

A TEST OF COMMUNICATION AND CONSENSUS, CORRELATES
OF ETZIONI'S COMPLIANCE THEORY

By

MARY JO CLARK

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1957

Master of Science
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1970

Education Specialist
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1991

Shaw
1910
C. 111
C. 2

A TEST OF COMMUNICATION AND CONSENSUS, CORRELATES
OF ETZIONI'S COMPLIANCE THEORY

Thesis Approved:

Anna K. Aney

Thesis Adviser

Kenneth M. Clari

David Yellin

Larry M. Perkin

Norman A. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was concerned with the analysis of compliance, communication, and consensus in Kansas elementary schools. The primary objective was to test the relationship between communication and consensus in schools having normative, utilitarian, and coercive compliance, as outlined in Etzioni's compliance theory.

I wish to express appreciation to my major advisers: Dr. Patrick Forsyth and Dr. Lynn Arney for their guidance and assistance throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members: Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Dr. Larry Perkins, and Dr. David Yellin for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of the final manuscript.

In addition, a special note of thanks is given to Dr. Patrick Forsyth and Iris McPherson for their assistance in the preparation of the programming model. Thanks are also extended to Mrs. Kay Porter and Mrs. Sue Dickey for their assistance in typing early drafts of the manuscript, and to Mrs. Sharon Phillips for excellence of the final copy and her valuable suggestions concerning format. In addition, appreciation is extended to the many Kansas principals and teachers for their efforts in supplying data for the study.

Appreciation also goes to each member of my family of origin (my mother, Muriel Grantham Webb; my dad, Clifton Gore Webb; my brother, Dr. Ralph Henry Webb; and my sister, Frieda Faydean Pacheco), who have always had faith in me. I also want to thank the following for their immeasurable support: Jim Clark; Ralph Clifford; May Creach; Eleanor Dean;

Jane Duff; Penny Geis; Yaso Gurusingham; Don Hough; Beverlee Kissik; Vivien Kochanowski; Evelyn Maxwell; Harry McLeod; Sanae Tsutsumi Miyaji; Paul Parker; Paul Reed; Ray Russin; Gertrude Simmons; Sydney Soderberg; Bea Starrett; Jim Timmons; Patti Webb; Janet Wendland; Paula Wright; the educators of Coffeyville and Salina, Kansas; the entire Educational Administration and Higher Education Department of Oklahoma State University; many unnamed teachers, professors, and others without whom this would have been impossible.

Special gratitude is expressed to my sons: Jeffrey, Jonathan, and Joel Clark, and to my daughters-in-law: Jo, Linda, and Rosie Clark, for their understanding and encouragement. Hurray for my beautiful grandchildren! Each is pure possibility. They deserve to have a grandmother who finished her doctorate once it was begun.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Significance of the Study.	3
Limitations of the Study	4
Definition of Terms.	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	9
Compliance	9
Noneducational Settings	10
Higher Education Organizational Settings.	11
K-12 Educational Settings	11
Communication.	13
Consensus.	14
III. RATIONALE AND HYPOTHESES.	16
Compliance	16
Communication and Compliance	17
Vertical Communication.	17
Instrumental Vertical Communication	17
Downward Expressive Communication	18
Horizontal Expressive Communication	18
Consensus and Compliance	19
Teacher Consensus.	19
Consensus Between Status Groups	19
IV. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	21
Identification of the Sample Population.	21
Instrumentation.	22
Operational Measures of the Variables.	23
Compliance.	23
Communication	25
Consensus	26
Statistical Procedures Used in Statistical Analysis.	27
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	28
Findings	28
Frequency of Congruent Compliance Types	28
Communication Patterns of Congruent Organizations	29
Consensus Patterns of Congruent Types	35

Chapter	Page
Conclusions	38
Compliance	38
Remunerative Power as a Response to Calculative Involvement	39
Alienation as a Response to Coercive Power	40
Vertical Communication	42
Instrumental Vertical Communication	42
Downward Expressive Communication	43
Expressive Horizontal Communication and Consensus	44
Recommendations	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47
APPENDIXES	50
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE	52
APPENDIX B - COMPLIANCE INDEX	58
APPENDIX C - COMMUNICATION CALCULATION	63
APPENDIX D - PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. A Typology of Compliance Relations	2
II. Reliability of Instruments	24
III. Compliance Results in 40 Kansas Schools.	30
IV. Vertical Communication	31
V. Vertical Instrumental Communication by Compliance Type . . .	32
VI. Downward Expressive Communication by Compliance Type	34
VII. Horizontal Expressive Communication.	35
VIII. Consensus Variance by Compliance Type.	37
IX. Discrepancy of Consensus Means Between Elites and Lower Participants	38
X. Compliance Index Z Scores for All 40 Kansas Schools.	61
XI. Mean Scores for the Communication Calculation Instrument . .	66
XII. Pupil Control Ideology, Mean Scores by School.	69

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Compliance theory, introduced by Etzioni in 1961 and expanded in 1975, is designed to interpret the factors and the interrelationships in various organizations. Although tangentially supported in the literature, much of Etzioni's compliance theory remains untested. The purpose of this study was to describe an empirical test of general compliance theory, and particularly the theoretical relationship between compliance, communication, and consensus in an elementary school setting.

As shown in Table I, Etzioni (1975) constructed a typology of organizational compliance based on three types of power and three degrees of involvement and argued that, of the nine possible compliance types resulting, three are congruent. That is, among three cells in the typology there is a match between power and involvement which is stable and more effective than the six remaining noncongruent theoretical types.

Three types of compliance, represented by cells one, five, and nine, are considered by Etzioni (1975) to be congruent. Briefly, Etzioni postulated an interaction of coercive, remunerative, or normative power with alienative, calculative, or moral involvement such that: when coercive power is used, the expected result will be alienation from those being coerced; when remunerative power is used as the power base, the expected response will be calculative; when normative power is used, the expected response will be positive moral commitment. The "coercive-alienative" relationship is referred to as "coercive compliance" (Etzioni, 1975, p.

14). The "remunerative-calculative" relationship is called "utilitarian compliance" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 14). The "normative-moral" type is referred to as "normative compliance" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 14). Noncongruent compliance types are believed to be less effective than congruent ones (Etzioni, 1975).

TABLE I
A TYPOLOGY OF COMPLIANCE RELATIONS

Kinds of Power	Kinds of Involvement		
	Alienative	Calculative	Moral
Coercive	<u>1</u>	2	3
Remunerative	4	<u>5</u>	6
Normative	7	8	<u>9</u>

Source: A. Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (1975).

The compliance patterns of all organizations are associated with the communication flow within each organization. The study of organizational communication is important because many organizations are big, complicated, need to be accountable, and have an intricate framework which requires far-ranging processes for transmitting information (Etzioni, 1975).

In the area of communication, Etzioni (1975) posited that messages may be given upward, downward, and/or passed among those at the same

organizational level. The content of the message may include information on policy and procedure (instrumental), or the content may be supportive in nature (expressive).

Within the line and staff framework of the organization, the communication may move among those of a particular level or may be sent upward or downward between those of differing levels (Etzioni, 1975). However, information usually flows down to the lower participant rather than the other direction (Schumpeter, 1959).

Consensus refers to both lower participants' agreement among themselves and the lower participants' agreement with power holders (Etzioni, 1975). Hypothetically, the three compliance types will differ in their levels of consensus (Etzioni, 1975). Etzioni outlined six areas of consensus to assist in the measure of consensus in organizations. These areas included: agreement on overall beliefs, concurrence on organizational aims, consensus on methods, agreement on the level of effort lower participants are willing to give to the organization, concurrence on how the superordinates and subordinates will know a subordinate is accomplishing assigned tasks, and consensus on perceptions of reality (facts) (Etzioni, 1975).

Significance of the Study

Etzioni's compliance theory predicts and explains stability, effectiveness, and efficiency. The theory also explains the delicate relationship between power use and participant involvement. All of these concepts are important to school organizations. They could be immensely useful in resolving power conflicts; creating commitment; cultivating consensus; improving communication; and understanding effectiveness, efficiency, and stability.

Russell (1938), Filley and House (1969), Grusky and Miller (1970), and Bierstedt (1950), among others, have called attention to the importance of power as a fundamental concept in understanding organizational behavior. Silver (1983) stated that, although compliance is difficult to measure, it is an effective method for understanding organizations.

While the theory itself appears to have vast potential for explaining critical organizational variables, it has been tested in very few organizations of any type. The review of literature relating to compliance types revealed only eight studies which focused on compliance theory in K-12 educational settings. No studies were located which addressed communication as it is addressed in compliance theory, and only two studies were located which tangentially discussed consensus.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the analysis of communication patterns, consensus levels, and compliance types of selected public schools in Kansas. Etzioni (1975) has identified six consensus spheres. This study explores only one; that is, consensus on tactics.

Another limitation of this study deals with the possible biasing effect of self-selection of the schools in the study. All elementary schools in Kansas having 350-550 students in enrollment were identified and invited to participate.

Other limitations which should be kept in mind are that the sample of schools studied, as indicated, was limited to those within a single state and to elementary schools with enrollments ranging from 350 to 550. The schools were not randomly selected unless there were two schools with 350-550 enrollments in the same district. In these cases, one of those schools was randomly selected. It is doubtful, therefore, that one can

generalize beyond the sample itself. Therefore, any findings of the study may or may not be indicative of relationships in all schools throughout the United States.

The researcher also recognized the limitations imposed by a study at one point in time. Such a study must make the assumption that average conditions prevailed at the time the measurements were made, as well as the assumption that the phenomenon studied was not in the process of change from one state to another. This latter is an assumption that can seldom be made when the study deals with a living population.

Definition of Terms

In order that there be no misunderstanding of variables used in this study, the following definitions are provided. The conceptual definition is given in this section and the operational definition appears in Chapter IV.

Power. "Power is an actor's ability to induce or influence another actor to carry out his [or her] directives or any other norms he [or she] supports" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 4). There are three types of power--coercive, remunerative, and normative.

Coercive Power.

Coercive power rests on the application, or the threat of application, of physical sanctions such as infliction of pain, deformity, or death; generation of frustration through restrictions of movement; or controlling through force the satisfaction of needs such as those for food, sex, comfort, and the like (Etzioni, 1975, p. 5).

An example of coercive power would be that of a principal who dismisses or suspends a teacher.

Remunerative Power. "Remunerative power is based on control over material resources and rewards through allocation of salaries and wages,

commissions and contributions, 'fringe benefits,' services and commodities" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 5). An example of remunerative power would be of a principal who provides teachers with a microwave oven for the teachers' lounge.

Normative Power.

Normative power rests on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations through employment of leaders, manipulation of mass media, allocation of esteem and prestige symbols, administration of ritual, and influence over the distribution of 'acceptance' and 'positive response' (Etzioni, 1975, p. 5).

An example of normative power would be that of a principal who invites teachers to participate in decision making.

Involvement. "Involvement refers to the cathetic-evaluative orientation of an actor to an object, characterized in terms of intensity and direction" (Etzioni, 1975, pp. 8-9). The intensity of involvement ranges from high to low. The direction is either positive or negative (Etzioni, 1975). Etzioni (1975) considered involvement to be on a continuum. The most negative involvement is alienation; the most neutral involvement is calculative, and the most positive involvement is normative.

Alienative Involvement.

Alienative involvement designates an intense negative orientation; it is predominant in relations among hostile foreigners. . . . Inmates in prisons, prisoners of war, people in concentration camps, enlisted men in basic training, all tend to be alienated from their respective organizations (Etzioni, 1975, p. 10).

An example of alienative involvement would be that of teachers who have been told that they cannot be in the teachers' lounge during their planning period.

Calculative Involvement. "Calculative involvement designates either a negative or a positive orientation of low intensity. Calculative orientations include intentions predominant in relationships of merchants

who have continuous business contacts" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 10). An example of calculative involvement would be that of teachers who are paid extra dollars to drive the school bus.

Moral Involvement. "Moral involvement designates a positive orientation of high intensity" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 10). The reason for involvement is usually a strong identification with the values which the organization represents. An example of moral involvement would be teachers who spend hours of their own time after school tutoring students with learning problems.

Compliance. "Compliance refers both to a relation in which an actor behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power, and to the orientation of the subordinated actor to the power applied" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 3).

Taken together, the two elements--that is, the power applied by the organization to lower participants, and the involvement in the organization developed by lower participants--constitute the compliance relationship. Combining three kinds of power with three kinds of involvement produces nine types of compliance (Etzioni, 1975, p. 12).

Congruent.

When the kinds of involvement that lower participants have because of other factors and the kind of involvement that tends to be generated by the predominant form of organizational power are the same, we refer to the relationship as congruent. For instance, inmates are highly alienated from prisons, coercive power tends to alienate; hence, this is a case of a congruent compliance relationship (Etzioni, 1975, p. 12).

There are three congruent compliance types of organizations which are labeled coercive, utilitarian, and normative.

Coercive. In coercive compliance, the predominant power is coercive alienative (Etzioni, 1975).

Utilitarian. In utilitarian compliance, remunerative power is predominant and the predominant involvement is calculative (Etzioni, 1975).

Normative. In normative compliance, the predominant power is normative and the predominant involvement is moral commitment (Etzioni, 1975).

Communication.

[Communication] processes modify the position of lower participants [and] penetrate all organizational units. Communication [is] chiefly a symbolic process by which orientations of lower participants to the organization are reinforced or changed (Etzioni, 1975, p. 241).

Substance of Communication.

Organizational communication systems consist of two quite different networks, distinguished by the substance of the communication transmitted. One network allocates instrumental communications, the other transmits expressive communications (Etzioni, 1975, p. 242).

Instrumental Communication. "Instrumental communication distributes information and knowledge, and affects cognitive orientations. Blueprints, technical textbooks, and experts' directives are typical examples" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 242).

Expressive Communication. "Expressive communication changes or reinforces attitudes, norms and values. Preaching, praising and expressions of acceptance are typical examples" (Etzioni, 1975, p. 242).

Direction of Communication.

The direction of the communications flow is the other dimension by which communication networks are characterized. Communications may flow vertically or horizontally in the rank structure, and vertical communications may flow upward or downward (Etzioni, 1975, p. 242).

Consensus.

Statements about consensus point out differences and similarities in the orientations of two or more groups. The degree of consensus is a measure of the degree to which the organization is integrated as a collectivity (Etzioni, 1975, p. 232).

One way to conceptualize consensus in a school is in terms of the patterns that teachers and principals use to control students. Consensus was measured by the Pupil Control Ideology developed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to describe an empirical test of general compliance theory and particularly the theoretical relationship between compliance, communication, and consensus. This chapter begins with compliance studies, follows with a discussion of communication, and concludes with a section on consensus.

Compliance

Etzioni (1961, 1975) developed a typology of compliance whereby nine types of compliance relationships result from the interaction of three kinds of power applied by the elites in an organization with one of three kinds of lower participant involvement in the organization. Of the nine resulting cells, only three (coercive, utilitarian, and normative compliances) are considered to be congruent. Etzioni theorized that congruent compliance types are more effective in completing their goals than are noncongruent ones.

Segments of the theory and its correlates have been studied in various contexts. Studies by Taylor (1975), Cates (1980), Angle and Perry (1981), and Mayer (1987) were conducted in noneducational settings. Studies by Shapiro (1978), Pyles (1980), and Zarzycki (1981) were conducted in higher education organizational settings. Studies by Hodgkins and Herriot (1970), Schaupp (1971), Schlottman (1980), Cury (1981),

Schaupp (1984), Schwartz (1985), Dunleavy (1986), and Gaston (1988) tested compliance theory in the K-12 schools.

Noneducational Settings

The Taylor (1975) study did not support Etzioni's typology regarding congruence, which stated that a normative power would elicit a moral response. Taylor found that church members in the San Francisco Presbytery resisted the church's reform attempts.

Cates (1980) studied 5 of 10 World War II Relocation Authority (WRA) camps. The administration of each camp was studied in terms of Etzioni's coercive, remunerative, and normative power types. The findings supported Etzioni's typology regarding congruent compliance types. The findings also supported his hypothesis that incongruent types are ineffective.

Angle and Perry (1981) examined the relationship of organizational effectiveness in mass transit organizations and commitment to the organization by lower participants (employees). They found that, on the whole, items in the Value Commitment Scale typified Etzioni's moral involvement, and calculative involvement was found in the items of the Commitment to Stay Instrument. The connection between effectiveness and the two involvement types was not confirmed in this study.

Mayer (1987) randomly divided 39 parents who had been reported for negligence and abuse into control and experimental groups. The control group followed the usual procedures. The experimental group met with their case worker(s) and with an outside mediator, to develop a plan to alter the condition. Involvement orientation (moral commitment, calculative, or alienation) was measured through responses to a questionnaire given to all parents. Findings indicated that the parents in the

experimental group were more committed to the plan because they had input through participation in the mediation process and therefore, the plan was not forced upon them. The hypotheses that normative power tends to engender moral commitment resulting in normative compliance, which is congruent and therefore more effective, was supported.

Higher Education Organizational Settings

Pyles (1980), using all full-time faculty, tested Etzioni's compliance typology in the Allied Health Division at Fairmont State College. Pyles found the division to be congruent in that normative power in the form of giving or withdrawing approval was used by administrators in the division and the professors were morally committed. Thus, this result appears to support Etzioni's contention that educational organizations will usually have normative compliance.

The Shapiro (1978) and Zarzycki (1981) compliance studies were done in unionized and nonunionized colleges. Etzioni postulated that entries in the congruent cells would be more numerous than those in incongruent cells. Compliance theory was not supported in the Shapiro study because only 6 of the 28 colleges were congruent types and the remaining 22 were incongruent. The results of the Zarzycki study confirmed Etzioni's typology of three powers used by elites and three types of lower participant involvement forming nine cells of various combinations. Also, in contrast to the Shapiro study, the Zarzycki study confirmed Etzioni's proposition that the three congruent types would be more numerous and that educational institutions would tend to be normative.

K-12 Educational Settings

Hodgkins and Herriot (1970) studied compliance patterns in

elementary and secondary schools. They found that there was a transition from coercive to normative power as one moved from early elementary to high school.

In two separate but related studies, Schaupp (1971), using public schools, and Schaupp (1984), using public and private parochial schools, compared the types of administrative power and the involvement among full-time teachers in West Virginia. Etzioni's compliance theory was supported. Specifically, both studies concluded that normative power was used most often and the teachers had moral involvement. Both studies found, however, that remunerative power elicited more negative involvement (alienation) than any other form of power. This latter finding does not support Etzioni's hypothesis that coercive power will elicit alienation and that remunerative power will elicit calculative involvement and congruence.

The Schlottman (1980) study, which included administrators, counselors, fifth and sixth grade students and their teachers, supported several propositions. Normative power did elicit moral commitment on the part of students. Schools were primarily normative and only used coercive power secondarily. The use of remunerative power was rare.

The Cury (1981) study inspected power, teacher involvement, and absenteeism in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania schools. Etzioni's compliance typology was supported. However, less than 10% of the absenteeism was due to the type of power used.

Schwartz (1985) studied power and involvement in three films about fictional schools: If (1969), Child's Play (1972), and Educating Rita (1983). The Schwartz study supported compliance theory in regard to elite (superordinate) usage of coercive power and corresponding alienation of lower participants.

Dunleavy (1986) studied administrative (elite) power usage and (lower participant) teacher involvement in West Virginia private Catholic and public schools. The results indicated that the public school administrators used more coercive power and used less normative power with staff than did the administrators of the private schools. The relationship was significant between coercive power and teacher alienation. Also significant was the relationship between normative power and moral commitment. Thus, Etzioni's theory regarding coercive compliance and normative compliance was supported.

Gaston (1988) did a compliance study of an alternative school in Louisiana. The sample included an experimental group of 105 students at risk of dropping out of school and a control group of 65 at-risk students. The experimental group was provided more input and participation in the management of their learning environment (less differentiation between the teacher and learner). Student learning in the experimental group increased, while the control group experienced no change. The findings supported Etzioni's normative compliance typology.

Communication

In normative organizations, expressive communication is important; downward expressive communication is predominant and there is little instrumental communication (Etzioni, 1975). Communication in normative organizations usually flows freely because there is little differentiation between the elites and lower participants (Etzioni, 1975).

In utilitarian organizations, instrumental communication is predominant and must flow upward as well as downward (Etzioni, 1975). Any expressive communication is usually horizontal among the lower participants.

In coercive organizations, expressive horizontal communication is common, while communication between the organizational representatives and the lower participants is virtually nonexistent. The organizational representatives usually either withhold downward instrumental communication or give it to a few in order to manipulate the situation (Etzioni, 1975).

According to Etzioni (1975), there are very few studies which deal with communication as it is described in the theory. Specifically, he stated:

. . . the analysis of communication is based primarily on a mixture of theoretical consideration and direct observation, rather than a distillation of existing data. Most communication studies are conducted in the human relations or cybernetics tradition, neither of which includes all the variables used by this analysis. There are very few functional-structural studies of communication, in particular of communication in organizations (p. 241).

A search of the literature confirmed Etzioni's statement. Studies found and analyzed did not deal with the variables addressed in Etzioni's compliance theory.

Consensus

A synthesis of consensus in normative, utilitarian, and coercive organizations is included here. Such a synthesis should provide a better understanding of Etzioni's (1975) compliance theory and the consensus correlate.

There are various patterns of consensus for each compliance type. Etzioni (1975) reported that, in normative organizations, high consensus in all areas is essential. Utilitarian (remunerative-calculative) organizations especially need consensus in instrumental (directive) activities, while consensus in some other areas may be optional (Etzioni,

1975). Unlike the other two types, coercive organizations require little or no consensus.

Only two consensus studies were located which were even tangentially associated with compliance theory. Both studies were conducted in public school settings.

Bacharach and Mitchell (1981) studied consensus in six central New York school districts. They found that the power employed by the superintendent had an impact on consensus. This finding supported Etzioni's hypotheses regarding effect of power employed and the level of consensus. Bacharach and Mitchell's findings also supported Etzioni's correlate involving consensus within groups.

Schlottman (1980), using a sample of fifth and sixth grade students and their faculty, revealed that in 63% of the schools the type of control used by the teacher respondents was perceived to be similar to the type of control used by most teachers in the building. This particular finding would appear to support Etzioni's (1975, p. 233) "consensus on means."

For purposes of this study, all rationale and hypotheses will come directly from Etzioni's (1975) revised and enlarged edition of A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. Seven hypotheses have been chosen for this study and are described in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

RATIONALE AND HYPOTHESES

The purpose of this chapter was to set out rationale and hypotheses to test Etzioni's theories. The chapter will first address congruent compliance types, followed by communication patterns of schools representing the three congruent types, and concludes with consensus patterns of schools representing the three congruent types.

Compliance

The power used by superiors to control subordinates, and the reaction of the subordinates to that power, comprise the compliance relationship. Etzioni (1975) created a typology of organizational compliance based on three types of power and three levels of involvement and argued that, of the nine possible compliance types resulting, three are congruent.

Etzioni (1975) provided the hypothesis that organizations are expected to be effective and that the six incongruent types are less effective than the three congruent compliance types. Thus, insofar as possible, organizations tend to shift from incongruence to congruence and congruent organizations make every effort to remain congruent.

Etzioni (1975) proposed that educational organizations, among others, are categorized as predominantly normative (symbolic means of control and intense positive involvement of lower participants). Thus, the first hypothesis of this study stated:

Hypothesis 1. Schools will tend to fall within the three congruent compliance types with the normative category being predominant.

Communication and Compliance

Vertical Communication

Vertical communication includes all expressive and instrumental communication flowing both upward and downward. How vertical communication varied by compliance type has been set out by Etzioni. Coercive organizations do not have or need extensive vertical communication between the elite and the subordinate. Vertical communication which does occur will tend to be downward and instrumental (Etzioni, 1975). On the other hand, normative and utilitarian organizations both require a great deal of vertical communication. The substance of this vertical communication is usually expressive for normative organizations and instrumental for utilitarian organizations (Etzioni, 1975). Thus, the second hypothesis stated:

Hypothesis 2. Coercive schools will have less vertical communication than normative and utilitarian schools.

Instrumental Vertical Communication

According to Etzioni (1975), instrumental communication is needed for productivity in utilitarian organizations. In such organizations, vertical instrumental communication must go both directions almost equally. Any vertical instrumental communication which occurs will tend to be downward in coercive organizations. On the other hand, Etzioni anticipated little vertical instrumental communication in normative organizations. Thus, the third hypothesis stated:

Hypothesis 3. Utilitarian schools will have more vertical instrumental communication than normative and coercive schools.

Downward Expressive Communication

Communication of one direction (downward) and with one content (expressive) varies by compliance type. Etzioni (1975) theorized that normative organizations require expressive communication. More specifically, they require downward expressive communication to be effective. On the other hand, Etzioni concluded that in utilitarian organizations, there is little upward or downward communication that is expressive in content. Etzioni further concluded that because there is such a role difference between power holder and the lower participant in organizations, such as penitentiaries, it is almost incomprehensible that friendly, supportive downward expressive communication would be found in coercive compliance type organizations. Thus, the fourth hypothesis of this study stated:

Hypothesis 4. Normative schools will have a higher level of downward expressive communication than utilitarian or coercive schools.

Horizontal Expressive Communication

Horizontal expressive communication among lower participants in the coercive compliance types is common (Etzioni, 1975). Lower participants in utilitarian organizations tend to communicate expressively with each other (Etzioni, 1975). As has been said before, normative organizations rely on expressive communication for effective performance. However, in normative organizations, downward expressive communication is more common than horizontal expressive communication (Etzioni, 1975). Thus, the fifth hypothesis stated:

Hypothesis 5. Coercive and utilitarian schools will have more horizontal expressive communication than normative schools.

Consensus and Compliance

Teacher Consensus

Consensus among lower participants varies in the three congruent compliance types. Consensus is essential in normative and utilitarian organizations if they are to operate effectively (Etzioni, 1975). However, consensus in coercive organizations is not essential and is generally low (Etzioni, 1975). Thus, the sixth hypothesis stated:

Hypothesis 6. Normative and utilitarian schools will have higher teacher consensus than coercive schools.

Consensus Between Status Groups

Etzioni (1975) contended that to analyze consensus, the researcher must identify the subordinates and the superordinates within the organization and must determine the consensus level within and between these groups. Etzioni stated that those actors on the same level will agree more often than will those on differing levels.

Normative and utilitarian organizations require high consensus between superior and subordinate (Etzioni, 1975). Unlike the other two types, coercive organizations do not require consensus to function (Etzioni, 1975). Thus, hypothesis seven stated:

Hypothesis 7. Discrepancies in consensus between the principal and teacher will be greater in coercive schools than in normative and utilitarian schools.

The intent of the hypotheses in this chapter was to test Etzioni's typology regarding the predominance of the three congruent cells, the flow and type of communication in the congruent cells, and the level of consensus in congruent organizations. The method and design of the study appear in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In general, the purpose of this study was to describe an empirical test of Etzioni's (1975) compliance theory. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to substantiate the congruent compliance patterns with school organizations and to determine the effects of congruent compliance patterns on communication and consensus. This chapter describes the selection of the sample, the instruments used, data collection, and statistical procedures.

Identification of the Sample Population

The Kansas Educational Directory, 1982-83 (1982) was used to determine Kansas elementary schools with enrollments of 350 to 550 students. In districts with two or more elementary schools within that enrollment range, one school was drawn at random. Sixty eight Kansas school districts had one or more elementary schools with the stated enrollment criterion. The above directory was also used to obtain the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the 68 superintendents and principals.

On March 31, 1983, the superintendents were mailed letters requesting permission to use a particular school in that district for this study. A stamped, addressed postal card was included for their convenience in responding (Appendix A).

A follow-up letter was mailed to the nonresponding superintendents on April 18, 1983 (Appendix A). Fifty-four superintendents responded

favorably, eight superintendents said "no," and seven superintendents did not respond. The response rate was 79%.

On April 20, 1983, questionnaires and explanatory cover letters were mailed to all classroom teachers and the principals in 54 Kansas schools. Questionnaires to the principal contained the Communication Calculation and the Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) instruments. All teacher questionnaires contained the PCI instrument while half of the teacher questionnaires contained the Communication Calculation measure and the other half contained the Compliance Index. This was done to keep each questionnaire short enough to encourage the maximum response. Each questionnaire included a stamped, self-addressed envelope to facilitate return mailing of the completed instrument. Questionnaires were coded by school for follow-up purposes.

On May 13, 1983, follow-up letters were sent to the schools to encourage further responses. A sample of the follow-up letter may be found in Appendix A.

Seventy-four percent of those 54 schools with superintendent permission participated in the study. About 59% of the original 68 schools participated in the study. Responses were received from teachers in six additional schools. However, to be considered a participating school, both the principal and teachers had to return a completed questionnaire. In all, relevant data were collected from 529 teachers and 40 principals in 40 Kansas schools.

Instrumentation

The questionnaires used in this study generated the following data: the organization's compliance type, communication pattern, consensus level between the principal and classroom teachers, and consensus level

among the teachers themselves. Each of these measurements are described in the following section.

Operational Measures of the Variables

Compliance

Compliance was measured by the Compliance Index developed by Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp (1981). The responses to items in this instrument will register as one of three types of power or one of three types of involvement.

The test constructors tested and found types of power (coercive, remunerative, normative) and involvement (alienation, calculative, moral) items to be within a usable span. A Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was computed to determine reliability of the Compliance Index (Table II). The Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp study yielded reliability coefficients of .86 (normative power), .79 (remunerative power), .68 (coercive power), .74 (moral involvement), .73 (calculative involvement), and .67 (alienative involvement).

In this study, reliabilities were .81, .70, and .68 for normative, remunerative, and coercive power, respectively, with a Cronbach Alpha procedure and a .70, .51, and .51 for moral, calculative, and alienative orientations, respectively (Table II).

Measurement constructors, Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp (1981) confirmed the construct validity of the instrument by using the SPSS subprogram factor (Nie et al, 1975). The Compliance Index is composed of 41 Likert-type items scaled from 1-6 (Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp, 1981, pp. 18-21). An example of the 12 normative items states: "Members get recognition from those higher up" (Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp, 1981, p.

18). An example of the seven remunerative items states: "Assignments and schedules are used for rewards" (Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp, 1981, p. 18). An example of the six coercive items states: "Management discourages chatting with co-workers while we are performing our jobs" (Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp, 1981, p. 19). An example of the six moral items states: "I trust the decisions management makes" (Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp, 1981, p. 20). An example of the five calculative items states: "I should receive extra pay for administrative paper work" (Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp, 1981, p. 20). An example of the five alienative items states: "At work I do just the minimum required" (Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp, 1981, p. 21).

TABLE II
RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENTS

	Reliability in Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp Study	Reliability Alpha in This Study
<u>Power</u>		
Coercive	.68	.68
Remunerative	.79	.70
Normative	.86	.81
<u>Involvement</u>		
Alienative	.67	.51
Calculative	.73	.51
Moral	.74	.70

Power (coercive, remunerative, normative) and involvement (alienation, calculative, moral) were determined for each of 40 schools using the Compliance Index.

The Z scores were computed to eliminate the difference in the number of items used to determine each of the three types of power and three types of involvement. According to Gay (1976) and Bartz (1981), an important benefit of the Z score is that it allows comparisons of dissimilar scores.

Communication

Communication patterns were identified through the Communication Calculation measure (a sociometric instrument) developed for this study. The Communication Calculation instrument measured both the direction and substance of communication patterns (Appendix B). Respondents reported the incidence of each type of communication (upward instrumental, upward expressive, downward instrumental, downward expressive, horizontal instrumental, and horizontal expressive). All vertical communication is tabulated by totaling all upward and downward instrumental and expressive communication.

Miller (1975), Mouton, Blake, and Fruchter (1960), and Blake and Mouton (1960) approved studying organizations using sociometric means. They believed that individuals reporting their own behavior patterns provide more accurate information than those who report sentiments or beliefs. The findings of these researchers led them to believe that responses to sociometric tools are actually closer to what really occurred. They concluded that the reliability and validity of sociometric instruments were more than sufficient for researching interaction patterns.

Consensus

One way to conceptualize consensus in a school is in terms of the patterns that teachers and principals use to control students. Willower and Jones (1967) posited that the student management is an integral part of every school. Willower, Eidell and Hoy (1967, 1973) developed an assessment tool called the PCI, which measures how pupils are perceived by the administrators and teachers on a continuum, from humanistic (positive) to custodial (negative). The humanistic school tends to be normative, in that those in power are trying to provide a positive learning environment. At the other end of the continuum, the custodial schools tend to have more rules and regulations and to utilize more coercive means for maintaining the order they so highly value. The PCI instrument consists of 20 items using a Likert scale. The responses are: strongly agree (5 points), agree (4 points), undecided (3 points), disagree (2 points), and strongly disagree (1 point). The higher the score, the more humanistic and the lower the score, the more custodial.

The discrepancy between teacher and principal consensus was determined by calculating the mean PCI score of all teachers and the mean PCI score of the principal in each normative school and then subtracting the two scores to obtain the discrepancy index. This procedure was also used for the utilitarian schools and the coercive schools. PCI questions include: "Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision" and "Being friendly with pupils often leads them to become too familiar" (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967, p. 48).

The PCI instrument's reliability coefficients range from the upper .80s to the high .90s (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967). To determine construct validity, principals were given a careful description of

humanistic and custodial characteristics. Principals were then asked to identify the same number of humanistic and custodial teachers in their building. The mean PCI scores of each group of teachers were compared. The difference between groups was supported at $<.05$ level of significance. When cross validation of the instrument was done, the significance was at the $.001$ level (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1967).

Statistical Procedures Used in Statistical Analysis

To determine the normative, utilitarian, and coercive schools, the compliance index mean scored for each school was translated into a Z score. The highest power and involvement score was used to determine into which cell each school fell (Appendix B).

To test the remaining hypotheses, a t-test was used to analyze the data. This procedure was designed to identify whether the means of two comparison groups are different at a significant level. If the t-value is sufficiently large, the two groups are deemed to be different (Popham and Sirotnik, 1967).

Because the t-test assumes homogeneity of variance, a test for homogeneity of variance was conducted. If the assumption was not met; that is, the probability was $> .05$, a nonparametric t-test was used in lieu of the parametric procedure.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, the purpose of this study was to describe an empirical test of Etzioni's (1961, 1975) compliance theory. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to substantiate the congruent compliance patterns with school organizations and to determine the effects of congruent compliance patterns on communication and consensus. This chapter has been organized around three sections: Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

Findings

The three major theoretical propositions relating to frequency of compliance types, communication patterns of congruent organizations, and consensus patterns of congruent organizations will serve as the foci for this section. Each hypothesis relating to the major area is restated with the supporting rationale and is followed by the relevant findings. In those instances where a t-test is employed, if the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not met, then a nonparametric t-test procedure was substituted.

Frequency of Congruent Compliance Types

Hypothesis 1. Schools will tend to fall within the three congruent compliance types with the normative category being predominant.

Compliance is a relationship consisting of the power employed by superiors to manage lower participants and the response to the organization by lower participants as a result of this power (Etzioni, 1975). Etzioni constructed a typology of organizational compliance based on three types of power and three degrees of involvement resulting in nine possible compliance types. He argued that there is a match between power and involvement which is stable, effective, and therefore congruent. He stated that types 1, 5, and 9 should occur more often than the six incongruent theoretical types.

According to the results displayed in Table III, the three cells containing the most schools included the normative-moral (N=10), the coercive-calculative (N=7), and the coercive-alienative (N=6). Fifty-seven percent of the total sample fell into these three cells. Of these three cells, two were congruent (normative-moral and coercive-alienative) and one was not (coercive-calculative). The remaining congruent cell, remunerative-calculative, contained only three schools. By chance alone, it would be expected that at least 4-1/2 schools would cluster in each cell.

Communication Patterns of Congruent Organizations

Hypothesis 2. Coercive schools will have less vertical communication than normative and utilitarian schools.

Vertical communication includes expressive and instrumental communication traveling both upward and downward. Patterns of vertical communication in the various congruent compliance types have been identified by Etzioni (1975). Coercive organizations do not have or need much vertical communication between the elite and the subordinate (Etzioni, 1975). On

the other hand, normative and utilitarian organizations both require a great deal of vertical communication. The substance of this vertical communication is usually expressive for normative and instrumental for utilitarian organizations (Etzioni, 1975).

TABLE III
COMPLIANCE RESULTS IN 40 KANSAS SCHOOLS

Power	Involvement		
	Alienative	Calculative	Moral
Coercive	Type #1 n=6 Schools (15%)	Type #2 n=7 Schools (17.5%)	Type #3 n=2 Schools (5%)
Remunerative	Type #4 n=4 Schools (10%)	Type #5 n=3 Schools (7.5%)	Type #6 n=1 Schools (2.5%)
Normative	Type #7 n=5 Schools (12.5%)	Type #8 n=2 Schools (5.0%)	Type #9 n=10 Schools (25.0%)

Because the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met for either the coercive-normative dyad ($F=14.48$, $p=.001$) or for the coercive-utilitarian dyad ($F=3.50$, $p=.049$), a nonparametric procedure was employed. According to the results reported in Table IV, coercive schools did indeed have less vertical communication as predicted. The means for the normative, coercive, and utilitarian schools were 68.3, 38.3, and 60.6, respectively. It is important to note that, while the

difference was statistically significant for normative and coercive schools, the results were not significant for coercive and utilitarian schools.

TABLE IV
VERTICAL COMMUNICATION

Compliance	Mean Score	t-value	Probability
Normative and Coercive	68.3 28.3	2.48	.02*
Coercive and Utilitarian	28.3 60.1	1.47	.14

*Significant at the <.05 probability level

Hypothesis 3. Utilitarian schools will have more vertical instrumental communication than normative and coercive schools.

Etzioni (1975) postulated that utilitarian organizations require almost an equal amount of downward and upward instrumental communication. The small amount of vertical instrumental communication which does occur in the coercive organization will tend to be downward. Little vertical instrumental communication exists in the usual normative compliance type because it is not needed. If instrumental communication does occur, it will more likely be among the lower participants (Etzioni, 1975).

The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for utilitarian/normative schools ($F=1.57$, $p=0.86$) and for utilitarian and coercive schools ($F=7.01$ and $p=.071$). In part the hypothesis was supported and in part it was not. According to the results reported in Table V, the mean scores as to vertical instrumental communication of utilitarian and coercive schools were significantly different. However, mean scores as to vertical instrumental communication for normative and utilitarian schools were not significantly different and not in the direction predicted.

TABLE V
VERTICAL INSTRUMENTAL COMMUNICATION BY
COMPLIANCE TYPE

Compliance	Mean Score	t-value	Probability
Normative and Utilitarian	46.90 43.0	-2.0	.42
Utilitarian and Coercive	43.0 22.5	.20	.04*

*Significant at the $<.05$ level

The volume of vertical instrumental communication was significantly greater in the utilitarian school than in the coercive schools, and this would support Etzioni's position. The volume of vertical instrumental communication of normative and utilitarian schools was greater in both

instances than it was in coercive schools. While the difference between the normative and utilitarian schools was not substantial, the volume of vertical instrumental communication in normative schools was slightly greater than in the utilitarian schools, which is contrary to Etzioni's hypothesis. Etzioni had expected that the volume of vertical instrumental communication would be greater in utilitarian organizations.

Hypothesis 4. Normative schools will have a higher level of downward expressive communication than utilitarian or coercive schools.

Etzioni (1975) stated that the content and direction of communication varies from one compliance type to another. In any type of organization, there is much less upward communication than downward communication (Schumpeter, 1950). Downward expressive communication is important in normative organizations because lines of communication must remain open in order to reach organizational objectives (Etzioni, 1975). Downward expressive communication is not as necessary for efficiency in utilitarian as in normative organizations, according to Etzioni. It is rare to find downward expressive communication in coercive organizations.

The assumption of homogeneity of variance ($F=1.22$, $p=.68$) was met for the normative-utilitarian dyad. The assumption of homogeneity of variance for normative and coercive schools was not met ($F=29.11$, $p=.002$), and a nonparametric t-test was employed. According to the results displayed in Table VI, there was no significant difference in downward expressive communication between normative and utilitarian schools. Normative schools did experience slightly lower levels of downward expressive communication. There was a significant difference in downward expressive communication between schools having normative and coercive compliance, with normative schools having significantly higher levels of downward expressive communication as predicted. Hypothesis

four was only partially confirmed, in that the difference between normative and utilitarian schools was not significant and the difference between normative and coercive schools was significant.

TABLE VI
DOWNWARD EXPRESSIVE COMMUNICATION BY
COMPLIANCE TYPE

Compliance	Mean Score	t-value	Probability
Normative	9.7	.19	.44
Utilitarian	11.0		
Normative	9.7	-2.17	.03*
Coercive	2.3		

*Significant at the <.05 level

Hypothesis 5. Coercive and utilitarian schools will have more horizontal expressive communication than normative schools.

Etzioni (1975) asserted that utilitarian and coercive organizations will be expected to have expressive horizontal communication. However, horizontal expressive communication will occur more often in utilitarian than normative organizations (Etzioni, 1975).

The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for coercive-normative organizations ($F=1.31$, $p=.24$) and for utilitarian-normative organizations ($F=1.05$, $p=.09$). According to the results reported in

Table VII, the horizontal expressive communication in utilitarian schools (95.33) and coercive schools (78.66) was greater than the mean score for the normative schools (67.20). Although the direction of difference supports Etzioni's (1975) proposition, the differences are not significant. Hypothesis five was supported, but not at a significant level.

TABLE VII
HORIZONTAL EXPRESSIVE COMMUNICATION

Compliance	Mean Score	t-value	Probability
Normative	67.20	.72	.24
Coercive	78.67		
Utilitarian	95.33	1.47	.09
Normative	67.20		

Consensus Patterns of Congruent Types

Hypothesis 6. Normative and utilitarian schools will have higher teacher consensus than coercive schools.

Theoretically, organizations that have different compliance patterns will differ in consensus (Etzioni, 1975). Etzioni does not presume that consensus will be high in various organizations nor does he infer that a high degree of consensus is always necessary for getting results (Etzioni, 1975).

This study explored one kind of consensus; that is, agreement about methods, procedure, and strategy (Etzioni, 1975). It was hypothesized that compliance type would have a direct effect on consensus relating to teachers' beliefs about how to treat children.

Etzioni (1975) suggested that consensus on methods will differ in the following ways: normative compliance types require consensus because dissension causes the organization to be ineffective--utilitarian organizations need agreement as to methods, while coercive organizations can function with little or no consensus.

The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for the coercive and normative dyad ($F=3.2$, $p=.211$). The assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met for the utilitarian and coercive schools ($F=30.44$, $p=.003$); therefore, a nonparametric t-test was employed with that dyad. According to the results displayed in Table VIII, normative and utilitarian schools had higher teacher consensus (73.91 and 126.74, respectively) than did coercive schools (60.34). While the direction for the hypothesis was confirmed, the differences were not significant.

Hypothesis 7. Discrepancies in consensus between the principal and teacher will be greater in coercive schools than in normative and utilitarian schools.

Consensus refers not only to level of agreement among lower participants, but also to the level of agreement between lower participants and power holders (Etzioni, 1975). Consensus will tend to be higher among those at the same level in the organization than consensus between levels. Etzioni (1975) stated that more consensus will be found in the normative than utilitarian compliance types and that coercive types will have little or no consensus.

TABLE VIII
 CONSENSUS VARIANCE BY COMPLIANCE TYPE

Compliance	Mean Score	t-value	Probability
Utilitarian	126.74	-.92	.23
Coercive	60.34		
Coercive	60.34	-.86	.20
Normative	73.91		

The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met for normative/coercive schools ($F=3.01$, $p=.144$) and for the coercive/utilitarian schools ($F=6.94$, $p=.261$). According to the results in Table IX, the discrepancy in mean scores between the principals and teachers in the coercive schools was 9.58; whereas, normative and utilitarian schools had a mean score discrepancy of 6.55 and 5.54. Consensus between the elite and lower participant was lower in coercive than in either normative or utilitarian schools, but not at a significant level.

TABLE IX
DISCREPANCY OF CONSENSUS MEANS BETWEEN
ELITES AND LOWER PARTICIPANTS

Compliance	Mean Score	t-Value	Probability
Normative	6.55	1.27	.11
Coercive	9.58		
Coercive	9.58	1.07	.16
Utilitarian	5.54		

Conclusions

Generally, the results of this study would confirm that public schools, while sharing certain common characteristics with other organizations, are unique entities. The nature of those differences and certain problems with the measurement of the theoretical constructs are discussed in this section.

Compliance

It was hypothesized that within a nine-cell typology, three congruent cells (coercive, utilitarian, and normative) would contain more schools than the others. The largest number of schools (n=10) fell into the normative-moral (congruent) cell. The second greatest number of schools fell into the coercive-calculative, incongruent cell (n=7). The third greatest number of schools fell into the coercive-alienative

congruent cell. The hypothesis was confirmed with two of the three congruent cells. The theoretical proposition that more schools would tend to fall into the third congruent type, the remunerative-calculative (congruent) cell, was not supported.

Etzioni (1975) described the power use and involvement orientation relationship as reciprocal by saying, "Congruence is attained by a change in either the power applied by the organization or the involvement of lower participants" (p. 14). Because of the reciprocal nature of power and involvement, the question as to why there were more schools in the coercive-calculative cell than in the remunerative-calculative cell can be reframed in two ways. Why did not more principals with teachers who responded primarily in a calculative way use remunerative power predominately and why did not more teachers who worked with principals who relied primarily on coercive power respond primarily with alienation?

Remunerative Power as a Response to

Calculative Involvement

Etzioni (1975) stated that remunerative power involves monetary compensation and tangible rewards. Kansas law allows individual school districts to increase their overall budget by only 2% to 3% annually. Within the budget limitation, school board negotiators and the teacher negotiators in local districts determine salaries and fringes for their systems. Unlike managers in other types of organizations, therefore, principals in Kansas may not employ remunerative power very often, even when teachers are calculatively involved, because they in fact lack that kind of power. Many principals do not have access to discretionary funds or bonuses or fringes for reward purposes and cannot easily provide time

off or compensatory time when hours and days taught are fixed by contract with the school district. Teacher promotion options in the public schools for all practical purposes do not exist. All teachers, regardless of length of service, tend to have the same size of classroom, the same number of students, and the same number of preparations. Even salary increases are the same for teachers having similar experience and degrees (Glickman, 1990). Only a few Kansas school districts are piloting career ladder programs which are designed to include a means for providing teacher promotion. Etzioni (1975) admits that of the three power types, remunerative power will be used less often than the other two types in schools.

Alienation as a Response to Coercive Power

Why did teachers not respond with alienation to the predominantly coercive power employed by their principals. Etzioni (1975) defined alienation as an intensely hostile reaction which reflects a lack of control. An example of alienation in its purest sense would be that of convicts in a penitentiary. In contrast, in a school setting coercive power and alienation would not be as extreme. Because teachers have the support of professional organizations and negotiation power, the coercive power of the principal may well be mitigated by the professional orientation of faculty. For example, the instrument employed to measure calculative involvement describes teachers who believe they should receive extra compensation for doing administrative paper work and who would comply with their unions' or peers' request to strike or stage a job action. Were these same teachers alienated, their responses would have indicated that they were more likely to do the minimum and that they performed their best only when the principal was around. Principals who

employ coercive power do not intimidate professional faculty; they may only encourage militancy.

The limited number of utilitarian schools identified in this study can also be explained by the test items used to operationalize teacher involvement. According to Etzioni (1975), a calculative involvement is mildly positive or negative and indicates an intention to benefit by obedience to the power holder. In this study, calculative teachers described themselves as willing to strike if the union requested it. Is it accurate to describe teachers with militant inclinations as obedient for pay? Would teachers who were willing to strike on the union's request be mildly or intensely negative? Perhaps there were only three schools in the utilitarian cell because the cell represents something other than a remunerative-calculative pattern. Indeed, the coercive-calculative cell which contained the second greatest number of schools appears to be congruent when these operational issues are considered.

In summary, at least two explanations are possible--one conceptual and the other operational. While Etzioni (1975) intended that his theory be applied to all types of organizations, it appears that schools may be sufficiently unique and different to warrant caution when the theory is applied in school settings. The power of principals may be sufficiently mitigated by statutory and contractual constraints to eliminate or moderate the remunerative power option, and the negotiating power of teachers reduces alienation by giving teachers greater control. And finally, the conceptual explanation may be totally disregarded if degree of involvement, specifically calculative involvement, is inaccurately measured. However, either of the explanations would explain the lack of confirmation of the utilitarian cell.

Vertical Communication

It was hypothesized that normative and utilitarian schools would have higher levels of vertical communication than coercive ones. When vertical communication was studied in schools having congruent compliance, normative schools had significantly higher levels of vertical communication than coercive schools as predicted. However, utilitarian schools did not have significantly more vertical communication than coercive schools. Why did this occur?

Perhaps the utilitarian schools in this sample do not reflect a high degree of vertical communication because there is a tendency for teachers to communicate instrumentally among themselves (horizontal communication). This latter pattern would eliminate the need for vertical communication because ambiguity could be reduced by teachers communicating with each other and with their professional organizations. Such an idea is supported by the way calculative involvement (the type of teacher involvement associated with utilitarian schools) was operationalized. Calculative teachers described themselves as willing to strike if the union or peers requested it. Teachers who are willing to strike would be more likely to be actively involved in the definition of their roles and less likely to turn to the principal for an organizational definition.

Instrumental Vertical Communication

It was hypothesized that utilitarian schools would have more vertical instrumental communication than the other two types of schools. Indeed, utilitarian schools did have greater vertical patterns than coercive schools. However, while the difference between the normative and utilitarian was not substantial, the volume of vertical instrumental

communication in normative schools was slightly greater than that found in utilitarian schools. This is contrary to Etzioni's (1975) prediction that normative communication would be expressive and that utilitarian communication would be instrumental. Why did the normative schools in this study have slightly more examples of instrumental communication than the utilitarian schools?

One reason may be that schools are unique organizations which differ from more traditionally normative organizations, such as churches, for example, with their predominant emphasis on expressive concerns and from utilitarian organizations, such as businesses, for example, with their predominant emphasis on instrumental concerns. Not only must schools convey values inherent in the culture (a high expressive concern), but they must also convey knowledge (a high instrumental concern). Consequently, normative schools will share some communication patterns with utilitarian organizations; specifically, a high vertical instrumental communication activity. In addition, Etzioni (1975, p. 82) conceded that ". . . relations between an organization and its paid workers contain a significant utilitarian element by definition." This supports the notion that even normative school organizations contain elements of utilitarian organizations.

Downward Expressive Communication

It was hypothesized that normative schools would have greater downward expressive patterns of communication than the other two. An example of downward expressive communication would include the principal expressing appreciation and giving recognition or approval. According to Etzioni (1975), downward expressive communication should be higher in normative organizations than in either utilitarian or coercive schools.

In fact, with this sample, downward expressive communication was higher when normative and coercive schools were compared but not when normative and utilitarian schools were compared. Why?

For all practical purposes, both normative and utilitarian schools have equal vertical instrumental and downward expressive patterns of communication. In short, if schools have a unique mission which differs substantively from other organizations in that their major missions be both instrumental and expressive, then the mission of schools could explain why both normative and utilitarian schools would require high levels of downward expressive as well as vertical instrumental patterns. Perhaps then coercive schools require neither pattern of communication because they are not involved with either value conveyance or content. In this sense, coercive schools are more like other types of coercive organizations described in Etzioni's (1975) theory, with a high emphasis on control and order, than are normative and utilitarian schools like their counterpart, noneducational organizations.

Expressive Horizontal Communication and Consensus

Of the seven hypotheses in this study, the first four were partially confirmed. All of the last three hypotheses relating to expressive horizontal communication, teacher-teacher consensus, and teacher-principal consensus were confirmed as to direction; but the differences were not statistically significant. This can be explained by recalling that Etzioni's (1975) theory is best used to classify different types of organizations along power and involvement dimensions rather than to classify different types of elementary schools along power and involvement dimensions. Specifically, the range of differences in communication and

consensus patterns for prisons and schools would be greater than the range of differences between normative and coercive elementary schools. Because the power of statistical tests depends upon the amount of systematic variance (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973), it is logical to assume that as systematic variance decreases, the opportunity for attaining levels of significance also decreases.

Recommendations

Recommendations have been identified based on results and conclusions of this study. Some recommendations are theoretical and some recommendations are practical.

The instrument used to measure types of power and involvement needs to be revised to operationalize power and involvement in ways that are more congruent with conceptual definitions proposed by Etzioni (1975). According to Silver (1983, p. 108), compliance theory has "some measurement problems." Kottkamp (1985), one of the authors of the Compliance Index instrument, recognized these problems and has developed and tested an improved instrument. This instrument should be used in future studies, or a new one should be developed.

Although coercive schools appear to be fairly typical of the prototype described by Etzioni (1975), utilitarian and normative schools did not readily reflect Etzioni's prototype in the areas of communication and consensus. For instance, expressive and instrumental communication were not in the direction predicted. Consequently, more studies with samples representative of the nation's schools are needed to identify congruence patterns and their concomitant communication and consensus characteristics.

College preparatory classes for administrators should provide more awareness and in-depth study of power and involvement. Principals would then be better prepared to develop a school climate that is congruent and effective. For instance, in-service and/or college training in the use of normative power is recommended. Having morally committed teachers would appear to be a worthy goal in the school setting.

Training in the appropriate use of coercive power is also needed. In this study, coercive power was linked with calculative teacher involvement in seven schools and teacher alienation in six schools. Schools with militant (calculative) or uninvolved (alienated) teachers are not desirable. If principals were to shift to a normative power, teachers may become less alienated and militant.

Very few principals in this study used remunerative power because most principals are not given remunerative authority. One way to increase remunerative authority would be to encourage the adoption of site-based management. In-service programs could assist further in awareness of site-based management and the appropriate use of remunerative power.

This study, a test of communication and consensus correlates of Etzioni's (1975) compliance theory, has been designed and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations have been identified. Implementing Etzioni's compliance theory in school systems has merit. Compliance theory is one way to address the demand for effectiveness and accountability in the nation's schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angle, H. L. and Perry, J. L. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 1981, 1-13.
- Bacharach, S. B. and Mitchell, S. M. Critical variables in the formation and maintenance of consensus in school districts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(4), Fall, 1981, 74-97.
- Bartz, A. E. Basic Statistical Concepts (2nd ed.). Minneapolis: Burgess, 1981.
- Bierstedt, R. An analysis of social power. American Sociological Review, 15, 1950, 730-738.
- Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. The reliability and validity of sociometric measures: Introduction. In: The Sociometric Reader, J. L. Moreno et al., Eds. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960, 318-319.
- Cates, R. T. Comparative administration and management of five war relocation authority camps: America's incarceration of persons of Japanese descent during World War II. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1980.)
- Cury, G. B. Individual orientation to work, perceived organizational power, and teacher absenteeism. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1981.)
- Cury, G. B.; Zarzycki, V. S.; and Kottkamp, R. B. An operational definition of organizational power and involvement. (Unpublished working paper, Rutgers University, 1981.)
- Dunleavy, R. A. Compliance patterns and teacher personalities in private and public school organizations in West Virginia. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1986.)
- Etzioni, A. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations: On Power, Involvement and Their Correlates. New York: The Free Press, 1961.
- Etzioni, A. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations: On Power, Involvement and Their Correlates. (Revised and enlarged edition.) New York: The Free Press, 1975.
- Filley, A. C. and House, R. J. Managerial Process and Organization Behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1969.

- Forsyth, P. B. and Clark, M. J. The communication calculation. (Unpublished document, Oklahoma State University, 1983.)
- Gaston, S. N. For at risk students: A theory based alternative structured school model, its implementation and evaluation. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1988.)
- Gay, L. R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1976.
- Glickman, C. D. Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach. (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1990.
- Grusky, O. and Miller, G. A., Eds. The Sociology of Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1970.
- Hodgkins, B. J. and Herriot, R. Age-grade structure, goals and compliance in the school: An organizational analysis. Sociology of Education, 43, 1970, 90-103.
- Jablin, F. M. Superior-subordinate communication: The state of the art. Psychological Bulletin, 86(6), 1979, 1201-1222.
- Kansas State Department of Education. Kansas Educational Directory, 1982-83. Topeka, Kansas: Kansas State Department of Education.
- Kerlinger, F. N. and Pedhazur, E. J. Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Kottkamp, R. B. Organizational power in schools: The development and test of an operational measure of Etzioni's power typology. Educational and Psychology Research, 5(2), 1985, 67-80.
- Mayer, B. S. Mediation and compliance in child protection. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1987.)
- Miller, J. P. Sociometric methods for influence, interaction and differentiation in organizations. (Working draft of unpublished paper.) University of Southern California, 1975.
- Mouton, J. S.; Blake, R. R.; and Fruchter, B. The reliability of sociometric measures. In: The Sociometry Ready, J. L. Moreno et al., Eds. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960, 320-361.
- Nie, N. H. et al. SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Popham, J. W. and Sirotnik, K. A. Educational Statistics Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Pyles, C. D. Compliance patterns in a division of allied health. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1980.)
- Russell, B. Power. New York: Norton, 1938.

- Schaupp, F. W. Compliance patterns in a school system: A case study. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1971.)
- Schaupp, R. A. Compliance patterns in three parochial high schools located in North Central West Virginia: A case study. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1984.)
- Schlottman, K. B. The relationship between the means of control of the elementary school and student involvement: A test of Etzioni's compliance thesis. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1980.)
- Schumpeter, J. A. Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Schwartz, A. J. Power and involvement in three fictional schools from the silver screen. (Paper presented at 69th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, March 31-April 4, 1985.)
- Shapiro, A. R. Etzioni's compliance relationship as applied to the faculty and academic administration in unionized and non-unionized private colleges. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1978.)
- Silver, P. Educational Administration: Theoretical Perspectives on Practice and Research. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Taylor, M. G. Two models of social reform action in a normative organization. Sociological Analysis, 36(2), Summer, 1975, 161-167.
- Willower, D. J. and Jones R. G. Control in an educational organization. In: J. D. Raths et al., Eds., Studying Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967, 424-428.
- Willower, D. J.; Eidell, T. L.; and Hoy, W. K. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. (Monograph #24.) University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1967.
- Willower, D. J.; Eidell, T. L.; and Hoy, W. K. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. (Monograph #24, revised). University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1973.
- Zarzycki, V. S. Etzioni's compliance relationship applied to student personnel workers and the administration of unionized and nonunionized private colleges. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers State University of New Jersey-New Brunswick, 1981.)

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
CORRESPONDENCE

March 31, 1983

Dear Dr. (Name of Superintendent):

As superintendent of schools, you are aware of the importance of communication. We are doing a survey of communication patterns in Kansas schools of a certain enrollment. (Name of School) in your district has the opportunity to participate in this study.

As superintendent, you will only need to complete and return the enclosed post card.

With your approval, short questionnaires will be sent to the designated school building. The principal will be asked to complete a questionnaire and to ask his or her secretary to place a questionnaire and cover letter in the box of each classroom teacher. With each questionnaire there will be a stamped, addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire to us. All responses and respondents will remain anonymous.

Upon request, you will receive a copy of the abstract of the study.

We will certainly appreciate the data from your school. We believe the results of our study will offer you and the other participants important guidance toward the establishment or maintenance of maximumly effective communication patterns in schools.

Sincerely,

April 20, 1983

Dear Dr. (Name of Superintendent):

I have not received the information I need from you. It is possible my correspondence of March 31 has been delayed in the mail or for some other reason was never received.

As superintendent of schools, you are aware of the importance of communication. We are doing a survey of communication patterns in Kansas schools of a certain enrollment. (Name of Participant) in your district has the opportunity to participate in this study.

As superintendent, you will only need to complete and return the enclosed post card.

With your approval, short questionnaires will be sent to the designated school building. The principal will be asked to complete and return a questionnaire and place a questionnaire and cover letter in the box of each classroom teacher. With each questionnaire there will be a stamped, addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire to us. All responses and respondents will remain anonymous.

Upon request, you will receive a copy of the abstract of the study.

We will certainly appreciate the data from your school. We believe the results of our study will offer you and the other participants important guidance toward the establishment or maintenance of maximumly effective communication patterns in schools.

Sincerely,

Researcher, _____ has my permission to contact the faculty and administrators of _____ Elementary School to provide data for a study of communication. I understand she will be sending members of the faculty and the administration questionnaires to be completed and returned. I understand the district, school, names of respondents, and their responses will remain confidential.

I wish to receive a copy of the results of the study:

Yes No.

USD

Signature of Superintendent

April 20, 1983

Dear Mr. (Name of Principal):

We are doing a survey of communication patterns in Kansas schools. Your school falls within the enrollment range of the sample and your superintendent has approved your participation in this study if you should choose to do so.

Please complete the attached questionnaire. A stamped, addressed envelope has been included for your convenience.

We might suggest that your secretary act as our distributor. Her only responsibility would be to place a questionnaire in the mailbox of each classroom teacher. Attached to each questionnaire will be a stamped, addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire to us. Respondents are not asked to place their names on the survey.

We certainly appreciate the cooperation of your school. We believe the results of our study will offer you and the other participants important guidance toward the establishment or maintenance of maximumly effective communication patterns in schools.

Sincerely,

Dear Respondent:

This questionnaire was developed to survey the communication patterns in Kansas schools. Your school falls within the enrollment range of the sample and your superintendent has approved your participation in this study if you should choose to do so.

Please complete the attached questionnaire. A stamped, addressed envelope has been included for your convenience. All responses and respondents will remain anonymous.

We certainly appreciate the cooperation of your school. We believe the results of our study will offer you and the other participants important guidance toward establishment or maintenance of maximumly effective communication patterns in schools. Thank you for your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

May 12, 1983

Re: Study of Communication Patterns

Dear Education Colleague:

Help!! The end of school is fast approaching and you will soon be leaving for summer pursuits. Meanwhile, I will be sitting here "dataless," seriously contemplating a study of Hamlet's immortal question. A great deal of time and well over \$1,000 have already been expended for this study. In order to have enough data, responses from the principal and most of the teachers are needed. If you have not completed your questionnaire, please DO IT NOW. The average time needed to complete the questionnaire is nine minutes. In case you misplaced yours, an extra is available through the secretary. If you have completed and returned your questionnaire, please accept my heartfelt THANKS. In any case, best wishes in all of your endeavors.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX B
COMPLIANCE INDEX

COMPLIANCE INDEX

INSTRUCTIONS:

All of the following items refer to events and conditions in your organization. There are no right and wrong answers. Each statement simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the probable frequency of its occurrence.

- A. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY...THEN THINK ABOUT HOW FREQUENTLY IT OCCURS.
 B. DECIDE HOW FREQUENTLY IT OCCURS...
 ...NEVER (1) ...ALWAYS (6)
 C. THEN CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

NEVER (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	ALWAYS (6)
1.	A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly discouraged here.				6
2.	I look forward to coming to work.				6
3.	Management uses discretionary funds for special projects as rewards.				6
4.	I should receive extra pay for administrative paper work.				6
5.	In meetings management fosters a feeling that we can get things done.				6
6.	When my boss is present, the quality of my work increases.				6
7.	Members are involved in decisions regarding the adoption of new policies.				6
8.	I am loyal to this organization				6
9.	Management discourages chatting with co-workers while are performing our jobs				6
10.	My superior confides in me.				6
11.	I feel free to discuss my personal problems with my superior				6
12.	Assignments and schedules are used as rewards.				6
13.	If there was a call for a strike by my teacher association or union representative, I would willingly comply.				6
14.	In this organization the top brass is easily accessible.				6
15.	One way to get back at the organization is to "go" by the book.				6
16.	Bonuses and fringes are rewards for outstanding employees.				6
17.	I would pursue a grievance if my workload exceeded the amount traditionally assigned.				6
18.	Management always acts with the welfare of members in mind.				6

19. I am morally committed to this organization	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Members are not permitted to move about freely here	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Supervisors spend time after hours with subordinates who need help	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. If my peers staged a job action, I would participate, even if I was not a dues paying member. . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Management uses the potential of promotion as an incentive to workers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. At work I do just the minimum required.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Members get recognition from those higher up. . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I trust the decision management makes	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Management is known to reward its star employees with additional time off.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I alert my peers to the unannounced presence of superiors	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. Members are expected to stay in assigned areas at all times	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. When the boss is around, I will perform my job to expectations more often than not.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Management involves me in decisions on the adoption of new policies	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. As I see it, the management orientation program is helpful to my job	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Compensatory time is used to reward employees . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. Non-work time (off duty) is restricted to designated locations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Management allows me to design my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. One can expect "a little something extra" for doing an outstanding job	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. The most important sources of communication are to and from my superiors.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. Management likes to know where each person is at all times.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I work at my best during evaluation time	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. Managers encourage communication among peers . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. One always has the feeling that you are being "watched" here.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Permission to use the Compliance Index was granted by telephone by Dr. Robert B. Kottkamp on December 5, 1990. The Compliance Index was constructed by Cury, Zarzycki, and Kottkamp (1981).

TABLE X
COMPLIANCE INDEX Z SCORES FOR ALL
40 KANSAS SCHOOLS

School Code #	Power			Involvement		
	Norm.	Remun.	Coercive	Moral	Calc.	Alien.
1	-.404	-1.498	.633	-1.497	.032	-.285
2	-.222	.225	.925	-.339	-.930	.641
3	.683	2.108	.048	.591	1.256	.641
4	.715	.542	-1.358	1.158	-.609	-.601
5	.393	.121	.089	.484	-1.462	.097
6	-.222	1.001	2.034	-.632	1.496	.391
7	.075	-.810	-.430	-.213	-.309	1.199
8	.520	2.279	-.634	-.051	-.860	.516
9	-.982	.785	.794	-.634	1.112	.895
10	1.296	2.258	1.029	.605	.474	.611
11	1.400	.561	1.729	-.994	-.499	-.006
12	-.743	-.192	-.686	.543	1.097	1.288
13	.149	-.567	-.797	.121	-1.362	-1.777
14	-.099	-1.017	-1.121	.531	-.609	.148
15	.452	-.339	-1.435	.591	1.211	-.492
16	-.540	-1.167	-.709	-.534	.248	.663
17	.545	-.955	-.025	.647	-.675	.244
18	.149	-.696	.462	-.748	-1.111	-.307
19	-2.528	-.825	1.149	-1.157	2.650	2.170
20	.520	-2.181	-2.133	1.228	-.233	-2.145
21	.520	1.135	-.917	.684	-.108	-1.844
22	.812	.158	-.576	-.376	.113	.061
23	.594	-.980	-.106	1.623	.685	.244
24	-1.676	-1.130	.867	-1.032	.679	-.918
25	-.805	-.567	1.230	-.980	-.609	-.307
26	.651	.406	-.025	.414	.328	.428
27	.459	1.311	-1.027	-.167	.393	-1.109
28	.054	.380	.640	.484	.443	1.273
29	2.216	-.241	-.054	.605	-.279	.244
30	-.328	.742	.802	.484	-.108	.244
31	2.497	.618	-.917	2.623	-.945	-.616
32	-.858	-1.105	-.323	-.167	-.945	-2.946
33	-.769	-.318	1.327	-.767	-.609	.553
34	-1.282	.897	2.034	-1.376	2.098	-.197
35	-1.345	.018	.672	-.353	.945	.317
36	.753	.173	-1.144	1.228	-.810	-.491
37	.329	.173	-1.208	-1.190	-1.111	-.197

TABLE X (Continued)

School Code #	Power			Involvement		
	Norm.	Remun.	Coercive	Moral	Calc.	Alien.
38	-1.324	-.241	-.495	-1.100	1.898	-.050
39	-1.282	.147	-.106	-1.910	-.609	.428
40	.520	-.241	.056	1.461	1.145	1.714

Note: The largest Z score for power and involvement indicates into which of the nine cells that school was placed.

APPENDIX C

COMMUNICATION CALCULATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Please think of the five people in this school with whom you have worked most closely in the last month. In your mind, assign them a letter from A to E. Place the appropriate number on the line to the left of each question.

YOU AND PERSON A

- ___A-1) How would you describe Person A's position in the organization relative to yours? Higher--1 About the same--2 Lower--3
- ___A-2) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) you initiated WITH Person A this month?
- ___A-3) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ___A-4) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
- ___A-5) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) initiated by Person A this month?
- ___A-6) Of the contacts initiated by Person A, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ___A-7) Of the contacts initiated by Person A, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
* * * * *

YOU AND PERSON B

- ___B-1) How would you describe Person B's position in the organization relative to yours? Higher--1 About the same--2 Lower--3
- ___B-2) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) you initiated WITH Person B this month?
- ___B-3) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ___B-4) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
- ___B-5) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) initiated by Person B this month?
- ___B-6) Of the contacts initiated by Person B, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ___B-7) Of the contacts initiated by Person B, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
* * * * *

YOU AND PERSON C

- ___C-1) How would you describe Person C's position in the organization relative to yours? Higher--1 About the same--2 Lower--3
- ___C-2) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) you initiated WITH Person C this month?
- ___C-3) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ___C-4) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
- ___C-5) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) initiated by Person C this month?
- ___C-6) Of the contacts initiated by Person C, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ___C-7) Of the contacts initiated by Person C, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
* * * * *

YOU AND PERSON D

- ____D-1) How would you describe Person D's position in the organization relative to yours? Higher--1 About the same--2 Lower--3
- ____D-2) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) you initiated WITH Person D this month?
- ____D-3) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ____D-4) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
- ____D-5) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) initiated by Person D this month?
- ____D-6) Of the contacts initiated by Person D, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ____D-7) Of the contacts initiated by Person D, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
* * * * *

YOU AND PERSON E

- ____E-1) How would you describe Person E's position in the organization relative to yours? Higher--1 About the same--2 Lower--3
- ____E-2) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) you initiated WITH Person E this month?
- ____E-3) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ____E-4) Of the contacts initiated by you, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
- ____E-5) What is the approximate number of contacts (verbal and written) initiated by Person E?
- ____E-6) Of the contacts initiated by Person A, how many would you consider to be an exchange of information directly related to your work task?
- ____E-7) Of the contacts initiated by Person E, how many would you consider to be only marginally related to task, or purely social?
* * * * *

TABLE XI
MEAN SCORES FOR THE COMMUNICATION
CALCULATION INSTRUMENT

School Code #	UE	UI	DE	DI	HE	HI
<u>Normative</u>						
4	.390	58.200	36.000	48.800	82.80	145.200
5	11.286	12.857	7.429	9.286	53.571	72.000
13	2.500	6.750	0.500	7.000	24.250	61.250
14	9.000	14.333	6.000	8.444	71.889	104.889
17	11.143	20.714	13.714	14.186	68.571	68.143
20	4.750	34.250	2.750	29.250	60.75	181.250
23	13.500	36.500	9.000	23.500	42.500	120.000
29	14.750	38.750	14.500	35.750	73.000	122.000
31	3.800	13.000	0.600	4.800	135.000	112.000
36	6.400	31.800	5.200	20.400	58.000	121.800
Total	77.519	267.154	95.693	201.616	670.331	1108.532
Mean of Means	7.7519	26.7154	9.5693	20.1616	67.0331	110.8532
<u>Utilitarian</u>						
3	0.857	11.143	0.429	6.429	66.714	72.857
27	12.000	44.250	10.250	18.250	95.250	170.250
38	<u>7.250</u>	<u>41.500</u>	<u>22.500</u>	<u>7.500</u>	<u>123.50</u>	<u>87.75</u>
Total	20.107	96.893	33.179	32.179	285.464	330.857
Mean of Means	6.70	32.298	11.060	10.726	95.155	110.286
<u>Coercive</u>						
2	8.571	18.857	5.857	16.857	111.286	138.286
11	3.000	15.875	1.250	9.750	62.000	65.125
18	0.667	7.333	2.333	4.000	100.000	100.667
25	2.833	10.333	0.666	5.833	104.333	118.333
28	1.833	12.833	3.0	6.5	22.5	69.167
33	<u>2.667</u>	<u>15.667</u>	<u>0.667</u>	<u>9.667</u>	<u>72.333</u>	<u>754.625</u>
Total	19.571	80.898	13.174	52.607	472.452	754.625
Mean of Means	3.262	13.483	2.196	8.769	78.742	125.771

Note: UE = Upward Expressive, UI = Upward Instrumental, DE = Downward Expression, DI = Downward Instrumental, HE = Horizontal Expressive, and HI = Horizontal Instrumental

APPENDIX D

PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY

PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY

INSTRUCTIONS:

Following are some statements about schools, teachers, and pupils. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement.

SA--Strongly Agree, A--Agree, U--Undecided, D--Disagree, SD--Strongly disagree

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. It is desirable to require pupils to sit in assigned seats during assemblies | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. Pupils are usually not capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. Directing sarcastic remarks toward a defiant pupil is a good disciplinary technique | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. Beginning teachers are not likely to maintain strict enough control over their pupils | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. Teachers should consider revision of their teaching methods if these are criticized by their pupils | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. The best principals give unquestioning support to teachers in disciplining pupils | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. Pupils should not be permitted to contradict the statements of a teacher in class | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. It is justifiable to have pupils learn many facts about a subject even if they have no immediate application | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 9. Too much pupil time is spent on guidance and activities and too little on academic preparation | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 10. Being friendly with pupils often leads them to become too familiar | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 11. It is more important for pupils to learn to obey rules than that they make their own decisions | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 12. Students governments are a good "safety valve" but should not have much influence on school policy | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 13. Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 14. If a pupil uses obscene or profane language in school, it must be considered a moral offense | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 15. If pupils are allowed to use the lavatory without getting permission, this privilege will be abused | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 16. A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 17. It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 18. A pupil who destroys school material or property should be severely punished | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 19. Pupils cannot perceive the difference between democracy and anarchy in the classroom | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 20. Pupils often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Permission to use the Pupil Control Ideology was granted by telephone by Dr. D. J. Willower on November 30, 1990. Dr. Willower is the primary author of the PCI instrument.

TABLE XII
 PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY, MEAN
 SCORES BY SCHOOL

School Code #	Teacher Mean Score	Principal Score
<u>Normative</u>		
4	54.50	44
5	51.24	44
13	48.07	52
23	53.90	43
14	56.72	53
17	55.07	62
20	48.70	42
29	57.70	69
31	56.45	54
36	<u>52.20</u>	<u>54</u>
	53.46	51.70
<u>Utilitarian</u>		
3	51.24	44
27	51.90	48
38	<u>54.80</u>	<u>63</u>
	52.65	51.67
<u>Coercive</u>		
2	53.94	40
11	54.84	47
18	59.54	55
25	52.47	55
28	55.06	36
33	<u>59.60</u>	<u>50</u>
	55.91	47.17

VITA

Mary Jo Clark

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: A TEST OF COMMUNICATION AND CONSENSUS, CORRELATES OF ETZIONI'S
COMPLIANCE THEORY

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, September 29, 1935,
the daughter of Muriel Audrey Grantham Webb and Clifton Gore
Webb.

Education: Graduated From Cushing High School, Cushing, Oklahoma,
in May, 1953; received Bachelor of Science degree in Education
from Oklahoma State University in 1957; received Master of
Science degree in Education from Pittsburg State University in
1970; received Education Specialist degree in General School
Administration from Pittsburg State University in 1980; com-
pleted requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Okla-
homa State University in May, 1991.

Professional Experience: Library Supervisor, Coffeyville, Kansas
Unified School District Number 445, 1968-81; Public Relations
and Library Supervisor, Kansas Unified School District Number
445, 1981-82; Project Assistant, Management Academy for School
Executives of Oklahoma, 1982-83; Director, Media Services,
Salina Unified School District Number 305, 1983-90; Adjunct
Professor, Ft. Hays State University, 1980-82 and Kansas State
University, 1988.

Professional Organizations: Phi Delta Kappa, United School Adminis-
trators of Kansas, Kansas Association for Supervision, and Cur-
riculum Development.