplishment of the organization's mission, and which satisfies the need-disposition of the individual. In terms of this research, success is more narrowly defined as individual performance of such a character that an individual's superior is willing to predict that the individual's future performance in the same or a similar position of employment will be successful.

Rating of Performance

Rating of performance, in this research, is defined as a subjective, holistic assessment of the perceived success of a subordinate by a school superintendent, or other superior.

Hypotheses to be Investigated

As indicated by the literature reviewed, there was need for
the development of a conceptual model, and there was need to investigate the effects of union militancy as an element in organizational climate.

Climate was believed to relate to leader success. It was expected that climate may moderate the effectiveness of different leader opinions as contributors to success in the workplace. In this light, it was expected that measures of the militancy component of organizational climate and leader success would differentiate leader opinion about appropriate leader behavior.

Using these perceptions as a basis, the research reported here investigated the following set of hypotheses:

1. Opinion regarding "considering" behavior will differ between school principals who are rated "more successful" and school principals who are rated "less successful" by their respective superordinates.

2. Opinion regarding "considering" behavior will differ between school principals in school districts with organizational climate characterized as "more militant" and those characterized as "less militant" according to an index of teacher union militancy.

3. The amount of difference in opinion regarding "considering" behavior between "more successful" principals and "less successful" principals will vary between those in "more militant" school districts and those in "less militant" school districts.

4. Opinion regarding "structuring" behavior will differ between school principals who are rated "more successful" and school
principals who are rated "less successful" by their respective superordinates.

5. Opinion regarding "structuring" behavior will differ between school principals in school districts with organizational climates characterized as "more militant" according to an index of teacher union militancy.

6. The amount of difference in opinion regarding "structuring" behavior between "more successful" principals and "less successful" principals will vary between those in "more militant" school districts and those in "less militant" school districts.

Significance of the Study

The set of hypotheses generated for this research, and the research carried out, focused attention on the situational variable of teacher union militancy. This study is important in at least three respects. First, the study generated some empirical knowledge about a phenomenon that is typically viewed and discussed from a philosophical-emotional perspective. The apparent trend among teacher organizations is toward a more militant organizational climate. It is evident that leaders in future years must become increasingly cognizant of the phenomenon of militancy, and have an obligation to become more adept at successfully leading organizations in spite of it. Second, this research provided an example of an alternative method of assessing organizational climate through use of organizational data, as opposed to use of survey data gathered from members of the organization. The conceptual model posited here
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directs attention to two separate but related dimensions of organizational climate relative to leader-member relations. Typically, attempts at measurement have focused on the individual member-leader relationship dimensions of the climate. In this investigation, the attempt to measure climate focused on the dimension of union-leader relations, however, thus bringing into focus the collective-membership variable. Finally, confirmation of the hypotheses proposed here could have pointed up a need to reassess the organizational models typically used for the study of leadership in the public school setting. Further attention may need to be focused toward the union dimension of leader-member relationships, as an important component of organizational climate, as it affects the success of organizational leaders.

Organization of the Dissertation

This chapter has presented the problem addressed by the research study undertaken and reported here. The background and context of the problem have been discussed. Pertinent assumptions, concepts, and definitions have been presented. A set of research hypotheses has been proposed and the potential significance of the investigation briefly discussed.

The chapter which follows presents the development of a conceptual paradigm and an illustrative model. The purpose is to explain the alternative model which has been developed and to provide structure for the investigation design and the research hypotheses. The background of this model is presented and discussed.
The third chapter presents a review of selected literature relevant to the investigation. Topic areas for this review were:
(a) organizational models, (b) situational variables and leader style, (c) organizational climate, (d) union militancy, (e) principal role, (f) principal effectiveness and success, and (g) consideration and initiation of structure.

A detailed presentation of the research design and data collection is found in the fourth chapter. Findings are reported and discussed in the fifth chapter, while the sixth chapter reviews the conclusions reached and discusses the potential implications the findings may have for research and practice in the future.
CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL MODEL

This chapter presents the development of the conceptual model which undergirds the investigation reported here. A rationale for development and the background of the model are provided. Application of the model is discussed and the model is presented as a Kuhn paradigm.

Rationale for Development of the Model

Review of the development of organization theory as applied to the field of school administration or school leadership indicates that the basic models commonly used to undergird research in the field have their genesis in the decade of the 1950s. While these models have served well for many years, the past decade has witnessed manifold change in the organizational dynamics of school systems in the United States. It has been a decade in which the organizational structure of public schools has been severely stressed by increased teacher professionalism and higher levels of teacher union militancy than previously experienced.

Militant teacher unionism and a reliance on collective bargaining to structure the work environment are primary changes in the organizational ethos of public education. Existing conceptual models permit research which compares the opinions, the attitudes,
or behaviors, among school leaders, and differentiation among individuals and groups on the basis of task orientation or human orientation. These models have facilitated research which explores the variety and meaning of relationships between organizational leaders and individual members and groups of individual members. They have not, however, facilitated meaningful investigation of the relationship between leader opinion, attitude or behavior and the posture of subordinate employee groups as formally structured entities.

It was believed here that the perceptions individual members of organizations have of leaders and leader activities may be different from the perception which is formally sanctioned by employee unions and which results from the interaction of leaders and a militant employee union. It was expected that a primary influence on the success or failure of different patterns of leader behavior, and the efficacy of different leader opinions, may be the organizational climate established through the formal process of interaction between the employee union and the organization's formal leaders. It was appropriate that a conceptual model be developed which facilitates investigation of these relationships and their influence on organizations and organizational leaders.

Background for the Conceptual Model

The conceptual model developed and used to structure this investigation was drawn in large part from social systems theory as adapted by Boles (1978) from Getzels and Guba (1957). The school
was viewed as a social system with a systemic need for welding of divergent elements to preserve organizational integrity. The school must operate, in this view, as a system—with a unity of purpose and is characterized by an interdependence of parts.

Boles (1978) cites Lipham (1965), as saying "to better understand leadership, we can no longer afford to ignore the extra-organizational variables—the relationship of the leader to the larger social structure of which the organization is a part" (p. 52). This concept was central to the expansion of an understanding of the leader's role, particularly in an environment characterized by conflict and change. The focus suggested by Lipham (1964), on leader/extra-organizational variables, however, still slighted member/extra-organizational variables, and a third interaction with what might be termed the collective/extra-organizational variable. An understanding of the three environmentally structured variables and their interaction may be most crucial to the understanding of organizations, their functioning, and the leadership necessary for them to function most effectively.

The bifurcated organizational paradigm developed and introduced by Getzels and Guba (1957) brought into focus the importance of the membership variables. The paradigm focused on the nomothetic or institutional dimension and the idiographic or individual dimension of individual behavior in organizations. These dimensions, as defined in the paradigm, expanded the variables considered to include those which could be classified as member/extra-organizational
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as well as those that are leader/extra-organizational. This paradigm provided a major vehicle for the study of leadership in the public school setting in the 1960's and 1970's.

The organizational structure of public schools has undergone radical change in the more than twenty years since the initial publication of the Getzels-Guba paradigm. Prior to the development of the paradigm, and for several years after, there was no legitimate labor-union movement in public education. More than twenty years after the 1957 publication of the Getzels-Guba paradigm, however, the existence of teacher unions and the occurrence of militant action on the part of teacher organizations had become hallmarks of the organizational structure and climate of public schools (Metz, Noell, and Wheeler; 1978).

The balance of power in public education was radically altered in the span of two decades. Change in the balance of power and in organizational structure resulted in the interposition of a third variable between the nomothetic (or institutional) dimension and the idiographic (or individual) dimension of some organizations. This third variable, or dimension, was comprised of the collective personality of the labor force that exists within many organizations. As with the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions, this dimension was tempered by forces both from within the organizational structure and by environmental forces which have their genesis in the unique social dynamics of the society in which they exist.

The existence of a moderating dimension which tempers group
behavior vis-a-vis individual behavior is well documented, although it is not necessarily well understood. The literature which explores the phenomenon of "risky shift" and "safety shift" behavior testifies to the existence of a group mode of behavior which is distinguishable from individual action. This pattern of human behavior was indicated by Malamuth and Feshbach (1972) and by Myers (1970) in "risky shift" studies. Fleishman (1973) reported investigation of the leader behavior patterns of group members and the propensity of members to behave differently in a group mode.

Janis (1973) wrote about the phenomenon of group behavior and the impact of group pressures on shaping decisions at a top policy making level. The importance of the collective personality of the group was also indicated in Lannacone's (1964) discussion of the role of the informal organization vis-a-vis the formal organization. Lannacone posited that the informal organization could relate to the formal organization in a subversive manner, a non-interfering manner, or in a supplemental and supportive manner.

Lannacone (1964), like Getzels and Guba (1957), conceptualized the organization prior to the unionization of public school teachers. Unionization can be viewed as transforming the informal organization into a new type of organization which exists in a symbiotic relationship with a host formal organization. The new organization has a unity of purpose and a task orientation that exists parallel to, and in competition with, the formal organization to which it is attached. Unionization of an employee force, then, places a new unit into the competition for the resources
available to the total organization. The new unit must be dealt with on an interorganizational basis as well as on an intraorganizational basis and is thus qualitatively different from other competing organizations in its relationship with the host organization. The level of militancy which exists within the labor union is dependent upon the credibility or strength of that organization among its members. High levels of militancy may be expected to lessen the ability of the host organization to treat employees as an informal organization or as individuals.

Getzels and Guba (1957) conceptualized three styles of leadership: (a) nomothetic, which emphasized the requirements of the institution and was characterized by a task orientation, (b) idiographic, which emphasized the requirements of the individual, and was human value oriented, and (c) transactional, which was an intermediate type. Transactional leadership was viewed, by Getzels and Guba, in the most positive light, as it was conceived as the kind of leadership which mediated between institutional and individual need-dispositions, and therefore attended to both task needs and organizational maintenance needs.

Leadership research has tended to investigate the major dimensions of leadership activity called task orientation and human need orientation. The parallels between the paradigm discussed above and such research are obvious. Reddin (1970) reconciled three primary schools of leadership or management theory growing out of the Ohio State Leadership Studies, the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, and Harvard University as all focusing on
these two dimensions from different perspectives and using different terminology. The Ohio State studies resulted in numerous confirmations of the validity of viewing leadership in terms of human oriented behaviors called "considering," and task oriented behaviors called "initiating structure" or "structuring." By whatever labels, these have become primary variables in the study of leaders and leadership (Stogdill, 1974).

For many years, almost concurrent with the development of the above paradigm and the accumulation of supportive research, there has been an expectation that the setting for leadership has a significant influence on determining the type of behavior necessary for optimizing group effectiveness and leader success. Fleishman (1953), early proposed that leadership was situational. Interest became intensively focused on the situational aspect of leadership with publication of Fiedler's (1967) work titled, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. Here it was proposed that three primary variables; leader-member relations, task structure, and leadership position power, structured every leadership setting. Of the three primary variables, leader-member relations was considered to be the most important. Fiedler proposed that the eight combinations of the dichotomized primary variables formed eight distinct settings in which leaders might be expected to exercise leadership. Measuring leaders' attitude toward their least preferred co-worker on a Least Preferred Co-Worker Instrument (LPC Scale), Fiedler (1967) hypothesized that leaders with particular response patterns fit into descriptive cells in the model which he developed from the
three primary situational variables. The theory proposed that leaders with low LPC scores were "structuring" leaders and that they could be expected to perform well in "highly favorable" leadership settings and in "highly unfavorable" settings. Leaders who were in situations characterized as "intermediate" in favorableness were expected to be most successful if their LPC scores were high. These were postulated to be "considering" leaders.

Fiedler's (1967) work is subject to criticism on several grounds. The model, although it is built on situational variables of undoubted importance, is not impervious to mutation as other common situational variables, with grounding in the external environment, change. Further, the obvious relationship between the primary structuring variable in the organizational model and the instrument used to measure leader style or behavior, as well as the dichotomous nature of the measurement of behavior, call both the model and the instrument into serious question. Fiedler (1973) in later presentations recognized the obvious relationship between the means of structuring situations and the LPC instrument. He also attempted to deal with the moderating influence of other situational variables by relating them to the three primary dimensions proposed in his (1967) theory. Fiedler's primary contribution has been to focus attention to the concept that situational parameters may moderate the effectiveness of either "considering" or "structuring" behavior.

Stogdill (1974) reviewed other research which studied the relationship between situational determinants and leader behavior.
He reported that the general trend of the research supported the hypothesis that "groups tend to accept as leaders those members who exhibit characteristics and abilities which will facilitate the accomplishment of the group's specific task" (p. 169). As is evident from the general trend of the research reported, much of the research investigated relationships in small group settings and focused on the phenomenon of emergent leadership. A major variable in much of the research on situational aspects of leadership has been group member relations. The traditional measure of group member relations has focused on an aggregation of the series of dyadic relationships between the individual members and the group leader rather than data which might define the group as a collective entity, thereby enabling one to make a judgment about the relationship between the leader and the group. Further, much of the research is focused on small group settings rather than on organizationally integrated groups and their leaders. Although the dynamic of union organization of an employee work force may be expected to have an impact on the situational climate of the setting for leadership, this variable has not been studied directly as a situational variable which may affect leader behavior and leader success.

The Conceptual Model

The conceptual paradigm for this research posited a relationship between each organization and its external environment which exerts a force upon the members of the organization as individuals,
upon the designated leaders of the organization, and upon the collective membership of the organization. The collective character of the membership is believed to exist along a continuum ranging from an informal mode with informal leaders and a relatively weak power position vis-a-vis the formal organization, to a highly-formalized unit with a formally selected cadre of leaders. In the formalized state, the union leaders are capable of effectively interposing the collective character of the group, in the form of representation, into transactions between the role expectations of the institutional dimension and need-dispositions of the members comprising the individual dimension of the organization.

As the collective character of the membership tends toward a more formalized unit, or union, the ability of the designated leaders to interact with individual employees of an organization is diminished. The multitude of dyadic relationships, which permits recognition of the unique nature of each individual's need disposition, are each intruded upon by the necessary relationship between the designated leaders and the union as represented by its leaders. The primary relationship which structures the member-leader relations facet or organizational climate then becomes the relationship between the two types of leaders, those representing the organization and those representing the union. This paradigm is depicted in the model which follows in Figure 1.

The climate of an organization is the product not only of the leader-member relations and the leader-union relations within the
Figure 1. Dimensions and Characteristics of Behavior of Individual and Collective Work Forces as they Interact in an Employment Social System

Adapted from Boles & Davenport (1975, 12)
organization, but also of the environmental pressures upon the leaders, the individual members, and upon the unions representing the members of the organization. Climate, consequently, may be perceived as including an individually oriented dimension and a collectively oriented dimension. The relationship between these two dimensions of the group, or organizational climate, reflects a relative level of militancy within the organization. This level of militancy may characterize interaction between the collective-membership and the designated leaders of the organization. As the collective-membership dimension of the group becomes dominant over the individual-member dimension, formal work agreements and formal processes for conflict resolution may characterize intra-group relationships.

It is also perceived that a power relationship may exist within each organization which produces a relative tilt toward either leader dominance or member dominance in the organization. As the balance shifts toward member dominance, it is expected that the collective-membership dimension becomes dominant as an influence in structuring organizational climate over the individual-member dimension. If the leaders of organizations are to accomplish the dual goals of task accomplishment and organizational maintenance, they must consequently become progressively more adept at effectively dealing with the collective-membership dimension of the group, while at the same time they maintain a proper focus on the organizational task and on individual member needs.

It is believed that the failure of an organization's leaders
to facilitate the meeting of individual members' needs in an organization may cause the individual members to turn to the strength inherent in the collective-membership of the organization to achieve a level of need satisfaction.

While modern management techniques apparently have reversed or stalled a trend toward unionization of the industrial workforce in the United States generally, there is little evidence to suggest that improved management practices will lead to de-unionization of existing organizations. Neither is it expected that the balance of power within an organization will readily shift back to favor the designated leaders of an organization once their power has waned. Rather it is expected that the balance of power, once tilted in favor of the members, will become stabilized in written contracts governing virtually every phase of the employment relationship. Negotiations for successive labor agreements often are marked by increased union militancy, resulting in more stringent formal parameters governing the leader-member relationships within the organization, and further erosion of management power.

Summary

This chapter has presented the rationale and the background for the conceptual model upon which this investigation is based. The model is discussed and presented in detail. The chapter which follows presents a review of selected literature providing background for a focus on the important issues involved in the investigation reported here.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews selected literature pertinent to the investigation conducted, and reported here. Literature is reviewed in the topic areas of: (a) organizational models, (b) situational variables and leader style, (c) organizational climate, (d) union militancy, (e) the organizational role of school principals, (f) principal effectiveness and success, and (g) "consideration" and "structure." Recent research and conceptual developments in each of the topic areas are discussed. Taken as a whole, the review provides a logical development of the focus taken in this investigation.

Organizational Models

Antecedents

The nature of organizations and the role of organizational structure and process in task accomplishment have been the focus of formal study for at least the eight decades of this century. This study has resulted in a vast and still growing body of literature which parallels the formation of Western society as a whole, from a pretechnical to a technical state. Study of the variety, and the effectiveness and the efficiency of organization types is usually dated from Max Weber's work. Weber's (1922-1968) studies culminated
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in the publication of *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (Presthus, 1962; March, 1965). Weber, a historian, economist, and legal scholar directed and reported research, and developed the structural theory of organization that is the genesis of the contemporary study of organizations.

March (1965), in the introduction to his *Handbook of Organization*, attempted a brief synthesis of the development of organization theory. The study of organization, he contended, has a history but not a pedigree. The field of organizational study does not provide a consecutive orderly development of thought. To identify the universe of organization theory March assembled a representative bibliography of two contemporary works with "fashionable" reputations, with a focus on the phenomenon of organization, from each of the six fields of sociology, anthropology, management, economics, political science, and psychology. These works were analyzed to determine from the citations relied upon by their various authors, if a coherent, rationally developing theory could be discerned. A bibliography of 33 works was distilled out of the mass of citations which provided some interconnection of origin. The overall result, however, confirmed a general impression of diversity in antecedents. Weber's work was the starting point, with very few other common or connecting works.

Probably second only to Weber in significance as a progenitor of research into theory about the function of organizations is Talcott Parsons. It was through the scholarship of Parsons that the process of organizational functioning became a focus at least equal
with that of organizational structure. Parsons (1937), attempting a first synthesis of theory about social action, published The Social System. This work brought to the study of organizations a focus on the elements of role and expectation. Additionally it fostered a focus on the analysis of the conflict that may arise between role and expectations.

It may be said that while Weber pointed out the importance of variance among needs and goals within formal organizations, the interrelationship between the environment and formal organizations, and the interrelationship between the environment and formal organizations; Parsons expanded the total focus on organizations to include recognition of the importance of the informal organization the interrelationships between the informal organization and its environment within the organization.

**Social Systems Models**

Writers in many fields continue to assess the impact of variables which are structural, or formal organization variables, or the impact of process of functional variables, which are informal organization variables, on the effectiveness and efficiency of overall organizational functioning. Assessment of organizational effectiveness, however, is dependent on an understanding of both the formal and the informal organization. It is also important to understand the impact that variance in intraorganizational interaction patterns, or intraorganizational relationships, may have on organizational productivity and organizational maintenance. In the
field of education this approach to the study of organizations has had a great deal of currency since the publication of a seminal article on the study of educational administration by Jacob Getzels (1952).

Getzels (1952) called for the development of an approach to research in educational administration which transcended descriptive study, and which systematically explored the nature of the process of educational leadership. Along with the challenge for more meaningful research, however, Getzels (1952) began the process of formulating a framework which could provide a conceptual base for such systematic investigation. At this phase he contended, "on a priori grounds it is evident that an interaction founded in prior reciprocal rationality with respect to authority must by that token be functionally specific as to role and universalistic as to affectivity" (p. 241). He recognized, however, that reality is much more complex. He then suggested that the role of research is to determine in what ways the ideal theoretical type cases are affected as the environmental conditions change, both inside and outside the organization.

Continued research at the University of Chicago during the 1950's led Getzels to publish with Guba (1957) the general model which has come down through the literature as the "Getzels-Guba Model" or systems model of social behavior (see Figure 2.). This was followed by Getzels' (1960) publication of a more extensive discussion of the model in the context of relating theory to
Figure 2. The Getzels-Guba or Systems Model of Social Behavior
practice in the field of educational administration. A coeval selec-
tion by Guba (1960) discussed application of the model in re-
search in what he called internal administration. In this discus-
sion the model was presented as the product of, or subject to, ex-
ternal interpreting forces and internal alienating forces which may
produce conflict within the organization. These were defined as
"specific points of divergence between or within the nomothetic and
idiographic dimensions [of the model]" (p. 121). The administra-
tor was depicted as the person responsible for balancing the two
dimensions of the model by playing the integrating forces against
the alienating forces affecting the situation.

The influence of the Getzels-Guba Model in the study of edu-
cational administration was evidenced by the inclusions in the 1964
Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. This
issue of the yearbook was devoted to the topic of behavioral science
and educational administration. The volume contained a major selec-
tion by Griffiths (1961), the yearbook editor, which discussed
the nature and meaning of theory in the study of administration or
leadership. In this selection the Getzels-Guba model was presented
as being representative of one major school of thought, along with
theories of motivation and theories of decision-making.

In an article by Lipham (1964), in the same volume, the Get-
zels-Guba model was related to the leadership constructs of "con-
sideration" and "structure." Unfortunately, the construct deve-
loped by this relationship has apparently not been actively pur-
sued in research, even though it seemingly provided a sound basis
for relating theory and research. Lonsdale's (1964), Iannacone's (1964), and Charters' (1964) contributions to the 1964 NSSE Yearbook also reflected approaches to the problems of organizational theory and leadership which were influenced by the Getzels-Guba social systems model of organizations.

The publications of the late 1950's and early 1960's appear to have set in motion a trend toward a pattern of conceptualizing organizations and organizational relationships. What was lacking, however, was a comprehensive exposition of theory. This was forthcoming with the publication of *Educational Administration as a Social Process* by Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell (1968). Further discussion of the social systems model followed in numerous works on school administration and on the topic of supervision in the school setting (e.g., Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1971). Interest in the model and publication regarding its application in the field of school leadership has continued on the part of Getzels (1978) up to the current period.

Throughout the time period in which the social systems approach to organizations was being conceptualized and communicated by Getzels and others who built on his theories, other writers continued to provide information which could expand our understanding of the importance of organizational structure and process. Etzioni (1961) published an exhaustive compendium of comparative research on organizations. Presthus (1962) attempted to define patterns of individual accommodation to the bureaucratic milieu. Katz and Kahn (1966) published a massive work which became a classic champion of
the open system approach to the study of organization, an approach which in many ways dovetails with the social systems model of organizations.

Reviewing the work accomplished during this period Meyer (1978) noted that a fundamental shift in thinking about organizations occurred in the late 1950's and early 1960's. The focus of research moved from the role of individuals in organizations to the organization itself and its internal and external environment. Diversity in approaching the problems of organizational effectiveness and efficiency is still, however, the hallmark of thought in this field.

Recent Developments

Recent work in expanding the organizational model within the social systems framework includes an important adaptation by Boles and Davenport (1975) and by Boles (1978). This adaptation includes culture and social system components of each dimension of the model, and proposes that position is the counterpoint of personality within the dimensions. These theorists adopt the contention that while organizational roles grow out of the position an incumbent fills in an organization, need dispositions which must be met for that incumbent to function satisfactorily grow out of the incumbent's personality (see Figure 3).

Another recent adaptation of the social systems model was published by Hoy and Miskel (1978). Their model includes group intentions as an input equal with institutional expectations and individual needs (see Figure 4). This model recognizes group, or
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Figure 3. Boles' (1978) adaptation of the Systems Model of Social Behavior
Figure 4. Hoy and Miskel (1978) Adaptation of the Getzels-Guba Systems Model
the collective sense of the organization, as an entity distinct from the idiographic dimension. The conceptual model presented in Chapter II expands on this perception and postulates that the group can exist with different levels of formal identity and structure and will thus differentially affect the transactions of leadership within the organization.

Situational Variables and Leader Style

Antecedents

During the same period of time in which the study of organizations took a new direction and began focusing on the social system characteristics of the organizational phenomenon, new directions in the study of leadership were also being charted. A number of major studies conducted at Ohio State University began to indicate that the traditional personality trait approaches to the study of leadership were inadequate (Fleishman, 1973). Wide ranging review of the literature of leadership tended to indicate that some traits described leaders in some situations but not in others (Stogdill, 1948). While this led to some thought that the matching of specific situations and specific traits was the key to effective organizational leadership, continued research sponsored by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University led to a new viewpoint.

In this new perspective, the situation was still regarded as important, but it was postulated that some general principles about leadership could be ascertained, and that these could become the
foundation for future leadership training (Fleishman, 1973). With this development, the focus on traits began to be displaced by a focus on leader and follower behavior.

A search for general principles of leadership, while maintaining a recognition of the importance of the situation, is the focus of Fleishman's (1953) study, in which he attempted to describe supervisory behavior and develop an instrument to measure it. At the outset of his report he pointed out his view, that leadership is to a large extent situational, and that leadership is not a trait but a pattern of behavior. Barnlund (1953) also gave evidence of the trend away from the trait view of leadership, when he defined leadership as the unique relationship existing between the members of a group, and the successful attempt by one member of the group to influence and coordinate the activities of the group. This is without doubt a behaviorally focused point of view.

For the next several years a focus on situation as an important variable affecting leadership, and the definition of leadership as behavior or activity became increasingly popular (Stogdill, 1974). In the mid-1960's Lane (1966) wrote in a textbook on educational administration, for example, that leadership must be discussed in terms of the leadership setting. He further pointed out that the task of supervision in particular required an interrelationship of subordination and superordination within an organization, and within the context of any given situation the individual must mediate the demands of the dual role on his/her behavior. That is a viewpoint that tied the behavioral model of leadership directly
into the social systems model of organizations.

Contingency Theory

For a large part of the academic community which was interested in the study of leadership and organizations, concern with situational constraints and structure for leadership became de rigueur with the publication of Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory of Leadership. Fiedler reviewed a great amount of literature, and engaged in a wide range of investigation on his own, in his attempt to define leadership. These studies led him to the conclusion that leadership setting could be classified according to a typology, and that leader types could also be so classified, and could be successfully matched to appropriate situations. While Fiedler's work may be questioned on a number of grounds, including instrumentation and interpretation, his strident call for attention to the contingency of situation helped to bring focus to research and the development of theory in the area of leadership. In virtually every endeavor of leadership and organizational research the contingency of situation began to be emphasized.

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Welch (1970) asserted that time and again writers have sermonized about the importance of situational variables. This observation was made in the context of a broad review of research and investigations which attempted to establish a theoretical groundwork for nurturing effective executive performance in business and industry. Reddin (1970) in the same year suggested that there were appropriate and inappropriate
situations for each identifiable management type. In the context of public education Wiggens (1971) suggested that typically a school principal can expect to find that his/her behavior is largely subject to the control of the school climate in which he/she happens to work. Hill (1973) suggested that the successful leader must be able to see what the situation requires and be able to adapt his/her behavior to meet that contingency.

**Recent Research**

Much research in recent years has focused on the task of identifying situational variables and relating them to leader style and organizational effectiveness. Fleishman (1973) reported that situational and moderator variables have been identified. Examples of such variables are; pressure for production, climate variables, upward influence, and favorableness of the situation. Miskel (1974) conducted a major study which attempted to correlate leader style variables and situational climate variables with perceived organizational effectiveness and the leader effectiveness of school principals. While this study demonstrated main effects variability of effectiveness on the basis of leader "consideration" and "structure," the situational variables investigated did not mediate the relationship so that significant interaction effects could be discerned. The investigator pointed out in the summary of his report, however, that his inability to find significant effects probably was a result of higher correlations between scores derived using the **Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire** scale to assess leader
style and the scores derived from measures he used to assess organizational climate. The study, while inconclusive in itself, provides significant background for establishing the direction of further leadership research.

Other investigators assessed many aspects of leader style and situation. Rice and Chemmers (1975) investigated leader style through use of Fiedler's (1967) Least Preferred Co-Worker's Instrument. They found that job structure strongly influenced leader behavior. Greene (1975) reported that the nature of subordinate performance caused the relative emphasis a leader placed on the dimensions of "consideration" and "structure" to change. Silver (1975) also measured leader style by means of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and demonstrated a relationship between the environmental complexity of the work setting and leader "consideration."

Weed, Mitchell, and Moffitt (1976) reported an investigation of the interaction between leader style, subordinate personality, task type, and impact on the task performance and job satisfaction of employees. They reported that leader styles did not differ significantly across the range of studied situational variables, but that significant interaction effects were noted and that the effectiveness of style was situationally determined. Garland and O'Reilly (1976) reported, on the basis of their study of leader-member interaction in groups, that leader style did not by itself influence organizational results directly. Implied in their report, however, is the influence of interaction between style and
situation.

A number of the studies reported recently have investigated the relationship of leader style and subordinate satisfaction. Schriesheim and Murphy (1976) for example, studied the relationship between leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction as moderated by the variables of unit size and stress. They reported that in relaxed situations the leader style dimension of "consideration" led to improved subordinate satisfaction, while in stressful situations the leader style dimension of "structure" correlated with improved subordinate satisfaction. Bass and Mitchell (1976) investigated the perceived need for union membership by professionals. They found that consultative type management was related to a diminished desire for unionization, but that more directive leader behavior correlated with a higher perceived need for unionization. They also reported that, in all cases studied, managers underestimated the sympathy professional employees felt for unionization.

Much of what has been discussed here under the topic of situational variables affecting leaders could also be included under the topic of organizational climate. Many of the studies reported investigated factors which are either related to organizational climate or may be included as a part of organizational climate. Other investigators have merely measured organizational climate holistically by means of some instrument and attempted to relate this measure to some defined leader type or to a definition of leader effectiveness. Armstrong (1976) for example, used a Survey of Organizations Questionnaire and related the results of this
measurement to leader type as determined from a scale based on Reisman's (1950) inner-other social preference construct. Vice (1976) compared the management styles of school principals with the organizational climates of their school buildings and found that teacher centered management style related to a more open climate. Crist (1977) also reported a finding that leader behavior and organizational climate may be directly related.

Organizational Climate

Research on organizational climate is another important point of departure for the investigation of leadership and organizational effectiveness. If the social systems model of organizations is accepted, and if situational variables are viewed as important mediators of leader style and effectiveness, then organizational climate must be considered as an important situational variable. Organizational climate—the sense of community, cohesiveness, and purpose which characterizes relationship within an organization—may be considered as the product of a complex of simpler situational variables.

This focus must be considered especially important to current and future research when it is recognized that supervisors underestimated their subordinates' desire for union representation and collective security (Bass and Mitchell, 1976), misperceived subordinates' perception of organizational climate (Curcio, 1974), and had little ability to predict what motivators were important to their subordinates (Roberts, 1977). What is particularly
disconcerting, however, is realization that research in the area of organizational climate has, on the whole, been inconclusive (Thomas, 1976).

In a major review of organizational climate literature related to climate in the school setting, Thomas (1976) did conclude that the organizational climate of schools may be influenced by the socio-economic environment, and perhaps by certain personality characteristics of principals and teachers. No clear trends were established, however, that might prove useful in framing further investigation. Miskel's (1974) research pointed up one of the foremost problems confronting researchers in the area of organizational climate; that is the failure to establish the independence of investigation variables. This problem is also evident in a large portion of the literature reviewed and reported by Thomas (1976). That body of literature involved ratings of climate on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the comparison of those ratings to various other perceptions of the same samples of staff members who provide the climate measurement data.

A few recent investigations of organizational climate have resulted in significant findings which should be noted, however. Drexler (1977) investigated the pervasiveness of climate throughout organizations. He found that organizational climate had more variability attributable to organizations than to organizational sub-units. This finding indicates that organizational climate may be more the product of upper level management behavior and organizational policy than of supervisory level management behavior.
Drexler's finding supports earlier tentative findings reported by Fleishman (1953) and Fiedler (1967). Fleishman's (1973) later work also reflected his major concern for the pervasive effects of climate throughout organizations. He reported that his studies have indicated that the factor of organizational climate interacts with and overwhelsms the effect of leader training at the supervisor level.

In literature focused directly on the school setting, Wiggins (1971) theorized that building principals are more influenced by the organizational climate that they confront in their schools than they are able to influence that climate. He contended that a principal's personality gradually becomes dominated by the schools' expectations as the principal's tenure increases. Garland and O'Reilly (1976) reported, "Principals who, by one process or another, ended with a staff which enjoyed good leader member relations ran good schools" (p. 295), and vice versa. Simmons (1977), however, found that there was no significant relationship between the leader style of elementary principals and the organizational style of their building, as the phenomena were perceived by teachers. In sum, the observations about organizational climate in schools made by Hoy and Miskel (1978) appear appropriate; that is, we know little about how to deliberately change the climate of schools and we do know that it takes time for climate to change.

Union Militancy

An increasingly important facet of the complex of human relationships which comprise the social system of public schools is
the labor relations environment. During the decades of the 1960's and the late 1970's this relationship has been marked by the growth of influence of formal teacher unions and increasingly militant postures on the part of the teacher unions (Metz, Noell and Wheeler; 1978). It seems a logical contention that this set of relationships is a major component of organizational climate in many schools, and that it may be a situational variable which can mediate the effectiveness of leader style or behavior within the organization of a school.

Description and Measurement of Militancy

Militancy in labor management relations is difficult to measure because it is a unique organizational characteristic. A comprehensive discussion of the general nature of labor unions by Tannenbaum (1965) in the Handbook of Organizations (March, 1965) sheds light on this. Difficulty of measurement is caused in part by the inherent conflict which underlies the relationship between union and host organization. Tannenbaum (1965) observed that conflict is a necessary focus of the union-management relationship, and that apparent cooperation in one area of endeavor may actually lead to open, heated conflict in another. Olsen (1965) pointed out that there is a paradoxical contrast between the extremely low levels of participation in labor unions by members and the very high level of support they will give their leaders in crisis or conflict situations. This phenomenon was also reported by Tannenbaum (1965).
Union militancy on the part of public school teachers was not considered a very likely possibility by investigators of educational organizations as late as 1957. Ziegler (1957) studied the political activity of teachers and characterized the teaching profession as submissive and feminine, and unlikely to engage in concerted political action on the local level vis-a-vis the local school leadership. Bidwell (1965) pointed out, however, that the nonprofessional or submissive character of teachers as a group was never universal. Further, he suggested that the changing composition of the teaching force might affect intraorganizational relationships in public schools, and that a greater level of teacher organization might bring about manifest teacher militancy.

Corwin (1970) investigated the growth of militancy among Ohio public school teachers and concluded that the growth of militancy was equated with better professional preparation for teachers and a more professional approach to the occupation on the part of practicing teachers. The view that enhanced professionalism and higher levels of teacher union militancy are related was readily accepted by the spokesmen for teacher organizations (Cole, 1970). Meyer (1973), a teacher union organizer, suggested that the movement toward increased militancy was inevitable due to the normal process of union management relations. He also urged teachers to recognize that professionalism did not imply obedience and compliance. "You have to be pushy and ugly much of the time" to be a professional, Myers (1974, p. 8) contended. Professionalism, used in this sense, implied a changed power relationship within the organization.
Sentelle (1972) observed that teacher militancy was the result of relative economic deprivation, the changing composition of the teaching occupation to a more male and younger occupational group, and increased professionalism on the part of teachers. He summarized by concluding that the consequent underlying motive of teacher militancy was a quest for greater power for teachers in educational organizations. Trotty (1977) found that militancy was differentially important when the teaching level of teachers become a variable subjected to analysis. The group of secondary level teachers in this study, who were identified as more likely to be male and younger were more militant than were the group identified as more likely to be older and female, and employed in elementary schools. He also found that the level of militancy was significantly affected by the bargaining posture of the school board governing the school in which the teacher group being considered was employed.

The relationship of union militancy to power over the organization was indicated in the research reported by Tannenbaum (1965). It was also noted that the presence of a militant union served a number of social and psychological needs by empowering individuals within organizations. One result of the bi-partisan power relationship can be the creation of a climate of continual competition between the union and management leaders for the allegiance of employees. Conflict can become the union's most effective tool as it maintains the union's visibility and fosters a perceived need among the rank and file. Neal (1978) observed that union leaders have to prove their power, and the most effective way of doing this is to
close down schools.

Militancy and Climate

It has been observed that the mere existence of a labor union formalized the relationship between the leader or managers of an organization and its employees (Black 1970). The character of that relationship is an important ingredient in organizational climate. A number of investigations of the impact of teacher union militancy on the organizational climate of public schools have been accomplished.

Noone (1970) conducted a longitudinal study of the power relationships within a school district during the period of transformation from a premilitant state to a state of relatively mature union organization. He noted that over a twenty year period, often marked by acrimonious interchange and characterized by high levels of frustration, there was a gradual shift in power relationships within the school district. This shift in power relationships was instrumental in structuring a new set of working relationships in which the immediacy of conflict was removed but the latent power of the teacher union was always in evidence. Haynes (1971) conducted an investigation of the school districts in the state of Michigan which had at that time experienced work stoppages. He compared these districts to a matched sample of districts in which the same level of union militancy was not in evidence, and found that in the work stoppage districts the employees perceived management practices to be more participative. In a study of schools in which similar
districts were differentiated by an indicator of militancy in labor relations, Crandall (1976) found that there was a significant difference in the attitudes of teachers in districts where teacher contracts were settled peacefully when compared with the attitudes of teachers employed in districts where third party assistance was needed.

One study which did not indicate a difference in climate due to the impact of collective negotiations was conducted by Sobel (1977). This investigation compared the perception of principals who were appointed to their jobs prior to the official development of teacher collective bargaining and those who were appointed to their jobs after the advent of the formal negotiations process. The finding that there was no significant difference in the climate as perceived by these principals may be a function of the research design, or may be further evidence of the inability of incumbents of administrative positions to accurately assess organizational climate and the impact of that climate on the roles played by organizational members reported by Curcio (1974).

Kinsey (1978) investigated the organizational climate of schools in the state of Michigan after the enactment of collective bargaining legislation. Using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, he assessed the same sample of schools two years after the enactment of legislation and ten years after the enactment of legislation. He found that during the elapsed period of time the organizational climate had moved significantly from a more open climate to a more closed climate. This change was attributed
to societal changes and the process of collective negotiations. A further finding of significance in this study was the reported greater level of cohesiveness among staff after ten years of contract negotiations. Clay (1978) studied the phenomenon of staff reaction to labor conflict in public schools. He found that indices of teacher satisfaction correlated negatively with organizational conflict in the labor relations arena.

**Militancy as a Variable**

The indications have been that labor union militancy, as a component of climate, serves as a situational variable which has an impact on the behavior or leader style of public schools administrators. As Benson (1970) reported, teacher militants challenge administrative procedures and policies. They demand a piece of the action. They wish to be involved in policy formulation and policy implementation. Myers' (1973) book on teacher collective bargaining contains a chapter devoted to the implications of the process for administrators. The shift in authority, he contended, will require principals to use different methods of control. Neither benevolent paternalism nor authoritarianism will suffice; principals must learn to facilitate problem solving and mediate conflict, he implied.

Principals have recognized that teacher union power has impinged on their traditional roles and prerogatives, and have recognized a need for changed leader behavior. Kirschenstein (1977) studied the perceptions of school administrators in California and
reported that they felt their power diminished in the face of collective bargaining. Gee (1977) investigated the perceptions of superintendents regarding the impact of unions on principals. He reported that similar and definite limitations on the power to administer schools was perceived in both large and small school districts. Another study assessed the perceptions of superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding the impact of teacher collective bargaining on the role of the school principal. All three groups reported that the principals' power relative to personnel administration was diminished by collective bargaining. Not surprisingly, the principals had the strongest feeling about the influence of the negotiated contract over their power to function (Wysomirski, 1978). Tossie (1977) analyzed contracts and noted specific language which had substantial impact on principals' behavior in the areas of curriculum, planning, and finance responsibilities.

The situation changes as union power vis-a-vis school board power increases. Myers (1973) warned:

The role of the administrator is going to be altered dramatically by the rising power of teachers. The administrator who survives the coming decade will be the one who understands the shift in authority structure of the school and who develops a leadership style complementary to that structure. (p. xiii)

The Principal's Role

A Historical View

An understanding of the organizational role of school principals is important in assessing the significance of the impact of
any given situational variable on principals' actions as leaders.

The principal typically is delegated the responsibility for a school building and the program housed in that building. Both practice and theory vary as to the meaning of responsibility in this context. They may include a primary responsibility for personnel supervision only, or they may include a host of other budgeting and resource allocation responsibilities. In some larger systems, the responsibility for personnel supervision may be divided between the principal and some other administrative office.

A number of writers in the field of educational administration have conceptualized the school principalship and developed descriptive role models. Wilder (1975) reviewed the writings of leading authors in this field during the period from 1950 through 1972 and compared the major tasks each authority posited as being essential administrative functions. His comparison indicated that a primary human orientation existed in most conceptualizations of the school principal's role.

Other writers in the field also indicated their recognition of the importance of intraorganizational human relations in schools and the principal's role in maintaining healthy, positive relationships. They also indicate an awareness of the responsibility for supervision of the educational process which resides in the principalship. Saxe (1968) reviewed the principal's role in relation to other organizational factors in the school. He reported that there were three primary categories of expectations for school principals; the expectation the principals would organize and
manage, that they would provide leadership, and that they would maintain appropriate and effective patterns of human relations within the organization. Abbott (1974), responding to a need for the development of performance objectives in schools, adopted the Katz-formulated (1955) constructs of human, technical, and conceptual skill areas as being appropriate for school principal performance assessment. Lipham and Hoeh (1974) devoted a major portion of their book *The Principalship: Foundations and Functions* to the interrelationships of principal and staff. Roe and Drake (1974) stated that the principal's major task is to optimize each of the input variables available to him or her. They then pointed out that the available human resources constitute the major pool of input variables. The focus of the position of principal, they contended, is upon the people in the organization and their relationships.

While a focus on the human relationship aspect of the principal's role is etched well into the history of the position, the nature of the human relationships which a principal must deal with has not been unchanging. Rosenberg and Dick (1968) wrote with a focus on the principalship as a changing role. They perceived the role as one which was being forced to change by the change in organizational dynamics within public education. They postulated that the principal would be the person in the middle, caught in the power struggle between boards of education and militant teachers' unions. Observations by Epstein (1974) confirmed that in some cases the result of this power struggle is less power and more responsibility for school principals. He alleged that this was the cause of much
personal and professional concern among practicing school principals. Others also proposed that staff concerns would be the major influence on the principalship in future years (Byrne, Hines & McCleary, 1978).

The Principal as Supervisor

The aspect of principal responsibility vis-a-vis the human organization which is connoted by the term supervision has been recognized as being of major importance. It has also been recognized that this aspect of the principals' role is one which is most likely to be affected by changing power relationships within schools. Evans (1968) reported that principals themselves felt that supervision should take 30 percent of their available time, but that they typically were able to devote only 12 percent of their available time to supervisory tasks. Evans stated that the primacy of supervision was appropriate for principals and indicated that she felt supervision would become ever more important for school principals in the future. Harris (1975) contended that supervision should be defined as action toward maintaining the teaching-learning process of the school, and that principals should be an important supervisory force in schools, on the basis of sheer numbers.

The problems attendant to the activity of supervision of teachers were described in detail by Blumberg (1974). Although the focus of this work was toward non-principal teacher supervisors, it is appropriate for principals who are responsible for the
supervision of teachers, particularly those in the small school settings where other administrative support may be at a minimum. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1971) presented a more positive overview, which prescribed the responsibility of supervisors for maintaining the human enterprise of education. Their text on supervision provided comparative theory and practice for school principals serving in the contemporary era, and was premised on the perception that principals can effectively meet the challenges of changing organizational climate and environment.

Principal Effectiveness and Success

Organizational success depends on the success of the actors who comprise the organization. Success in this sense connotes effective and efficient fulfillment of the role expectations accompanying the position in which an incumbent serves. Within an organization which is hierarchically organized, the dependence of the organization upon the success of position incumbents increases as one moves to higher levels of responsibility within the hierarchy of the organization.

Within large organizations, success at each organizational sub-unit can be said to have a primary dependence upon the position incumbent who is responsible for facilitating the transactions between the nomothetic or institutional, and the idiographic or human dimensions of the unit. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1971) discussed this under the topic of educational leadership. The primary goal of supervision, they maintained, is to move the organization
toward a more open climate. It was implied that only after an open organizational climate is established could organizational leadership occur. Effectiveness was consequently related directly to the climate within an organization. Hoy and Miskel (1973) pointed out that effectiveness has both an objective dimension and a subjective or perceptual dimension. Effectiveness must practically be defined as some composite of the dimensions. Miskel (1974), in the context of a major study of school administration, attempted to systematically integrate both dimensions of effectiveness. His effort met with little success, however, as he was unable to demonstrate any significant interrelation among subordinate, superordinate, and criterion-based measures of effectiveness.

**Objective Measurement of Effectiveness**

The most strident call for objective measurement of effectiveness in school administrative research was made by Halpin (1966). Halpin (1966) reacted to the body of research on leadership of schools which commonly used superordinate or referent evaluations as criteria for effectiveness. In developing an alternative paradigm for research into administrative behavior, he pointed out that, "The ultimate criteria of administrator effectiveness should be expressed in terms of group or organization achievement, in respect to the changes in the organization's accomplishments that can be attributed to the behavior of the administrator" (p. 50). He went on to point out that this concept of the measurement of effectiveness required definition of achievement in behavioral terms. Such
definition is, of course, a major problem in the field of education. The separation and definition of goals and tasks, as well as inputs, processes, and outputs is a project of such immense complexity that standardization and the achievement of ultimate criteria are probably not possible. Halpin (1966) himself seems to have recognized this in his discussion of the complex paradigm he developed.

Miskel (1974) indicated that his research project was designed specifically to respond to the criticism of intermediate or perceptual ratings of effectiveness discussed above. Miskel reported, however, that he experienced difficulty in specifying and measuring indices of organizational outcomes. While he stated a belief that neither superordinate nor subordinate ratings of effectiveness, nor a combination of the two ratings, would be sufficient as a measure of leader effectiveness, his research failed to provide a viable alternative to at least partial dependence on such ratings.

More recent investigations of the relationship between leader behavior and school effectiveness include Garland and O'Reilly's (1976) study of LPC (Least Preferred Co-worker) style and the effectiveness of elementary programs, as measured by the academic performance of the students in various elementary school buildings. They found that while leader style had only a limited relationship to group effectiveness, group attitude appeared to have a substantial relationship to effectiveness. Rasmussen (1976) investigated a sample of 996 elementary schools in the state of California.
which were judged either unusually successful or unusually unsuccessful, based on pupil test scores. It was found in this study that 87 percent of the variance in student achievement was accounted for by the factor of socio-economic status of the district clientele. When the sample was controlled on the basis of the socio-economic variable, regression analysis failed to demonstrate a relationship between pupil achievement and principal style as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Perceptual Measurement of Effectiveness

Measures of effectiveness which are perceptual, referent, or intermediate measures are common. They also are not without some justification in the literature. Getzels and Guba (1957) contended that effectiveness is the congruence of behavior with expectations and must be assessed as such. In this context, effectiveness is organizationally bound in terms of definition and standards and can thus be measured by intermediate measures. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weik (1970) noted that global measures of effectiveness are common, and that such measures reflect a common way of looking at success. They did note, however, that such measures are subject to many contaminants, but did not suggest that they are likely to be replaced nor that they should be discounted in importance.

Mend (1977) investigated the factors assessed and considered in the promotion of school administrators by superintendents. He found that the global perception variable, case performance, was
the factor which had the greatest weight in promotion decisions. This factor was followed by the factors of geniality, experience, and work style. It was found that the size or type of school district did not affect the factors considered, and that the educational background of the rating superintendent did not affect the factors considered. Another aspect of perceptual ratings was investigated by Marmino (1977). He found that there was a discrepancy between the perceptions of superintendents and principals as to the role of the principal in providing instructional leadership. Principals perceived their role as involving a higher level of instructional leadership than did their supervising superintendents.

Criteria of Perceptual Measurement

If effectiveness is commonly assessed by means of perceptual judgments, it is important to determine what aspects of behavior relate to assessments of effectiveness. Research conducted by Moser (1957) at the University of Chicago investigated twelve school superintendents and twenty-four principals employed in their districts to determine among other things if there was a relationship between leader style and ratings of effectiveness. He found that superintendents expressed the highest level of confidence in, and gave the highest ratings to, principals who perceived their own behavior as being nomothetic or institutionally oriented. The principals who were perceived as operating in an idiographic mode of behavior were given the lowest ratings by superintendents. Hemphill (1965) reported that principals who stressed communication tended to
be highly regarded. Fleishman (1973) digested a considerable amount of research and reported that leaders who scored above average on both of the dimensions of "consideration" and "structure" on instruments developed out of the Ohio State Leadership Studies are likely to be rated as effective performers by their superordinates. He also reported that higher "structure" scores related to higher performance levels on the part of subordinates but also related to higher grievance levels. Kunz and Hoy (1976) also found that teachers will rate principals who exhibit "structuring" behavior as more effective.

Swanson and Johnson (1976) investigated the relationship of supervisor ratings of performance to criterion-based measures of performance among 141 Air Force Instructor pilots. They found that there was a statistically significant correlation between the subjective rating and the criterion-based rating. Miskel, in his (1974) study also demonstrated a statistically significant correlation among superordinate, subordinate, and organizational measures of effectiveness. He did, however, report a finding that the length of position incumbency was negatively related to a rating of effectiveness of principals by both superordinates and subordinates.

**Effectiveness and Success**

The above discussion has focused on the construct of effectiveness. As evidenced by the discussion, it is difficult to find agreement on a definition of effectiveness that can be reasonably
operationalized. A more valid construct to use may be that of "success." If global perceptual assessments of position incumbents are to be used as the base measurement, it may be more honest to label the character of performance as successful than to label it effective.

Success is often measured in terms of the length of incumbency in a given position. This construct is logically faulty in that the nature of organizational structure and the lack of agency accountability mechanisms often permit positional maintenance by relatively ineffective position incumbents, particularly in mid-level positions. Incumbency plus the recommendation of a superordinate may, however, provide a somewhat more adequate measure of success.

Consideration and Initiation of Structure

The literature of leadership, administration, and management is permeated by reference to the behavioral constructs of "consideration" and "structuring." These terms have developed a standard meaning in the literature, and have served to anchor one of the major research efforts in leadership and one of the major schools of thought about leadership (Reddin, 1970).

Genesis of "Consideration" and "Structure"

The historical development of the concepts of "consideration" and "structure" and their relationship to the phenomenon of leadership is comprehensively reviewed by Fleishman (1973) in his overview of twenty years of research and theory in the field. These
two constructs grew out of a series of studies conducted under the auspices of the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University. Having rejected trait theories of leadership, the staff of the Personnel Research Board reconceptualized leadership as an activity. They researched the relationship of the leadership activity construct to nine classifications of behavior. Factor analysis of the items led to recognition of two major behavioral factors. These were labeled "consideration" and "initiation of structure" (Fleishman; 1953, 1973).

Since the early 1950's a number of modified forms of the original instrument, which was titled Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, have been developed. These instruments have been used in numerous research projects and investigations. Most of these instruments have been based on the report by subordinates of observed leader behavior, and they have measured the constructs of "consideration" and of "structuring" by means of larger or smaller portions of the scales developed at Ohio State University.

In 1953 Fleishman (1953, 1973) standardized an instrument he titled the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire. Like the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire this was a subordinate report instrument. At the same time, however, he also developed and standardized another instrument titled the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire which was designed for use by supervisors in describing their own leadership attitudes or opinions. This self report instrument has also played a major role in research focused on the phenomenon of leadership.
Meanings of "Consideration" and "Structure"

Since the development of the constructs of "consideration" and "structuring" their meanings have remained stable in the literature. In reporting on the development of the Supervisory Behavior Description, Fleishman (1953) gave the following descriptions:

Items in the "Consideration" dimension were concerned with the extent to which the leader was considerate of his worker's feelings. It reflected the "human relations" aspect of group leadership.

Items in the "Initiating Structure" dimension reflected the extent to which the leader defined or facilitated group interactions toward goal attainment. He does this by planning, communicating, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, etc. (p. 2).

Analysis of data collected with the 136 questions of the initial form led to the development of a forty-eight item "description questionnaire" with initial split-half reliabilities of .92 and .68 for "consideration" and "structure" respectively, and -.02 intercorrelation between the two scales.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, which was developed during the 1950's, published in 1960, and then revised in 1969 is based on the same descriptions of "consideration" and "structure" as the LBDQ. They are stated more formally, however. The revised edition of the administration manual (Fleishman, 1969) provided, the following "definitions":

CONSIDERATION (C) Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. A high score is
indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the individual is likely to be more impersonal in relations with group members.

STRUCTURE (S) Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterizes individuals who play a very active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score characterizes individuals who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways. (p. 1)

These comprehensive statements represent the idea contained in virtually all other "definitions" of terms (Fleishman, 1953a; Fleishman, 1953b; Halpin, 1954; Stogdill, 1974). These statements were cited by Gibb (1972) as being the best "definitions" of "consideration" and "structure" available. Fleishman (1973) in a discussion of the origins of the terms and their definitions posited that the basis for the terms is an action based-definition of leadership. The definition he proposed was, Leadership is "attempts at interpersonal influence, directed through the communication process, toward the attainment of some goal or goals" (p. 3). The underlying importance of communications activities is evident in the definitions.

"Consideration" and "Structure" in Research

Korman (1966) reviewed the research literature involving "consideration" and "structure" and reported that there was little evidence that the constructs were related to organizational criteria. At the same time he urged further research into the relationship
between the two leadership dimensions and other situational variables. Kerr and Schriesheim (1974) reviewed the research available eight years after Korman (1966) and found that the body of research reflected some progress in the effort to determine the moderating impact of situational variables on "consideration" and "structure." They also reported that research had not, however, been able to establish a causal relationship between leader behavior on these dimensions and subordinate productivity. Findings which confirm this relationship were reviewed in detail by Fleishman (1973).

Of special importance to the present study are findings which relate "consideration" and "structure" to ratings of effectiveness. Bass (1956, 1958) found, in two industrial samples, that supervisors who valued consideration were likely to be rated higher than their peers by their superordinates. Greenwood (1969), however, found that both scales were unrelated to several measures of supervisory effectiveness. Fleishman (1973) reported that studies had demonstrated that supervisors who have higher scores on the dimension of "structure" were rated as more effective supervisors. He also cited the findings which indicated the contrary and implied that the complex relationship of "consideration" and "structure" to effectiveness may be largely situational.

The interaction of the situation with leader "considering" and "structuring" behaviors was investigated by Bowman (1975). He reported that the type problems confronted by an elementary principal influenced his/her leader opinion as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Indicative of a long term impact, Cummins' (1970)
study of industrial foremen suggested that pervasive leader-member relationships act as an intervening variable between consideration and performance. This finding suggests that the nature of the work environment, as structured by labor-management relations, may be very important in terms of leader behavior. The relationship of employee morale, or satisfaction, to "consideration" has also been noted (Sumrall, 1976). This relationship also suggests that the militancy of the employee group may be a significant variable which has an impact on the behavior or the opinion of leaders as they relate to organizational and individual success. Greene (1975) provided further support for this perception with findings that indicated that a reciprocal relationship between the nature of supervisor-employee relations and productivity.

It was reported by Sims and Szilagyi (1975) that when roles are well defined, "structuring" may be perceived as unnecessarily close control and will therefore be negatively related to employee satisfaction. Badin (1974) reported that "structuring" was negatively related to group effectiveness for small groups, seasoned employees, low position-power managers, and high task structure conditions. In both of these studies variables which may be situational in the school setting were investigated. Fleishman (1973) indicated that "structure" was stable over time for leaders. Schreisheim and Murphy (1976) studied the interaction effects between "structure" and "consideration" and found that high "structure" was dysfunctional when accompanied by low "consideration." "Consideration" has been found to relate positively to
employee satisfaction (Greene, 1975) and to moderate the impact of high levels of "structure." This would tend to create the kind of condition envisioned by Black (1970), who contended that the supervisor's role is to create an atmosphere in which rules and directions are freely obeyed by each member of his group. McGregor (1966), in discussing the quality of foremanship needed in the face of an organized workforce, also indicated a recognition of the situational interplay of "consideration" and "structure."

Summary

This review of selected literature has addressed the topics of organizational models, situational variables, organizational climate, union militancy, the organizational role of school principals, principal effectiveness and success, and the leadership dimensions of "consideration" and "structure." The logic sequence implied that an organizational model can be developed, through which organizational behavior can be studied. It suggested that situational environments exist and can be described within an appropriately descriptive organizational model, that organizational climate is an important situational variable, and that organizational climate may differ among organizations on the basis of union militancy. Further, it is suggested that the organizational role of school principals is supervisory in nature and that it is consequently subject to the interpersonal climate established within the organization in which the principal is expected to function. Finally, the review suggested that "consideration" and "structure" are appropriate behavioral
constructs upon which a study of leader opinion might focus.

The following chapter describes the research design and methodology for the study reported here, which was designed to investigate the moderating impact of teacher union militancy on the leader opinion of principals as it relates to principal success. This study was a field test of the organizational model developed and discussed in Chapter II, and was based on the evidence of potential significance as indicated in the literature reviewed above.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this investigation was to test the model developed in Chapter II above. The study designed to accomplish this task attempted to determine if principals' leadership opinions as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire differed by classification of principals according to: (a) willingness of superordinates to give them a recommendation (b) the militancy of the teacher union of the district of employment as measured by a Teacher Union Militancy index devised for this study. A second focus of the study was to discover if the amount of difference in leadership opinion among principals varied when the variable of categories of principals was moderated by the variable of the classification of districts from which the sample of principals was taken.

Described below are the rationale for and description of the development of an index for the measurement of teacher union militancy. Also described is the application of the index in classifying school districts. Data collection methods are also discussed, as are the procedures used in the analysis of data.

Study Population

The population for this research consisted of all practicing public school principals in the state of Michigan who were employed in school districts which had reported pupil enrollments of more than
2,000 but fewer than 10,000 each, during the 1978-79 school year. Principals employed in large districts were eliminated from the population because of the technical difficulty of determining "most successful" and "least successful" position incumbents when large numbers of principals are employed. As district enrollment increased beyond 10,000 pupils it seemed likely that no single individual would be responsible for evaluation of all principals in the district, and therefore no single individual might be relied upon to make a selection of appropriate subjects for the study. Districts of fewer than 2,000 pupils were eliminated from the study population as a means of insuring that each district had a sufficient number of principals that at least one "more successful" and one "less successful" principal could be selected.

This delimitation of the population eliminated from consideration as subjects of the investigation all principals employed by 306 of the 530 Michigan school districts. Thirty-three districts were eliminated because they were too large and 273 were eliminated because they enrolled fewer than 2,000 pupils. Of the 224 school districts which remained in the population, the largest in terms of pupil enrollment had 9,980 pupils and employed thirteen building principals. The district having the largest number of principals employed nineteen educators in this capacity. The smallest district in terms of pupil enrollment had 2,002 pupils and employed six building principals.

Selection of the Sample of School Districts

As one of the group classifications used as a main effect variable in this study was based on the level of teacher union...
militancy in school districts, it was necessary to determine appropriate samples of school districts prior to selection of the sample of principals. The selection of the sample of school districts was based on the level of teacher union militancy in the district as measured by the Teacher Union Militancy Index described below.

Forty school districts were selected as a sample on the basis of high militancy scores on the Teacher Union Militancy Index and another forty districts were selected as the other sample on the basis of low militancy scores on the Teacher Union Militancy index. It was assumed that militancy is an organizationally-bound characteristic with little differentiation by sub-unit or hierarchical level within the organization. The level of militancy measured on a district basis, therefore, was assumed to be valid for each building within a single school district.

Review of the literature which analyzed the focus of teacher collective bargaining (Corwin, 1970; Noone, 1979; Sentelle, 1972a, 1972b, 1972c, 1972d; Wood, 1974) indicated that the focus of teacher bargaining efforts, or the drive behind teacher militancy, is first oriented toward improving salary and fringe benefits, and secondly oriented toward a shifting of the balance of management power in the district as that power can be used to affect the security and comfort of teachers. Review of documents relevant to the collective bargaining process, published by the Michigan Education Association and its affiliates, indicated specific priority areas of concern where contract language might be written to limit management prerogatives. Together, these data were used to construct the
following scale which was used to differentiate school districts in the state of Michigan on the basis of teacher union militancy.

Militancy Index

All Michigan school districts in the population described above were scored according to the criteria described below. A district was accorded a cumulative numerical score which ranged from a low of zero to a high of thirty points. The lower scores were interpreted as indicating a "lower" level of teacher union militancy, while the higher scores were interpreted as indicating a "higher" level of teacher union militancy.

Strikes

Districts were awarded ten points for a strike or work stoppage occurring in 1978 or 1979. Nine points were accorded for a strike which occurred in 1977, eight points for a strike which occurred in 1976, seven points for a strike which occurred in 1975, six points for an occurrence in 1974, and five points for any strike or work stoppage which occurred prior to the years listed. This set of points automatically shifted each district with a strike history into the "higher" militancy group, with the militancy ratings on this dimension of the index going to districts with the most recent incidences of work stoppage (or strike) or to districts with histories of multiple work stoppages.
Salary Considerations

Each district which qualified was accorded one point for each of the following salary related considerations:

1. If the scheduled B.A. degree base salary for the district was higher than the median B.A. degree base salary for all school districts in the Michigan Education Association Region to which the district belongs.

2. If the scheduled M. A. degree maximum salary for the district was higher than the median M. A. degree maximum salary for all school districts in the Michigan Association Region to which the district belongs.

3. If the salary schedule for the district had twelve or fewer increment steps from the B. A. base salary to the M. A. maximum salary.

4. If the portion of the school district's operating budget allocated to teachers' salaries was above the mean of the portion of operating funds allocated to teachers' salaries for all school districts in the same size classification, as classified by the Michigan State Department of Education.

Fringe Benefit Considerations

Each school district was accorded one point for each of the following fringe benefit items which accrued to teachers provided through the negotiated teacher employment master agreement:
1. Full payment of the premiums for health care insurance coverage for each employed teacher and members of that teacher's family.

2. The health care insurer was to be the Michigan Educational Special Services Association, and the program to be offered was the MESSA SuperMed II insurance program.

3. Dental care for teaching employees and their family members at no cost to the teacher.

Management Prerogative Considerations

Each school district in the sample was awarded one point on the index for each of the following considerations if the consideration was guaranteed as a matter of contract in the negotiated teacher employment master agreement:

1. The Board of Education agreed to recognize an agency shop right of representation on the part of the teacher's union or association.

2. The Board of Education agreed to submit all grievances to third-party binding arbitration as the final step of the grievance resolution procedure.

Based on the above criteria, the forty school districts in the selected population which were accorded the highest total scores were the districts selected as the sample of "more militant" school districts. The forty districts which were accorded the lowest total scores were the districts selected as the sample of "less militant"
school districts.

It was presumed that the profile of a "more militant" school district resulting from this process would show a school district with a history of strike activity on the part of its teachers, a high salary schedule, a high portion of district resources being used to pay teacher salaries, a high level of benefits provided to teachers, and a protected teacher union. Additionally, dispute resolution would be taken out of management hands and handed over to an impartial third-party. The profile of a "less militant" school district was presumed to show one with an absence of work stoppage or strike history, lower than average salaries, a lower portion of resources going directly to teacher salaries and fringes, and one in which traditional management prerogatives were relatively unimpaired.

Selection of the Sample of Principals

The sample of school principals drawn for inclusion in the study consisted of two principals selected from each of the eighty sample school districts. One "less successful" principal and one "more successful" principal was designated for each district. Selection was made on the basis of the district's Superintendent of Schools', or of a person designated by the superintendent as being responsible for evaluation of principals, willingness to provide a job recommendation. This selection process resulted in a potential sample of eighty "more successful" principals and eighty "less successful" principals. When divided by the grouping of districts
according to militancy, four sub-samples of forty principals each was made possible. The school principals were not apprised of the basis for their selection.

Selection was accomplished by means of a response to a hypothetical situation in which the superordinate rater was asked to respond as though he/she were providing a recommendation to a peer regarding principals currently serving in the school district. The queries made of the rater were:

1. Of principals currently serving on your staff, about whom would you feel most comfortable giving a favorable recommendation to one of your peers?

2. Of principals currently serving on your staff, about whom would you feel least comfortable giving a favorable recommendation to one of your peers?

It was assumed that a general or holistic rating based on a judgment that was projected to stand credibly before a rater's peers would be more valid than a criterion-based rating. It was expected that the "halo effect" which is often presumed to contaminate superordinate personnel ratings would be minimized by this strategem. "Success" was consequently operationally defined here as a quality of performance which would lead to one being favorably recommended by a superordinate to that superordinate's peer group, in a manner which predicts future successful performance on the part of the rated individual.

The superintendent or other superordinate rater in each
sample school district was requested to forward a designated response package to each of the selected principals. The response questionnaires were printed on different colors of stock to differentiate "more militant" and "less militant" school districts. Otherwise, the response packages were identical, excepting a coded designation of one package as a "more successful" and one response package as a "less successful" principal response. As no identifiers were included other than success and militancy codes, no individual identification of respondents, and consequently no follow-up, was possible.

Measurement of Leader Opinion

Measurement of the two dependent variables in this study, "consideration" and "structure" opinions of public school principals in each of the above designated groups was accomplished by means of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, or LOQ. This is a commercially available instrument published by Science Research Associates, Inc. The instrument is recommended by the publisher for use as a selection tool for management and supervisory personnel, for assessing managerial climate in performance appraisal, and as a development tool for supervisory trainees.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was devised by Edwin A. Fleishman, and grew out of the Ohio State Leadership Studies of the 1950's. The instrument is an adaptation of the "consideration" and "structure" scales of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire or LBDQ. Fleishman (1953) was involved in early application of
these scales to supervisory personnel. Gibb (1972) reported that the "consideration" and "structure" dimensions were shown to account for 83 percent of the variance in Halpin and Winer's (1952) factor-analytic reduction of the nine assumptions about leader behavior measured by the original Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Gibb (1970) cautioned that the scores obtained from the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire should be interpreted with care, as the scores reflect belief about appropriate leader behavior rather than observed leader behavior. As this measurement was not used for predictive purposes or against a criterion-based standard, but rather to attempt discernment of differences in leadership opinion among four different groups of school leaders, this caveat does not limit the use of this instrument in this investigation. The underlying assumption that leader opinion structures leader behavior in responding to various organizational climates is accepted as inherently important in the conceptualization of this research, nonetheless. Gibb (1970) further stated that while the instrument was not appropriate for prediction of criterion performance, the instrument is well designed and should be considered for assessment of management training and for other uses.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire is a brief form with forty response items, each with five choices of answers. The instrument may be self administered and should not take more than fifteen minutes to fill out under normal circumstances. The instrument is carboned and self scoring, providing separate independent scores on each of the dimensions of "consideration" and "structure."
Internal consistency reliabilities for the scales, reported in the administration manual (Fleishman, 1969), range from .62 to .89 on the Consideration scale and from .69 to .88 on the Structure scale. Test-retest reliabilities reported on one month and three month time differentials are within the same range as the internal consistency reliabilities. It is reported that the scales are independent and that the scores are not dependent on intelligence or verbal ability. Numerous correlations reported by Fleishman (1969) support these contentions.

Fleishman (1969) also reported a number of studies which correlated scores on the LOQ scales with a variety of external criteria, in diverse organizations, for a number of different types of employee groups. While no universal pattern was evident it was reported that no case had demonstrated a positive relationship between low "consideration" scores and high performance ratings. The relationship of the "structure" dimension to effectiveness apparently is more situational.

Each principal selected for the study was provided with the instrument and with an addressed stamped envelope in which the instrument was to be returned. As indicated above, these were distributed to the principals by the rating superordinates. The nature of the survey distribution thus was such that it was anticipated that the return rate would likely be affected by the sample selection process. It was expected that the return rate could be as low as 50 percent with as few as ten responses in a single data cell.
Collection of Ancillary Data

Along with collection of the leadership opinion data necessary to test the hypotheses central to this investigation, a number of items of demographic and opinion data were collected from the school principals surveyed. The purpose of this collection of ancillary data was threefold.

Firstly, the collection of selected demographic data provided a means by which the representativeness of the samples of school principals could be checked by comparison against other research data describing school principals.

Secondly, data were collected which permitted comparison between the demographic characteristics and opinions of "more successful" and "less successful" school principal samples. It was assumed that the finding of significant demographic differences or opinion differences unrelated to the dimensions of "consideration" and "structure" between these groups of principals could be important in terms of interpreting analysis of the data collected in response to the research hypotheses.

Thirdly, collection of selected demographic and opinion data was accomplished to permit ancillary analysis of the impact of these factors on the "consideration" and "structure" scores of the school principals surveyed. It was assumed that while the "more successful" and "less successful" groups of principals may not differ significantly on a proportionate basis on the demographic items, it would also be of importance to assess the direct possibility...
that the total sample of principals' "consideration" and "structure" scores might vary when the sample was differentiated on the basis of these demographic characteristics.

Ancillary data collected included the number of years of experience each subject had as a school principal and the number of years experience each had as a teacher. Information regarding academic degrees held and area of specialization also was collected. The questionnaire also asked about the numbers of assistant principals and teachers supervised and the number of pupils the principal was responsible for. Each principal was then asked to rate his/her: (a) level of success and (b) level of satisfaction with his/her position, each on a three-point scale.

Principals were asked to respond to two questions about the teacher unions in their districts, namely: (a) whether they regarded the teachers' organization as being militant and (b) the teacher union's impact on their ability to function as school principals. Three-point scales were provided for each of these questions, also. These questions also provided a check on the congruence of principal's perceptions of militancy with the data derived from the Teacher Union Militancy Index devised for this study.

Analysis of Data

Research Hypotheses

Six research hypotheses were developed for this investigation. These provided for study of two main effects variables; teacher
union militancy and a rating of success based on superordinates' willingness to recommend, as well as the interaction effects of these two independent variables on the dependent variables of "Consideration" and "Structure." The hypotheses are:

1. Opinions regarding "considering" behavior will differ between school principals who are rated "more successful" and school principals who are rated "less successful" based on their respective superordinates' willingness to recommend them to peers.

2. Opinions regarding "considering" behavior will differ between school principals in school districts with organizational climates characterized as "more militant" and those characterized as "less militant" according to an index of teacher union militancy.

3. The amount of difference in opinion regarding "considering" behavior between "more successful" principals and "less successful" principals will vary between those in "more militant" school districts and those in "less militant" school districts.

4. Opinions regarding "structuring" behavior will differ between school principals who are rated "more successful" and school principals who are rated "less successful" based on their respective superordinates' willingness to recommend them to peers.

5. Opinions regarding "structuring" behavior will differ between school principals in school districts with organizational climates characterized as "more militant" and those characterized as "less militant" according to an index of teacher union militancy.
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6. The amount of difference in opinion regarding "structuring" behavior between "more successful" principals and "less successful" principals will vary between those in "more militant" school districts and those in "less militant" school districts.

Analysis of the data collected in response to these research hypotheses was accomplished by means of a four cell two-way analysis of variance, with two levels of militancy and two levels of principal success as the main effects variables. As it was unlikely that cell equality or proportionality could be attained, the actual statistical manipulation was accomplished through use of the Statistical Package Program (STATPACK) of the Western Michigan University Computer Center, and cell disproportionality was accommodated through weighting of cell means. A .05 level of significance was established for rejection of the hypotheses.

Ancillary Analysis

Analysis of the ancillary data collected was accomplished in two phases. A portion of these data was reviewed and reported to describe the two sub-samples of "more successful" and "less successful" principals. Differences between the groups of principals were noted and are reported in the chapter which follows. Differences were statistically tested by means of the Chi-Square test for independent samples to determine if the proportionate incidence of selected variable factors was significant between the two groups.

In a second phase of analysis, the total sample of principals was analyzed by means of one-way analysis of variance to determine
if the "consideration" scores or "structure" scores varied by selected demographic or opinion factors. Findings significant at the .10 level, or greater, are reported.

Summary

This chapter has detailed the development of a Teacher Union Militancy Index and discussed the definition and selection of a study sample. Data collection procedures have been described and the program of analysis indicated. The following chapter reports and discusses the findings which resulted from the investigation detailed here. The significance of the various findings is indicated and discussed.
CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The following text presents the data collected in this study of the leadership orientation of school principals in the state of Michigan. Data are presented and examined in three general areas. First is an examination of the sample of school districts selected for this study, with a comparison of the characteristics of those districts that were selected as "more militant" with those that were selected as "less militant." Second is an examination of the sample of principals from whom responses were received. Following is a presentation of data regarding the "consideration" and "structure" constructs among Michigan school principals as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. All discussion focuses directly on the research questions posed earlier and on the findings related to them.

Militant and Non-Militant School Districts

Index Scores

Described in Chapter IV, above, is the development of an index for the purpose of rating Michigan school districts on the basis of teacher union militancy. This instrument was based on historical data regarding work stoppages by teachers, salary minimums and maximums, and the presence or absence of a number of...
fringe benefits and items of contractual language recommended by the Michigan Education Association as being desirable inclusions for teacher contracts.

No single source of labor relations data for Michigan school districts was found. Various data for various periods of time have been compiled by a number of agencies and organizations, apparently as the interests of individual researchers have indicated, or the interests of individual employers have compelled. Since 1972 The Tenure, Negotiations, and Retirement Office of the Michigan State Department of Education has collected and maintained on file work stoppage data. Work stoppage information for years 1965 to 1972 is available from the Negotiations Research, and Professional Development Division of the Michigan Education Association. Documentation regarding salary, fringe benefits, and contract inclusions was obtained from the periodic survey reports prepared by the Michigan Education Association and by the Michigan Association of School Boards for the 1977-78 and 1978-79 school years.

Of the 243 school districts in the population group (more than 2,000 and fewer than 10,000 pupils) selected for this study, complete data were available for 207 districts. The district scores on the Militancy Index ranged from a low of two to a high of thirty, as shown in Table 1. The mean score of the total group of 207 districts was 10.7. The mode score was seven, while the median score was eight.
Table 1
Summary of Militance Index Scores of School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population (N = 207)</th>
<th>Less Militant (N = 40)</th>
<th>More Militant (N = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Score</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Score</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores for the forty districts selected as "less militant" ranged from a low of two to a high of six. The scores for the forty districts selected as "more militant" ranged from a low of seventeen to a high of thirty. The "less militant" mean score was 4.7 while the mean score of the "more militant" districts was 20.6. The medians for "less militant" and for "more militant" districts respectively, were four and twenty while the modes were four and seventeen.

Strike Histories Compared

Comparison of the Index data, as presented in Table 2, reveals that the districts in the "more militant" group had been the subject of multiple work stoppages while the "less militant"
## Table 2

**Strike History of School Districts with more than 2,000 and Fewer than 10,000 Pupils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Population (N = 207)</th>
<th>Less Militant (N = 40)</th>
<th>More Militant (N = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of strikes</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of strikes per district</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of days of teacher strikes</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of days per strike</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of strike days per district</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School districts had all been free of strikes at the time the data were gathered for this research. In the entire population of 207 districts there were 147 strikes reported during the period of 1965 through 1978 inclusive. The "more militant" group of forty districts weathered eighty-nine of the reported strikes. The mean number of strikes reported was 0.7 for the entire population, 0.0 for the "less militant" districts, and 2.2 for the "more militant" districts.

*Strikes were not only more frequent in the "more militant"*
districts, they tended to be of longer duration. The mean duration of all strikes in the total population was 8.43 days as compared with 9.74 days duration for the forty "more militant" school districts. The "more militant" districts averaged a loss of 21.68 days of schedule instruction, a figure which is three and one-half times as great as the overall average time loss due to teacher strikes for the total population. None of the "less militant" districts in the population suffered any scheduled time loss as a result of a teacher work stoppage.

Salary and Financial Data

A number of differences were noted in the salary schedules of "more militant" and "less militant" sample groups of schools as may be seen from Table 3. Variance was noted in both minimum and maximum salaries. The mean B.A. base salary, or the lowest scheduled salary paid to teachers, was $698 higher for the "more militant" districts than for the "less militant" districts during the 1978-79 school year. An even greater differential existed between "more militant" and "less militant" districts at the M. A. maximum salary schedule level. While some salary schedules have increments for academic work beyond the Master's degree, the M.A. degree is the benchmark used by both the Michigan Education Association and the Michigan Association of School Boards in comparing school district salary schedules. The top salary on the M. A. schedule is typically the highest salary teachers achieve and consequently is the most significant benchmark in comparing salary schedules. At this
Table 3
Comparative Salary Schedule Data for the School Year 1973-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Less Militant (N = 40)</th>
<th>More Militant (N = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. A. Base Salary</strong>&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$ 9,187</td>
<td>$ 9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>11,834</td>
<td>13,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>11,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. A. Maximum Salary</strong>&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>15,880</td>
<td>15,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>23,535</td>
<td>25,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18,656</td>
<td>21,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Salary Schedule Increments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>*</sup>To the nearest dollar

level the difference in mean salaries between "more militant" and "less militant" districts was $2,464, in favor of the "more militant" districts.

While the amount of salary a teacher can receive is of primary importance, the number of years a teacher must work in a district to move from the beginning salary to the top of the salary schedule is also important. The data collected indicate that on the average a teacher in a "more militant" district not only will start at a higher salary and achieve substantially more at the top
of the schedule, but also will reach the top of the salary schedule more than one year sooner than his/her counterpart in a "less militant" district. The salary schedules in "less militant" districts had an average of 11.7 yearly increments or steps from the B. A. base salary to the M. A. maximum salary. This compares with an average of 10.5 increments from base to top on the salary schedules of "more militant" school districts.

Table 4 provides intraregional comparisons of salary schedules, substantiating the observation that there is a relative difference between the salaries paid in the "more militant" and "less militant" school districts as they were defined and sampled in this study. At both the B. A. base salary level and the M. A. maximum level of the salary schedule, the "more militant" school districts were paying salaries greater than the mean salary paid at the same level by all districts in the geographic region into which the district was grouped by the Michigan Education Association. Conversely, "less militant" districts as a group paid less than the mean paid by the other districts in the same geographic region in which they were located. This indicates that the relative militancy of school districts was measured, despite regional variations in the levels of salary paid teachers.

"More militant" and "less militant" districts were also discriminated on the basis of the portion of general fund operating revenues devoted to teacher salaries, as indicated in Table 5. In the "more militant" districts an average of 50.375 percent of such available funds was devoted to teacher salaries. When compared
Table 4
Intra-Regional Salary Comparisons of School Districts by Variance from the Mean Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Classification of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Militant (N = 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance of base salary from regional mean base salary</td>
<td>-$176.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance of maximum salary from regional mean maximum salary</td>
<td>-$59.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with all other districts of the same size, twenty of the more militant districts devoted a greater portion of available revenues to teacher salaries than other districts of the same size. "Less militant" school districts devoted an average of 48.6 percent of available general operating funds to teacher salaries. Of this group, sixteen school districts allocated a greater portion of

Table 5
Proportion of General Fund Resources Devoted to Teacher Salaries During the 1977-1978 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Classification of District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Militant (N = 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion of budget paid as teacher salaries</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
district resources to teacher salaries than the average of other school districts of the same size.

Fringe Benefit Comparisons

An important area of fringe benefit bargaining in teacher contracts is for medical and dental benefits. The data collected and presented in Table 6 reveal that the teacher in a "more militant" district was more likely to have a comprehensive fringe benefit package which included fully paid full family dental care provided for him/her than was his/her peer in a "less militant" district. Fifty percent of the "more militant" districts provided this benefit, as compared with only 17.5 percent of the "less militant" districts. "More militant" districts were also more likely to fully pay the premium for full family health care benefits, but were less likely to provide the insurance coverage sponsored by the Michigan Education Association and preferred by that teacher organization. This discrepancy can be explained by the fact that a number of the "more militant" districts were represented by American Federation of Teacher unions rather than Michigan Education Association unions. The former locals would more likely have insurance coverage provided by Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

Management Rights Comparisons

Two areas of management rights were identified as possible discriminators, and surveyed through the teacher union Militancy Index developed for this study. These were the recognition of an
Table 6

Comparison of Health and Dental Insurance Fringe Benefits Provided by School Districts During the 1978-1979 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of District</th>
<th>Less Militant (N = 40)</th>
<th>More Militant (N = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full family health insurance premium fully paid</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA sponsored insurance provided by contract</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully family dental insurance premium fully paid</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

agency shop, or requirement that each employee pay a representation fee to the union, and the inclusion of binding arbitration as the last step of the grievance procedure. These have been two key elements sought in contracts by the Michigan Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. The Michigan Association of School Boards, on the other hand, has counseled local districts to avoid including language in these two areas in contracts. Results of the survey are presented in Table 7.
Table 7
Comparison of the Incidence of Agency Shop and Binding Arbitration Clauses in Teacher Contracts of School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of District</th>
<th>Less Militant (N = 40)</th>
<th>More Militant (N = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract contains an agency shop clause</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract contains a binding arbitration clause</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the districts selected for both sub-samples, the majority had language in their contracts providing agency shop rights and binding arbitration. The percent of districts which had avoided inclusion of such language was greater among "less militant" districts, however.

District Sample Summary

The two sub-samples of school districts identified through use of the index differed in strike history, in salary structure and level, in the level of fringe benefits provided by negotiated contracts, and in certain management rights retained by the district. The "more militant" districts each suffered at least one work stoppage and some had weathered as many as four. Most of these districts had a history of multiple strikes. No "less militant" district had ever been the object of a teacher strike as of the
end of 1978.

Salary levels in "more militant" districts tended to be higher than those in "less militant" districts and the mean salary of the former was higher than the mean of other districts in the same geographic region, while the mean salary of "less militant" districts was less than the mean of other districts in the same geographic region. "More militant" school districts provided more benevolent fringe benefits than "less militant" districts. "Less militant" districts had held the line of management rights areas of the contract to a somewhat greater degree than had "more militant" districts. Evident differences did exist between the two samples of school districts.

"More Successful" and "Less Successful" School Principals

School principals were selected from the sample school districts for this study by each participating school district's superintendent. The superintendent in each of the forty "more militant" school districts and the forty "less militant" school districts was asked to select, for inclusion in the study, the principal in his/her district whom he/she would feel most comfortable recommending to a peer and the principal in his/her district whom he/she would feel least comfortable recommending to a peer.

Data on the sample of principals are reported below. To assist the reader in interpreting tabulated data the Chi-Square test for independent samples was conducted when appropriate. A .05
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significance level was established for these tests.

Summary of Responses

A summary of the principals' response rates is presented in Table 8. Out of the eighty possible responses in each of the two classifications of districts, fifty-three responses were received from "less militant" district respondents and twenty-nine responses were received from "more militant" district respondents. The proportionate difference in response rates between the "more militant" and "less militant" school districts is statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Of the eighty usable principal responses received, forty-two were from principals categorized as "more successful" while thirty-eight were from principals categorized as "less successful." No significant statistical difference exists between these response rates.

The response rate for this study was compared with the response rate experienced by Bowman (1977) in a study of the role and task orientation of Michigan school principals. The Bowman study was conducted using a scientific random sample of Michigan principals and thus provides an indication of what might be an expected principal response rate. The present study differed in that each single response required the participation of both a superintendent and a principal, and in that no follow-up or reminder letter was possible. It was consequently expected that the response rate for this study would be lower than that experienced by Bowman (1977).
Table 8

Summary of Principal Response Rates by Categories of Militancy and by Categories of Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total study</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;More Militant&quot; district principals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Less Militant&quot; district principals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;More Successful&quot; principals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Less Successful&quot; principals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman (1977) study</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .001)

The Bowman (1977) study surveyed 472 randomly selected principals and generated responses from 288 principals. The present study generated a total response of eighty-two out of a sample of 160 principals. The percentage comparison is a 61 percent response rate for the Bowman (1977) study compared with a 51 percent response rate for the present study.

Of the total eighty-two responses received for this study, two were not complete and thus could not be used in the analysis of principal data. After discarding the two incomplete responses, the sample of eighty principal responses was submitted to analysis.
Principal Assignment

A comparison of the assignment levels of principals in the sample is presented in Table 9. A higher percentage of the respondents who were assigned at the high school level was found to be categorized as "more successful" as opposed to "less successful." More principals who reported elementary school assignments were categorized as "less successful" than were categorized as "more successful."

The proportionate difference between the two categories of principals assigned at the high school level was statistically significant ($p < .05$), as was the difference between the two categories of principals assigned at the elementary school level ($p < .01$).

Table 9
Comparison of the Level of Assignment Among Groups of School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Principals</th>
<th>Less Successful ($N = 38$)</th>
<th>More Successful ($N = 42$)</th>
<th>Total ($N = 80$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Junior High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15**</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .05)  **(p < .01)
Principal Training

As indicated in Table 10, only two of the respondents in this investigation indicated that they held no degree beyond the Bachelor's degree level. Twenty-three, or 28.8 percent of the respondents, indicated that they had achieved either Specialists' or Doctors' degrees. This compares with a finding of only 14.4 percent of a larger and random sampling of Michigan principals holding advanced degrees beyond the Master's level in the study reported by Bowman (1977) two years prior to this study.

Table 10

Comparison of the Level of Degree Attainment Among Groups of School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Principals</th>
<th>Highest Degree Attained</th>
<th>Less Successful (N = 38)</th>
<th>More Successful (N = 42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist's Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor's Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers too small to report significance

No statistical significance was found in the comparative distribution of degrees among principals categorized as "more successful" as compared with those categorized as "less successful."
Principal Experience

Miskel (1974) indicated that the experience level of incumbent principals correlates negatively with superordinate and subordinate ratings of effectiveness. It was found in the present study, as shown in Table 11, that the number of years experience as a principal was statistically significant ($p < .001$) in differentiating "more successful" from "less successful" principals, as they were categorized for this study. While respondents who were categorized as "more successful" had 8.5 years experience on the average, respondents who were categorized as "less successful" had on the average, 12.7 years experience as school principals.

In addition to having more experience as principals, "less successful" principals reported slightly more teaching experience, on the average, than did their "more successful" peers. The difference in this experience category was only 0.4 years, however. The "more successful" group of principals averaged 7.8 years teaching experience per principal while the "less successful" group averaged 8.2 years of teaching experience.
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Table 11
Comparison of Experience Levels Among Groups of School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Principals</th>
<th>Less Successful (N = 38)</th>
<th>More Successful (N = 42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years experience as school principals</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years experience as teacher</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of school employment</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .001)

Principal Perception of Teacher Union Militancy

A major focus of this study was the search for leader belief patterns which might enhance productive interaction of school principals with militant school employee unions. Consequently it was surmised that the level of cognition principals have of teacher union militancy could be an important variable affecting leader opinion. Each principal respondent was asked to rate the teachers employed in his/her district as being "not militant," "moderately militant," or "highly militant." The principals were also asked to indicate whether they believed the impact of the teacher union on their ability to function as a principal was "not great," "moderate," or "very great." These data are presented in Table 12 and Table 13.

The responses indicate that principals working in districts
Table 12
Numbers of Principals Reporting Various Perceptions of Teacher Union Militancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Principal</th>
<th>Less Successful</th>
<th>More Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Union Militancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low militancy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate militancy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High militancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .01)

categorized by the investigator as "more militant" were more likely than principals working in districts classified as "less militant" to rate the teacher union as highly militant. Also, more principals in districts categorized as "more militant" were aware of the teacher unions as having an impact on their ability to function as principals *(p < .01)*, as shown by the tabulation of the perceptions reported by the principals in the sample. (See Table 13).
Table 13

Numbers of Principals Reporting Perception of Teacher Union Impact on Ability to Function Effectively as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Union Militancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Impact</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Impact</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .05)*

The data also revealed that among principals who were serving in districts categorized as "more militant, those principals categorized as "more successful" were more likely than principals categorized as "less successful" to accurately perceive the level of teacher union militancy, while principals categorized as "less successful" were more likely to report that the teacher union had an impact on their ability to function effectively as principals (p < .05). (See Table 12).
Principal Satisfaction and Success

To determine what relationship existed between the level of job satisfaction reported by school principals and the categorization of success given their performance in this study, each principal respondent was requested to indicate whether he/she was "highly satisfied," "moderately satisfied" or "not satisfied" with his/her position as principal. These data are presented in Table 14. No statistically significant differences were noted between the responses of principals categorized as "more successful" and principals categorized as "less successful."

Each principal was also asked to indicate his/her perception of his/her level of success as a principal. Ratings were made on a scale of "not successful," "moderately successful," and "very successful." Principals categorized by the researcher as "more successful" were more prone to rate themselves as "very successful" (p < .05). None of the principals who responded to the study rated themselves as "not successful."
### Table 14
Numbers of Principals Reporting Self-Rated Levels of Success and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-rating</th>
<th>Classification by Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Successful (N = 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not successful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately successful</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*($p < .05$)

"Structure" and "Consideration"

The constructs of "structure" and "consideration" were scored from the self administered Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). The top scores derived from this instrument are designed to be independent of each other. The "structure" and "consideration" scores obtained in this study were tested for correlation and were found not to correlate at a statistically significant level.

The "consideration" and "structure" scores of respondents in this study were not markedly different from those reported for other groups of individuals in supervisory roles, as may be seen from
Figures 5 and 6. Compared with the norms established for General Supervisory Personnel the principal respondent mean scores fell in the high average range for "consideration" and in the low average range for "structure." Compared with the norm table for Educational Supervisors the mean scores fell in the low range for "consideration" and in the high average range for "structure."

The frequency distribution of "consideration" scores was skewed toward the low and very low score ranges when it was compared to the Educational Supervisory norms published by Fleishman (1969). Of the eighty usable scores received, forty-nine, or 61.3 percent fell in the low and very low score ranges. When compared to the General Supervisory Personnel norms provided in the manual, however, 50 percent of the scores fell into the average range, with only three scores falling in the low range.

When the frequency distribution of "structure" scores was compared with the Educational Supervisor norms 57.5 percent of all scores fell in the average range of the published norms (Fleishman, 1969). Fifteen percent of the scores fell in the low and very low range while 27.5 percent were above the average range.

Analysis of Data

Consideration Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that the "consideration" scores of Michigan school principals derived from self administration of Leadership Opinion Questionnaire by the principals, would vary by
CONSIDERATION SCORE

Figure 5. Frequency Distribution of the "Consideration" Scores of Michigan School Principals Compared with the Norms for Educational Supervisors and General Supervisory Personnel (Fleishman, 1969; p. 13).
Figure 6. Frequency Distribution of the "Structure" Scores of Michigan School Principals Compared with the Norms for Educational Supervisors and General Supervisory Personnel (Fleishman, 1969; p. 13).
categorization as to "success," by categorization of school district "militancy," and by the interaction of "success" and "militancy."

These hypotheses were tested by means of a two-way analysis of variance adjusted for cell imbalance by weighting of means.

As indicated in Table 15, analysis revealed no main-effects or interaction-effects variation in "consideration" scores among the principal respondents. Null hypotheses postulating an absence of variance on the basis of "militancy," "success," and the interaction of these two variables could not be rejected.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Militancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militancy by success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that the "structure" scores of Michigan school principals, derived from self administration of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire by the principals, would vary by categorization according to school district "militancy" and by the
interaction of "success" and "militancy." These hypotheses were statistically tested by means of a two-way analysis of variance adjusted for cell imbalance by weighting of means.

As indicated in Table 16, "structure" scores of principals were found to vary at a statistically significant level (p < .01) between the two groups of principals differentiated by category of "success." Principals who were categorized as "more successful" were found to have a significantly higher scores on the "structure" scale.

No main-effects variance was found between the "more militant" and "less militant" categories of principals. No interaction-effects variance was found on the dimension of "structure."

Table 16

Weighted Means ANOVA Testing Variance of "Structure" Scores by Main Effect Success, by Main Effect Militancy, and by Interaction Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Militancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>398.64</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militancy by success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .01)
Ancillary Data Analysis

The hypothesized variability of "consideration" scores and "structure" scores was not demonstrated except for variance in "structure" scores between groups of principals differentiated by categorization of success. Data indicated, however, that some significant relationships might exist which may explain some of the variability in "consideration" and "structure" scores among the sample of principals. Therefore, analysis of ancillary data was conducted in an effort to identify variables which might be associated with variance in "consideration" and "structure" scores among principals.

The following twenty-four ancillary hypotheses were tested in this effort:

1. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals on the basis of the attainment of an academic degree above the Master's degree.

2. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals on the basis of the attainment of an academic degree above the Master's degree level.

3. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the number of years teaching experience of the principal.

4. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the number of years of teaching experience of the principal.

5. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school
principals by the number of years experience they have as school principals.

6. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the number of years experience they have as school principals.

7. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by their assignment to elementary versus secondary school positions.

8. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by their assignment to elementary versus secondary school positions.

9. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the number of pupils assigned to the building supervised by the principal.

10. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the number of pupils assigned to the building supervised by the principal.

11. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the number of teachers who are supervised by the principal.

12. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the number of teachers who are supervised by the principal.

13. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the assignment of an assistant principal to the building supervised by the principal.

principals by the assignment of an assistant principal to the building supervised by the principal.

15. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported levels of activity in professional organizations.

16. "Structure" scores will vary among school principals by the principals' reported levels of activity in professional organizations.

17. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported perceptions of the level of teacher militancy in their districts.

18. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported perceptions of the level of teacher militancy in their districts.

19. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported perceptions of the impact of the teachers' unions on their ability to perform their duties.

20. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported perceptions of the impact of the teachers' unions on their ability to perform their duties.

21. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported perceptions of their own levels of success.

22. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported perceptions of their own levels of success.
23. "Consideration" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported levels of satisfaction with their positions.

24. "Structure" scores will vary among Michigan school principals by the principals' reported levels of satisfaction with their positions.

Ancillary Analysis of "Consideration"

Analysis of the ancillary "consideration" score data are tabulated in Table 17. (Descriptive statistics may be found in Appendix C). Data were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance for each of the "consideration" hypotheses above. Three significant variables were noted, by which the "consideration" scores of respondents varied. Analysis indicated that "consideration" scores varied at a statistically significant level when principals were grouped by level of assignment, by availability of an assistant principal, and by the number of teachers supervised.

When principals were divided into two groups with elementary and middle school principals in one group and junior high school and senior high school principals in the other, the "consideration" scores of the two groups varied in an amount statistically significant at the .05 level. The group of elementary and middle school principals had higher average consideration scores.

"Consideration" scores varied between the group of principals who did not have assistant principals assigned to their buildings and the group of principals who did have assistant principals.
Table 17
Analysis of Variance in "Consideration" Scores Among Michigan School Principals by Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of degree beyond M. A.</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teacher experience</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience as principal</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of assignment</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.56</td>
<td>4.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils in building</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers supervised</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>3.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of assistant</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.85</td>
<td>3.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity in professional organizations</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union militancy</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.32</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union impact on performance</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of own success</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
assigned. This finding, however, had a relatively low level of statistical significance \((p < .10)\). As it is more common for high school and junior high school principals to have assistants assigned to their buildings, this finding is in harmony with that reported above regarding level of assignment. This finding may be a function of level of assignment and have no meaning by itself.

Another finding of variance in "consideration" scores was based on the variable of the number of teachers assigned to the building for which the principal had responsibility. When principals were grouped into three groups--on the basis of those supervising twenty or fewer, those supervising twenty-one to forty, and those supervising forty-one or more teachers--the variance in "consideration" scores was statistically significant at the .05 confidence level.

The highest average level of "consideration" scores was found among the principals with the lowest numbers of teachers to supervise and the lowest average level of "consideration" scores was found among the principals with the highest numbers of teachers to supervise.

This variable also seems to be closely related to the variable of

---

**Table 17 - (Concluded)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>(F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of satisfaction with position</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(* (p < .10) \quad **(p < .05)\)
having an assistant available and to the variable of level of assignment. Junior and senior high schools are commonly larger than elementary schools, and assistant principals are more commonly found in junior and senior high schools.

Ancillary Analysis of "Structure"

The results of the analysis of the ancillary "structure" score data are tabulated in Table 18. (Descriptive statistics are reported in Appendix D). "Structure" scores varied at statistically significant levels between groups of principals grouped on two variables other than militancy of the principal's district. The finding which was statistically significant at the highest confidence level was the variance of "structure" scores between groups of principals grouped according to their years of experience as principals. When those principals who had five or fewer years experience as principals were compared to those with sixteen or more years experience the variance in "structure" scores was statistically significant at greater than a .01 confidence level. The group of principals with fewer years experience had higher "structure" scores on the average.

When principals were divided into groups on the basis of their reported perceptions of the impact teacher unions had on their job performance, "structure" scores varied at a statistically significant level between the groups, although the level of significance was relatively low \( (p < .10) \). "Structure" scores were lower for the group of principals who reported that the teachers' union had no impact on their job performance. The group which reported that the
Table 18

Analysis of Variance in "Structure" Scores Among Michigan School Principals by Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of degree beyond M. A.</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching experience</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience as principal</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>291.10</td>
<td>9.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of assignment</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils in building</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers supervised</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of assistant</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity in professional organizations</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union militancy</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.32</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union impact on performance</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of own success</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Table 18 - (Concluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of satisfaction with position</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(p < .10)  **(p < .01)

The teacher's union had great impact on their job performance had, on the average, the lowest scores on the dimension of "structure." Table 18 included the data for these findings as well as the report of the analysis of variance for the other ancillary "structure" hypotheses.

Summary

This chapter has examined the characteristics of "more militant" and "less militant" school districts as measured by a Teacher Union Militancy Index devised for this investigation. It has provided a profile of each of the two groups of school districts which together comprised one of the two independent variables in this study.

Secondly, the chapter has examined the characteristics of two groups of Michigan school principals, one categorized as "more successful" and the other categorized as "less successful." The two groups of principals were compared on the dimensions of response rate, level of building assignment, level of training, experience as teachers and as principals, perceptions of union militancy in the district of employment, perceptions of the impact of the teacher...
unions on their job performance, and their reported perceptions of personal success and satisfaction in their positions. These descriptive data provided a profile of each of the two groups of principals which together comprised the second independent variable for this study.

The "consideration" scores and "structure" scores, obtained through self-administration of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire were reported and briefly discussed. These scores served as the dependent variables for this study.

Analysis of the data relative to the research hypotheses was presented and a single significant finding relative to variance in "structure" scores was noted. Analysis of data on the basis of twenty-four ancillary hypotheses was presented and five statistically significant findings were noted and briefly discussed.

The chapter which follows will provide a summary of the study, will present conclusions which may be drawn from the data analyzed and reported in this study regarding the "consideration" and "structure" leadership dimension scores obtained from a sample of Michigan school principals. Suggestions for further research will be discussed.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the dissertation and a discussion of conclusions based on the findings reported. Implications for future research are discussed and recommendations for framing future investigations are presented.

Summary of the Study

The problem of teacher militancy in public education is of major concern to current and future educational leaders. That research into patterns of leadership among school principals in public education which was reviewed has not focused specifically on the impact of teacher union militancy, nor on the interaction of teacher union militancy and leader style as they relate to leader success.

Teacher union militancy is a phenomenon with little more than one decade of history. Consequently, organizational models which form the basis for the study of educational organizations and leaders predate the phenomenon.

This dissertation developed a conceptual model for school organizations which included consideration of the impact of militant teacher unions organized on an industrial pattern. The model was tested by an investigation of the probability of variance among school principals in Michigan on the leadership constructs of...
"consideration" and "structure" when groups of principals were differen-
tiated by a categorization of success and by a measure of the
level of teacher union militancy in the districts in which the prin-
cipals were employed.

The Conceptual Model

The conceptual model which was developed for this study is
based on the model of behavior developed and publicized by Getzels
and Guba (1957). Adaptations of the model by Boles and Davenport
(1975) and Boles (1978) were also important in shaping its develop-
ment.

The model posited a relationship between each organization
and its external environment, which exerts a force on members of
the organization and upon the collective membership of the organiza-
tion. Addition of the collective membership as a unique and indepen-
dent element within the model, differentiated from the individual
dimension of the model, is a departure from the above cited models.

The more traditional models present observable behavior as
the result of transactions between the institutional and individual
dimensions of activity within an organization. The model developed
for this study presents observable behavior as the result of two
distinct sets of transactions. The first of these is the result of
an interaction between the institutional dimension and the collective
actions of individuals within the organization. This interaction pro-
duces an organizational climate which textures the ultimate observ-
able behavior which results from subsequent transactions between
the institutional and individual actions of the individuals who comprise the organization.

This study posited that increased levels of union militancy strengthen the collective dimension of organizations, and that this phenomenon results in a militant organization developing a different climate from that found in an organization in which the collective dimension is relatively undeveloped and unimportant vis-a-vis the individual dimension of the organization. The model led to the hypothesis that different leader opinions may correlate with success in organizations in which the collective dimensions differ in character. Conversely, it seemed reasonable to assume that "more successful" and "less successful" leaders in organizations with "more militant" and "less militant" climates would exhibit variance in leader opinion.

Review of Literature

Review of literature in topic areas pertinent to the investigation supported development of the conceptual model and the reasonableness of the hypothesis growing out of the model. Literature on organizational models indicated that at least one pair of theorists had developed an organizational model which in some ways parallels that developed here. Hoy and Miskel (1978) developed a model of organizations which included a group dimension that was independent of the institutional and individual dimensions. While their model, in this particular, closely parallels the model developed here, it did not suggest that organizational climate is the result of an
independent transaction between the group and institutional dimensions of an organization. Their model proposed, instead, that output is the product of social behavior which results from the direct interaction of the three organizational dimensions.

Theory and investigation noted in the review of the literature in the areas of situational variables and leader style, organizational climate, and union militancy provided support for the concept that teacher union militancy may be instrumental in structuring the organizational climates of schools so that the various climates differentially affect the leader style of school principals. Literature on the organizational role of school principals and principal effectiveness and success has explored the development of criteria by which principals could be differentiated. It was indicated in the literature reviewed that no objective measure of principal effectiveness has been operationalized with any consistent success. It was also indicated in literature reviewed that subjective or holistic ratings of subordinate success may have more validity than some critics have suggested.

Selected literature on the constructs of "consideration" and "structure" was reviewed. This review provided support for use of these constructs, as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, in a study of the leader opinion of school principals. Some of the literature reviewed indicated that use of these constructs to test the moderating impact of situational variables on leader style would be an appropriate direction for research in the area.
Research Design and Methodology

This investigation tested, by means of a two-way analysis of variance, the variability in "consideration" scores and "structure" scores among school principals in Michigan, as derived from the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. The independent variables in this design were the militancy of the district of employment as measured by a Teacher Union Militancy Index, and the categorization of principals as more or less successful on the basis of superordinate recommendation. The Teacher Union Militancy Index was devised for this study. The superordinate responses involved subjective holistic ratings.

The Teacher Union Militancy Index was based on a number of considerations. Primary among these were data regarding the labor relations history of the school districts. Also included in the index were relative salary comparisons, relative fringe benefit comparisons, and considerations in the area of management rights.

The superordinate categorization of principals was accomplished by means of a response to a question regarding the recommendation of a position incumbent to others, based on a subjective judgment of the future potential of the position incumbent as an administrator.

A population of 243 school districts was defined. A sample of forty "more militant" and forty "less militant" districts was selected from the population on the basis of the Teacher Union Militancy Index. A response was solicited from one school principal selected as "more successful" and one selected as "less successful" from each of the sample districts. This design provided a potential
of 160 respondents, each of whom was requested to return a completed Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and a brief survey form providing demographic and opinion data. Eighty-two responses were received from the 160 potential respondents. Eighty of these responses were usable in the study.

Six research hypotheses, based on the conceptual model developed for the investigation, were tested with the data collected. Twenty-four ancillary hypotheses were also tested in an effort to determine whether variability in "consideration" and "structure" scores was related to selected demographic and opinion variables.

Summary of Findings

Descriptive data on each of the pairs of independent variables were presented and discussed. These data provided comparison of "more militant" and "less militant" school districts and a comparison of the "more successful" and "less successful" categories of school principals. The range and incidence of "consideration" scores and "structure" scores were also presented and discussed.

The descriptive data indicated that the two sub-samples of school districts identified through the Teacher Union Militancy Index differed in strike history, in salary structure and level, and in the fringe benefits provided by negotiated contracts. All of the "more militant" districts had suffered at least one work stoppage. Most of these districts had a history of multiple strikes. No "less militant" district had ever been the object of a teacher work stoppage as of the end of 1978.
Mean salary levels in "more militant" districts were higher than in "less militant" districts, and tended to be higher than the average of other districts in the same geographic region. Mean salaries in "less militant" districts were lower than the mean of other districts in the same geographic region. Teacher union contracts in "less militant" districts tended to infringe less on certain management rights than did contracts in "more militant" districts.

A number of differences were noted between the sub-samples of "more successful" principals and "less successful" principals. A statistically significant higher percentage of "more successful" principals was assigned at the high school level. A statistically significant higher percentage of "less successful" principals was assigned at the elementary school level. Prior findings reported in other investigations which indicated that the experience level of incumbent principals correlated negatively with superordinate ratings of effectiveness. This phenomenon was confirmed by the data gathered for this study. The number of years experience respondents reported as principals was statistically significant in differentiating principals categorized as "more successful" from those categorized as "less successful."

Responses to the opinion survey instrument indicated that principals who work in "more militant" districts more frequently rate teachers' unions as militant and perceive teachers' unions as having impact on their ability to function as principals than their peers in "less militant" districts. A statistically significant
greater percentage of principals categorized as "less successful" reported that the teachers' unions had an important impact on their ability to function effectively as principals than did principals categorized as "more successful." Additionally, more principals who were categorized as "more successful" rated themselves as "very successful" than did principals categorized as "less successful."

"Consideration" and "structure" scores were derived from the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. The scores for the two dimensions were tested for correlation, and were found not to correlate at a statistically significant level. The scores of respondents in this study were not markedly different from the scores that have been reported for other groups of individuals in supervisory roles. "Consideration" scores were, on the average, somewhat lower than the educational supervisor norms, while the "structure" scores were, on the average, somewhat higher than the educational supervisor norms.

Analysis of the data by two-way analysis of variance, adjusted for cell imbalance by weighting of means, provided support for only one of the six research hypotheses. The "structure" scores of principals were found to vary at a statistically significant level between the two groups of principals differentiated according to categorization of success. The principals who were categorized as "more successful" were found to have higher scores on the average, on the "structure" dimension, than principals who were categorized as "less successful."

Further analysis of data, accomplished by testing twenty-four ancillary hypothesis by a one-way analysis of variance, provided
five significant findings. Principal "consideration" scores were found to vary between groups of principals divided on the bases of level of assignment, the number of teachers supervised, and the availability of assistant principals. "Structure" scores were found to vary between groups of principals divided on the bases of years of experience as principals and the amount of union impact on his/her performance reported by the individual principals.

Conclusions

The Conceptual Model

The investigation reported here failed to provide significant support for the conceptual model proposed in Chapter II. In particular, interaction effects on the dependent variables of "consideration" and "structure" by the independent variables "militancy" and "success" were not found. The conceptual model thus remains a theory without support.

There are other indications, however, that the model should not be discarded out-of-hand. Kinsey (1978) reported that the organizational climate in Michigan schools became more closed with the development of teacher union militancy. The finding reported above, that success correlated inversely with principalship experience among Michigan school principals, may be an indication that changed situational constraints are hindering the effectiveness of experienced principals. The finding that less experienced principals tended to score higher on the dimension of "structure" than
experienced principals, coupled with the finding that the principals whom superordinates were more willing to recommend had higher scores on the dimension of "structure," may lend tentative support to the hypothesis that change in organizational climate has moderated the leader opinions of successful school principals. It appears that as organizational climate in schools has changed, the perceived necessity for "structuring" on the part of school principals may have increased. Principals with less experience, who are not steeped in a tradition of school leadership which valued low levels of "structuring," may have responded more successfully to more militant climates.

The parallel independent development of an organizational model which interposes a sense of group into organizational transactions also lends some credence to the model developed here. The model developed by Hoy and Miskel (1978) supports, in many respects, the model developed for this dissertation.

The Investigation

It may be concluded from the investigation conducted that principals who score high on the leadership dimension of "structure" are likely to be selected by superintendents for positive recommendation. Further analyses of the data indicated that principals who scored above the mean of the group on both the "consideration" and "structure" dimensions were likely to be categorized as "more successful." Principals who scored below the mean on both leadership dimensions were most likely to be categorized "less successful." Of those principals who scored above the mean on one dimension and
below the mean on the other dimension, it was found that those who scored above the mean on the dimension of "structure" were more likely to be recommended by superordinates while those who scored above the mean on "consideration" but below the mean on "structure" were less likely to be recommended. These findings confirm those reported by Fleishman and Peters (1962) and Fleishman and Simmons (1970).

Table 19
Patterns of Leadership Opinion Questionnaire Scores Related to Superordinate Selection of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Number categorized as &quot;more successful&quot;</th>
<th>Number categorized as &quot;less successful&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High structure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High structure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low structure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low structure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may also be concluded that differences in organizational size and complexity will be accompanied by variance in principals' "consideration" scores. While Badin (1974) reported that "structure" was negatively related to group effectiveness for small groups and groups with low-position-power managers, in this investigation "consideration" scores were found to be higher on the average for elementary principals than for secondary school principals. Additionally,
the finding that "consideration" scores were higher, on the average, among principals who do not have assistants and who are employed in smaller schools, was supportive of this conclusion.

The finding that higher "structure" scores were associated with less experience has been discussed above. A tentative conclusion here is that less experienced principals have been initiated into an organizational climate which is different from that into which more experienced principals were initiated.

A final tentative conclusion may be drawn from the finding that "structure" scores were higher on the average for principals who did not think that teacher unions impaired their ability to function. Principals whose scores indicated that they placed a higher value on "structuring" behavior may engage in a mode of operation which is more compatible with militant teacher unionism than do their peers who place less value on structuring behavior.

Implications for Further Research

Even though the conceptual model developed was not supported by the findings of the investigation, the model should provide a basis for future research in the area of school leadership. As this research project was structured as the first test of a new conceptual model, the absence of significant findings provides no evidence to disprove the validity of the model. Further, it must be noted that the response rate of 51 percent achieved for this study is a limitation which must be considered in interpreting the results.

Future research should explore alternative modes of defining
union militancy and differentiating among schools on the basis of union militancy. A longitudinal dimension to future investigations may prove useful in this regard. Further study should be given to the role of teacher unions, and of the teacher union leadership, in the establishment of organizational climate both within individual school buildings and within total school districts. Additional case study research should be valuable in addressing these issues.

Further development of organizational measures of principal effectiveness or success is sorely needed. While this investigation relied upon a subjective superordinate selection of principals, it is readily conceded that such selection is often unreliable. Further, it is difficult to obtain high levels of response to such requests. Unfortunately, however, there is little available in the field which provides a sound alternative method of measuring the effectiveness or success of supervisory personnel across a broad stratum of organizations.

While this study is not recommended as a model for direct replication, the lack of objective knowledge in this field encourages further investigation. It is recommended that future investigations test the conceptual model developed here. The design of the investigation, however, should be refined. Alternative measures of principal effectiveness might be developed and tested as one appropriate refinement. Further, the Teacher Union Militancy Index developed for this investigation might be refined and elaborated by the consideration of additional variables. With such appropriate modifications this investigation may serve as a model for further testing.
of the conceptual model proposed here.

Another focus for further study might be to use an alternative instrument to measure either leader opinion or leader behavior. If the proposed model does have some validity, it may be appropriate to search for an alternative leadership construct which is based on the kinds of activities that become important as union organizations become more powerful within agencies. This again is a possibility that is deserving of extensive systematic study.
APPENDIX A

GENERAL INFORMATION
GENERAL INFORMATION

1. I am now principal of
   _____ an elementary school   _____ a junior high school
   _____ a middle school        _____ a senior high school

2. I am
   _____ female         _____ male

3. The total number of students enrolled in my building is
   __________.

4. The total number of years I have been a principal is
   __________.

5. The highest university/college degree I have earned to date is
   __________.

6. My highest degree earned is in the area of ________________.

7. The total number of teachers/staff for which I am responsible is
   __________.

8. Do you have an assistant principal?
   _____ Yes          _____ No
       How many? _____

9. The number of years I taught (or held a position on the educationa­
    tional staff) before becoming a principal was
   __________.

10. Were you ever an assistant principal before becoming a principal?
    _____ Yes          _____ No

11. Have you ever taken a college/university course specifically on
    the principalship?
    _____ Yes          _____ No
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12. How active are you in professional organizations related to the principalship?

_____ Not especially active  ____ Very active

_____ Moderately active

13. Have you ever assumed a leadership position in one of these professional organizations?

_____ Yes  ____ No

14. Do you hold a leadership position now?

_____ Yes  ____ No

15. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with your present position?

_____ Dissatisfied  ____ Moderately satisfied

_____ Highly satisfied

16. How would you rate your performance or success in your current position?

_____ Unsuccessful  ____ Moderately successful

_____ Highly successful
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APPENDIX C

CONSIDERATION HYPOTHESES--DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of degree beyond M.A.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teacher experience</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.29</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.80</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience as principal</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55.41</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.69</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of assignment</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58.02</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55.65</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils in building</td>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57.79</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501+</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers supervised</td>
<td>1 - 20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of assistant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58.02</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55.97</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity in professional organizations</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.22</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56.33</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59.06</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union militancy</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58.67</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union impact on</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.42</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56.49</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of own success</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.28</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of satisfaction</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57.10</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

STRUCTURE HYPOTHESES--DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS
### STRUCTURE HYPOTHESES—DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of degree beyond M.A.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teacher experience</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience as principal</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.69</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of assignment</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.04</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils in building</td>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501+</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers supervised</td>
<td>1 - 20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.12</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of assistant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity in professional organi-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zations</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.11</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union militancy</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.14</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44.22</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of union impact on</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.75</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of own success</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of satisfaction</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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