

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED DIMENSIONS  
OF BUREAUCRACY AND THE MILITANCY  
OF SECONDARY TEACHERS

By

DON KENT KING

Bachelor of Science in Education  
Central Missouri State College  
Warrensburg, Missouri  
1964

Master of Education  
Drury College  
Springfield, Missouri  
1967

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, 1972

Thesis

19720

K52r

cop. 2

AUG 10 1973

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED DIMENSIONS  
OF BUREAUCRACY AND THE MILITANCY  
OF SECONDARY TEACHERS

Thesis Approved:

*Kenneth A. Davis*

Thesis Adviser

*James B. Appleberry*

*Bill Elsom*

*Larry M. Perkins*

*D. D. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

860464

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the faculty members and administrators of the schools which participated in this research study. Without their cooperation, the research would not have been possible.

A sincere word of appreciation is extended to Dr. Kenneth St. Clair who served as thesis adviser. His understanding, encouragement, and guidance throughout the writer's study have been of mountainous proportions. Deep appreciation is also extended to the other members of the committee: Dr. James Appleberry, Dr. Bill Elsom, and Dr. Larry Perkins.

An expressions of genuine appreciation is extended to Mrs. Ethel McHale and Mrs. Oleta Maurer, whose financial assistance and continued encouragement have aided this writer and many other members of their family so very much. To the writer's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Morris King, a warm "thank you" is given for their encouragement not only in this project, but also throughout the life of the writer.

Finally, to Sandra, Tracy, and Derik, a special expression of appreciation is extended for the continued encouragement and affection shown throughout the completion of this study. An apology is extended to them for the sacrifices which they were forced to make so that the project could be completed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	5
Statement of Hypotheses . . . . .	5
Definition of Terms . . . . .	6
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	7
Assumptions of the Study . . . . .	8
Significance of the Study . . . . .	8
Organization of the Report . . . . .	9
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK . .	11
Introduction . . . . .	11
Review of Selected Literature . . . . .	11
Bureaucracy . . . . .	11
Hierarchy of Authority . . . . .	15
Specialization . . . . .	18
Rules and Regulations . . . . .	20
Impersonalization . . . . .	22
Technical Competence . . . . .	24
Professionalism . . . . .	26
Professional-Bureaucratic Conflict . . . . .	27
Teacher Militancy . . . . .	31
Rationale and Hypotheses . . . . .	34
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . .	45
Introduction . . . . .	45
The Sample . . . . .	45
Data Collection . . . . .	46
Instrumentation . . . . .	48
The Measurement of Teacher Militancy . . . . .	48
The Measurement of Bureaucracy . . . . .	49
Statistical Treatment . . . . .	52
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	53
Introduction . . . . .	53
Hypothesis One . . . . .	53
Hypothesis Two . . . . .	54
Hypothesis Three . . . . .	55

Chapter	Page
Hypothesis Four . . . . .	55
Hypothesis Five . . . . .	56
The Multiple Correlation Coefficient . . . . .	56
Correlations Between Bureaucratic Subscales . . . . .	58
Supplementary Data . . . . .	60
Summary . . . . .	67
 V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	 70
Introduction . . . . .	70
Summary of Findings . . . . .	70
Conclusions and Implications . . . . .	72
Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .	77
Discussion . . . . .	78
 A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 82
 APPENDIX A - THE TEACHER AND THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION . . . . .	 87
 APPENDIX B - SUBSCALE BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY . . . . .	  95

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Partial Correlation Coefficients . . . . .	54
II. Correlation Coefficients . . . . .	57
III. Distribution of Teachers by Age . . . . .	60
IV. Distribution of Teachers by Level of Formal Preparation . .	61
V. Distribution of Teachers by Total Teaching Experience . . .	62
VI. Mean Scores on Militancy Measure Categorized by Sex . . . .	63
VII. Mean Scores on Militancy Measure Categorized by Age . . . .	64
VIII. Mean Scores on Militancy Measure Categorized by Amount of Formal Preparation . . . . .	65
IX. Mean Scores on Militancy Measure Categorized by Total Teaching Experience . . . . .	66
X. Mean Scores on Militancy Measure Categorized by Years in Present Position . . . . .	67

## CHAPTER I

### THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

#### Introduction

One of the most urgent problems facing school administrators today is the increasing militancy among teachers. Teachers are demanding that many responsibilities which have traditionally been those of the school boards and administrators be shared. One area in which teachers want a stronger voice is the decision-making process. The NEA holds, for example, that teachers must have authority for ". . . establishing and administering standards of professional practice and ethics for all educational personnel."<sup>1</sup> Traditionally, school boards and their representatives have "administered" standards related to teachers.

Teachers have made demands of school boards for many years; however, the board's authority was usually not challenged if the demands went unmet. Now teachers take initiative if their demands are not met, and this initiative may result in strikes, sanctions, or work stoppages.

In the ten year period ending in June, 1970, there had been 500 teacher strikes in the United States, involving an estimated 510,571

---

<sup>1</sup>D. D. Darland, "The Profession's Quest for Responsibility and Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (September, 1970), p. 42 (underlining added).



teachers and more than 5,000,000 man-days of instruction.<sup>2</sup> That teacher militancy is a current problem is shown by the fact that 85 percent of all the 500 teacher strikes have occurred during the past three years.<sup>3</sup>

Both of the national teacher organizations advocate striking if necessary to obtain what the teachers believe to be essential. The spokesmen for these organizations place the finger of blame for these strikes upon the school board and its representatives, the administrators. This is very clearly stated by the NEA:

Actually, some boards have provoked teachers to the point where they had to choose between striking or relinquishing<sup>4</sup> not only their rights but also their own self-respect.

The administrator organizations are equally aware of the growth of teacher militancy, as evidenced by this AASA statement of 1968:

Many teacher organizations have repudiated acquiescence, abandoned passivity, and challenged the leadership of school administrators. Pressure for a more vital and greater share in educational decision making is evident in more and more school systems.<sup>5</sup>

The above statements clearly indicate that teachers are more militant today and that school administrators are aware of this. Many have speculated about the causes of this militancy and several possible sources have been advanced. One writer states that ". . . the

---

<sup>2</sup>"Teacher Strikes, 1960-61 to 1969-70," NEA Research Bulletin, XLVIII:3 (October, 1970), 69-72.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>4</sup>"Is It Militancy or School Board Provocation?" NEA Reporter, September 18, 1970, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup>Forrest E. Conner and George B. Redfern, eds., The School Administrator and Negotiation (Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1968), p. 39.

influence of salary in motivating militancy is apparent;" however, he concludes that other factors must be operative because "nine of the ten lowest states in average salaries paid are not among those experiencing strikes."<sup>6</sup>

One of these other factors may be that teachers are becoming more professional. Professionals assume that their work will be controlled in terms of ethical standards determined by their colleagues in their professional associations; whereas, in a bureaucratic organization, all employees are subject to evaluation and control by individuals who are not necessarily members of the same professional group.<sup>7</sup> Another important aspect of the professionalization of teachers is that their professional organizations are national in scope; thus, the teacher is found in some way by the standards established by his national reference group. On the other hand, the teacher is an employee of the local citizens; therefore, the expectations of him as a local employee may be different from those of him as a national professional.<sup>8</sup>

Corwin directly connects the increasing professionalism of teachers and militancy:

The process of professionalizing a publicly supported vocation like teaching is necessarily militant. A vocation will normally have increased its control mainly at the expense of those groups which have traditionally exercised control over the vocation. In the case of public education

---

<sup>6</sup>Donald W. Robinson, "Teacher Militancy Around the Nation," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (June, 1968), p. 554.

<sup>7</sup>W. Richard Scott, "Professionals and Complex Organizations," Professionalization, Howard M. Vollner and Donald L. Mills, eds. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 265.

<sup>8</sup>Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965), p. 221.

this means that in order for teachers to professionalize they must take power from the lay boards of control and from the entrenched administrators appointed by these boards.<sup>9</sup>

Another factor that may promote teacher militancy is the authoritarian rule frequently applied by boards and administrators. The professional's rejection of bureaucratic rules and standards may lead to conflict when professionals are employed in bureaucracies.<sup>10</sup> Park writes that ". . . complete and absolute authoritarian regimes in the family, in politics, or in the school should be resisted."<sup>11</sup>

A professional is one who specialized in a body of abstract knowledge, has a service orientation, and is guided by an internalized set of norms.<sup>12</sup> Because teachers are trained as professionals, they resent supervision and control by superordinates who are not members of that profession; therefore, conflicts may arise. Some other possible "causes" of teacher militancy are given below:

Teachers will no longer tolerate educational conditions which impair their ability to do the best job possible.

Teachers will no longer tolerate either school administrators or employing boards that treat them as irresponsible children who must be told what to do and when to do it.

Teachers will no longer render professional service unless they have a voice in determining educational policy in all areas affecting the quality of the educational program.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 222.

<sup>10</sup> Scott, p. 265.

<sup>11</sup> George Park, "The Educational Dilemma," Journal of Learning Disabilities, III (June, 1970), pp. 40-41.

<sup>12</sup> William J. Goode, "The Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?" Library Quarterly, III (October, 1961), pp. 306-320.

<sup>13</sup> Jack H. Kleinman, "Professional Sanctions: What, Why, When, Where, and How," NEA Journal, LVII (January, 1968), p. 42.

## The Problem

That teachers are becoming less likely to comply with the commands of their superiors without helping to determine what those commands will be is evident. The possible causes of this are many, but several seem to be related to the way in which the school structures itself for decision making and the way in which the resulting structure is utilized to implement decisions. Relevant to this structure is the theory of bureaucracy as conceptualized by Max Weber. The problem which was investigated in this study was one to determine whether a relationship existed between teacher militancy and the teacher's perceptions of the levels of selected dimensions of bureaucracy in the public secondary schools. Specifically, was the level of teacher militancy related to the level of each of the five selected dimensions of bureaucracy?

## Statement of Hypotheses

Because of the problem which has been presented and based on the rationale given in Chapter II, the five following hypotheses were tested in this study:

H.1. Teachers perceiving a high degree of hierarchy of authority in the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

H.2. Teachers perceiving a low degree of adherence to specialization within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

H.3. Teachers perceiving a high degree of adherence to rules and regulations within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

H.4. Teachers perceiving a high degree of impersonalization in the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

H.5. Teachers perceiving a low degree of adherence to technical competence within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

#### Definition of Terms

Bureaucracy: For purposes of this study, bureaucracy will be defined by the following five characteristics:

Hierarchy of Authority: "The extent to which the locus of decision making is prestructured by the organization."<sup>14</sup>

Specialization: The extent to which work tasks are subdivided by functional division of labor within the organization.<sup>15</sup>

Rules and Regulations: "The extent to which organizational members must follow organizationally defined procedures and the degree to which the behavior of organizational members is subject to organizational control."<sup>16</sup>

Impersonality: "The extent to which both organizational members and outsiders are treated without regard to individual qualities."<sup>17</sup>

Technical Competence: "The extent to which organizationally defined universalistic standards are utilized in the

---

<sup>14</sup>Richard Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," Administrative Science Quarterly, XII (December, 1967), p. 465.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

personnel selection and advancement process."<sup>18</sup>

Teacher Militancy: The degree to which teachers are willing to show "compliance" toward or to take "initiative" toward administrative demands.<sup>19</sup> "Those teachers who tend to 'initiate' actions because of administrative decisions relatively more than to 'comply' with those decisions are thought to be more militant."<sup>20</sup>

Professionalism: There are three distinguishing characteristics of professionals: (1) specialized training in a body of abstract knowledge, (2) a service orientation, (3) a collectivity with an internalized set of norms.<sup>21</sup>

#### Limitations of the Study

The sample of teachers included in the study was taken from secondary schools in Oklahoma with thirty or more teachers and which were members of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council; therefore, inferences to other teachers in other situations or locations should be made with caution. As membership in this organization was available to all districts in the state and only fifteen of the specified size elected to join, the possibility exists that the superintendents representing these districts were not typical of the superintendents of other districts of the state; therefore, the sample could have been

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ronald G. Corwin, Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, Cooperative Research Project No. 2637. (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1966), p. 142.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Goode, pp. 306-320.

more homogeneous than one drawn from the entire state. Also, since there was not a 100 percent response from the teachers within the participating schools, generalization beyond those teachers actually participating in the research study should be made with caution.

#### Assumptions of the Study

Several assumptions were made relative to this study. First, it was assumed that where there existed teacher-administrator conflict, there would be a high possibility for teacher militancy to occur. Second, it was assumed that the School Organizational Inventory measured certain salient dimensions of the bureaucratic structure of the school as it was perceived by the teachers. Further, it was assumed that the major aspects of the bureaucratic structure were taken into consideration by the items composing the subscales of the School Organizational Inventory. A fourth assumption was that the responses to The Way You See It, the measure of militancy, accurately represented the teachers' perception of what they would do if a similar situation were confronted by them. Finally, it was assumed that the participating teachers responded authentically.

#### Significance of the Study

Weber believed that the principles of bureaucratic organization led to rational decision making and administrative efficiency; thus, Blau and Scott wrote that, according to Weber, bureaucracy ". . . is the most efficient form of administrative organization."<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Peter B. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1960), p. 33.

Weber, however, was writing of a "pure-type" organization. When these organizations and the positions within them become occupied with people, the organizations lose some of their rationality. Because people occupy organizational positions and these organizations are not "pure-types," many writers have stated that Weber's ideas are really dysfunctional to organizational goal attainment. If these writers were correct in their assumptions, school administrators might be forced to re-examine some of the bureaucratic principles currently applied to the schools.

This study attempted to determine if any relationship exists between the levels of the five dimensions of bureaucracy and the level of teacher militancy. Administrators might find this information helpful in solving administrator-teacher conflicts if a relationship is found to exist. The results might also shed some light on possible administrative changes which could be put into effect in an attempt to determine if the changes actually reduce the level of teacher militancy in the schools.

If no relationship is found between any of the bureaucratic dimensions and teacher militancy, the need for future study of these variables would be questioned. The possibility that any, or all, of the five variables comprising bureaucracy has a direct relationship to teacher militancy would become somewhat less important in the study of administrator-teacher conflicts.

#### Organization of the Report

Chapter I has provided the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the statement of the hypotheses, definitions of terms,



and the limitations, assumptions, and significance of the study.

Chapter II will contain a review of selected literature and a development of the rationale for the hypotheses.

The sampling techniques, the data collection procedures, and the research instrumentation will be discussed in Chapter III.

Chapter IV will include the findings of the research; and the final chapter will be composed of the summary, implications of the findings, suggestions for further study, and a discussion of the research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

#### Introduction

The first part of this chapter consists of a review of the literature related to bureaucracy, the five selected dimensions of bureaucracy, professionalism, professional-bureaucratic conflict, and teacher militancy. Because of the abundance of literature, only that which was considered most salient to this study was included.

The rationale and hypotheses compose the final section of Chapter II.

#### Review of Selected Literature

##### Bureaucracy

Formal organizations emerge whenever men see the need for a collective effort to accomplish a desired goal. These organizations are established to coordinate the efforts of many for the attainment of common goals. Organizations function to elaborate upon general goals given by society at large and to determine what activities best lead to the goal attainment, and the sequence of these activities.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 26.

Coordination is a major contribution of formal organizations, and Barnard writes that a formal organization is "a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons."<sup>2</sup> This coordination involves an ordering of duties and positions, defining a hierarchy of command, which also requires administrative integration of specialized functions.<sup>3</sup>

One way of structuring formal organizations is bureaucracy. Many writers have categorized bureaucracy in different ways when writing about it as a design for formal organizations. Colloquially, the term has become synonymous with governmental inefficiency and red tape; however, the focus of this study was on bureaucracy in its classic sense, as it was set forth by Max Weber.

The theoretical analysis of the principles of bureaucracy in formal organizations by Weber has led to much thinking and research in the area. Blau, who has expanded upon Weber's theory, states that bureaucracy is "the type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals."<sup>4</sup> Five main characteristics of Weberian bureaucracy have been identified by Blau and Scott: (1) Hierarchy of Authority, (2) Specialization, (3) Rules and Regulations, (4) Impersonalization,

---

<sup>2</sup>Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), p. 73.

<sup>3</sup>Philip Selznick, "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations," A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1939), p. 20.

<sup>4</sup>Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society (New York: Random House, 1956), p. 14.

and (5) Technical Competence.<sup>5</sup>

Summarizing Weber's conceptualization of bureaucracy, Blau and Scott write:

In Weber's view, these organizing principles maximize rational decision-making and administrative efficiency. Bureaucracy, according to him, is the most efficient form of administrative organization, because experts with much experience are best qualified to make technically correct decisions, and because disciplined performance governed by abstract rules and coordinated by the authority hierarchy fosters a rational and consistent pursuit of organization objectives.<sup>6</sup>

As stated, all of the elements are interrelated and promote rationality in decision-making and efficiency in the organization. This coordination is attained by the hierarchical authority which is based on rational grounds. Weber designates this "legal authority," and states that "obedience is owed to the legally established impersonal order,"<sup>7</sup> which is stated in the form of specified rules and regulations.

Bureaucracy as a design for structuring formal organizations has been advanced because of its "technical superiority over any form of organization,"<sup>8</sup> and it optimizes such things as speed, precision, unity, strict subordination, and reduction of friction.<sup>9</sup> Business is

---

<sup>5</sup>Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 32-33.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>7</sup>Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations, A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, trans., and Talcott Parsons, ed. (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1947), p. 328.

<sup>8</sup>Max Weber, "Bureaucracy," The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies, Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1970), p. 12.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

carried on according to rules and regulations and in an impersonal manner.

As stated earlier, Weber believed all of the elements within bureaucracy to be independent, yet interrelated. However, several writers have conducted studies which raise questions concerning the idea that all bureaucratic elements are independent, and Hall suggests that the study of each of the bureaucratic dimensions should be approached as if it were a continuum.<sup>10</sup>

Udy concluded that the model of bureaucracy explained by Weber contained bureaucratic elements and rational elements and that the two groups of elements were negatively related.<sup>11</sup> Hall supported this conclusion when he found that the technical competence dimension was negatively correlated with the other bureaucratic dimensions in his study.<sup>12</sup>

More specifically, Kolesar placed the five characteristics of Weberian bureaucracy into two categories: (1) the expertise dimension, containing specialization and technical competence, and (2) the authority dimension, composed of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonality.<sup>13</sup> All of these reclassifications of Weber's

---

<sup>10</sup>Richard H. Hall, "Intraorganizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model," Administrative Science Quarterly, VII:3 (December, 1962), p. 297.

<sup>11</sup>Stanley H. Udy, Jr., "'Bureaucracy' and 'Rationality' in Weber's Organizational Theory: An Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, XXIV:6 (December, 1959), pp. 792-793.

<sup>12</sup>Hall, p. 306.

<sup>13</sup>Henry Kolesar, "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967), pp. 25-32.

bureaucratic characteristics were attempts to use his ideal type to empirically analyze formal organizations.

Gouldner believes there is one very important contradiction in Weber's theory. He states, "On the one side, it was administration based on expertise; while on the other, it was administration based on discipline."<sup>14</sup> Of this, Blau and Scott write:

Weber implies that there is no conflict between these two principles; that is, he implicitly assumes that in every disagreement between superior and subordinate, the superior's judgment is also the better judgment in terms of technical expertise. This is not a realistic assumption.<sup>14</sup>

Although there has been much criticism of parts of Weber's conceptualization of bureaucracy, most writers who study bureaucracy in formal organizations continue to employ his dimensions as their basis for study. The critics of Weber recognize his contribution to the study of formal organizations, and their criticisms have been undertaken in an attempt to refine some of his theoretical concepts. Bureaucracy is more fully discussed below, as each of the selected dimensions are reviewed separately.

#### Hierarchy of Authority

One of the characteristics of Weberian bureaucracy is that there is a hierarchy of authority, which means that there is a ". . . firmly ordered system of super- and sub-ordination in which there is a

---

<sup>14</sup>Alvin W. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954), p. 32.

<sup>15</sup>Blau and Scott, p. 35.

supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones."<sup>16</sup> Abbott illustrates how this principle has been applied to the public schools:

The typical organization chart is intended specifically to clarify lines of authority and channels of communication. Even in the absence of such a chart, school employees have a clear conception of the nature of the hierarchy in their school systems. In fact, rigid adherence to hierarchical principles has been stressed to the point that failure to adhere to recognized lines of authority is viewed as the epitome of immoral organizational behavior.<sup>17</sup>

Hierarchy of authority is usually assumed to be important in establishing programs and for coordinating the efforts of several people toward a common goal. It is recognized that this hierarchy interferes with effective communication, and may prevent information from reaching the higher levels within the organization, which can be a detriment to effective management; however, bureaucracy assumes hierarchy as a necessity in a formal organization, so this dysfunction is viewed as something which cannot be eliminated.<sup>18</sup>

Contributing to this is the idea that the person occupying the hierarchical position has authority over his subordinates, ". . . which means that he has the right to issue directives and they have the duty to obey them."<sup>19</sup> Authority, as defined by Weber and used here by Blau,

---

<sup>16</sup>Max Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, trans. and eds. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 197.

<sup>17</sup>Max G. Abbott, "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 45.

<sup>18</sup>Blau and Scott, p. 183.

<sup>19</sup>Blau, p. 29.

means ". . . the probability that a specific command will be obeyed."<sup>20</sup> A person occupying a position within the hierarchy, therefore, has authority when his commands are obeyed by his subordinates.

The person holding the hierarchical position of authority has the right to ". . . veto or affirm the organizationally directed proposals of his subordinates, subject to no appeal."<sup>21</sup> Abbott points to this characteristic as a major deterrent to educational innovation, by stating that the right to veto individual proposals is held by the superordinate, which ". . . favors the status quo and inhibits innovation from below."<sup>22</sup>

. . . Yet, in an organization which consists largely of professionals, as is the case in an educational institution, meaningful and workable innovations almost necessarily originate at the lower levels of the hierarchy.<sup>23</sup>

In a pure-type bureaucracy, it is assumed that the superordinate in the hierarchy has superior technical competence to the subordinates. Thompson writes that ". . . it is assumed that he [the superordinate] is more capable in all of his unit's activities than any of his subordinates who perform them."<sup>24</sup> Some writers, among them Blau and

---

<sup>20</sup>Max Weber, "The Three Types of Legitimate Rule," A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. 6.

<sup>21</sup>Victor A. Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, V:4 (March, 1961), p. 486.

<sup>22</sup>Abbott, pp. 46-47.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Victor A. Thompson, Modern Organizations (New York: Alfred A. Knopf and Company, 1961), p. 75.



Scott,<sup>25</sup> have questioned this. They question whether decisions made by someone because of his position within the hierarchy are compatible with decisions based on the expertise of specialists.

### Specialization

This bureaucratic dimension is characterized by the organizational activities being distributed in a fixed way throughout the organization; therefore, specialized experts can be employed for each particular position.<sup>26</sup> Each person is responsible for the performance of his duties, although he is also responsible to his superior in the hierarchy.

In industry, specialization has been referred to as the division of labor, the two terms being used interchangeably. Schools, also, have been influenced by the need for specialization, as Abbott illustrates:

The division of the school into elementary and secondary units; the establishment of science, mathematics, music, and other departments within a school; the introduction of guidance programs and psychological services; indeed, the separation of the administrative function from the teaching function, all represent responses to this need.<sup>27</sup>

This division of tasks exists in schools and both the teachers and the administrators ". . . believe in the advantages of specialization as the key to expertise."<sup>28</sup> Thompson, recognizing this, states that

---

<sup>25</sup>Blau and Scott, p. 185.

<sup>26</sup>Blau, pp. 28-29.

<sup>27</sup>Abbott, p. 44.

<sup>28</sup>Norman Robinson, "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations," Canadian Education and Research Digest, VII:1 (March, 1967), p. 35.

innovation occurs because of specialists, even though superordinate approval is necessary for legitimation.<sup>29</sup> Both teachers and administrators are trained as specialists, and their area of expertise is usually limited to their specialized areas of jurisdiction.

Specialized employees are usually thoroughly and expertly trained. Each is an expert in his area, and this permits a division of labor type of arrangement, which makes the coordination of activities of the formal organization more efficient.<sup>30</sup> Specialists, though, are subject to some degree of authority from administrators, since the latter serve the organization as coordinators of the efforts of all members of all groups within the organization.<sup>31</sup>

Teachers have been trained as specialists in particular areas and have become competent in certain socially valued functions.<sup>32</sup> They are trained professionals and have much expertise in their areas of specialization, usually a rather limited area, much as the physician is an expert in some specific area. This principle of specialization is a characteristic, then, of both professionals and bureaucratically structured organizations, as expertise is recognized by bureaucrats as an indication of specialization.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," p. 500.

<sup>30</sup>Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, p. 196.

<sup>31</sup>W. Richard Scott, "Professionals and Complex Organizations," Professionalization, Howard M. Vollner and Donald L. Mills, eds. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 273.

<sup>32</sup>Abbott, p. 44.

<sup>33</sup>Blau and Scott, p. 60.

## Rules and Regulations

This dimension of bureaucracy is concerned with the restrictions placed on participant actions by rules and regulations which are developed to help standardize the operation of formal organizations. General rules apply to particular cases to ". . . insure the uniformity of operations and, together with the authority structure, make possible the coordination of various activities."<sup>34</sup> Blau continues,

. . . Hence explicit rules and regulations define the responsibility of each member of the organization and the relationships between them. . . . It must be remembered that strict adherence to general standards in deciding specific cases characterizes not only the job of the file clerk but also that of the Supreme Court justice. . . .<sup>35</sup>

A set of rules to control and coordinate the performance of the workers is essential when tasks are subdivided, which occurs in a bureaucratic organization. These rules and regulations define the minimum level of acceptable behavior and permit the participant to adhere to these rules without being personally involved in the organization.<sup>36</sup> The rules are rather stable, relatively exhaustive, and they can be learned by the organizational participants.<sup>37</sup>

The ideal contribution of rules and regulations is to insure attainment of organizational goals and to maintain the work group as a social unit.<sup>38</sup> In addition, they perform other services for the

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>35</sup> Blau, p. 29.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, p. 198.

<sup>38</sup> March and Simon, p. 44.

organization. They give direction to participants related to their expected organizational behavior, assisting in communicating the expectations of the administration to the subordinates.<sup>39</sup>

Rules and regulations also serve to legitimate authority imposed by administrators, but Gouldner questions whether the effectiveness of a bureaucracy will be as great if these rules are imposed from above rather than agreed upon by organizational participants.<sup>40</sup> Those which are imposed could be dysfunctional to the organizational purpose.

Other possible dysfunctional consequences of bureaucratic rules and regulations have been advanced. Merton, for example, wrote that the demands for strict devotion to rules and regulations are often transformed into absolutes rather than serving as means to ends.<sup>41</sup> In addition to goal displacement as a possible dysfunctional consequence of rules and regulations, an individual may become dependent on these rules. Because he is responsible for the activities at his particular level within the organization, a person may adhere strictly to the rules so his defense against criticism from above will be stronger.<sup>42</sup> As well, to overcome outside pressures placed upon him, the employee may use the organizational rules for his defense.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>James G. Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority," Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter, 1966, p. 13.

<sup>40</sup>Gouldner, p. 20.

<sup>41</sup>Robert K. Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. 53.

<sup>42</sup>Anderson, p. 23.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

Because of the possible dysfunctions of rules and regulations, Anderson says that one of the most critical problems of a bureaucracy is that of maintaining an orientation ". . . midway between a rigid adherence to formal rules and the unlimited exercise of discretion. . ." so there may be enough flexibility in the organization to ". . . deal with individual problems and to accomplish the organizational goals."<sup>44</sup>

### Impersonalization

Certain bureaucratic rules may be utilized by the organization to assist in implementing the impersonalization dimension of bureaucracy. Organizational decisions must not be based on any personal feelings the official has toward his subordinate if this dimension is adhered to, and an "ideal official conducts his office . . . in a spirit of . . . impersonality. . . ."<sup>45</sup> Weber believed that impersonalization is necessary to prevent distortion of rational judgment by officials, who are ". . . expected to assume an impersonal orientation in their contacts with clients and with other officials."<sup>46</sup> Clients and subordinates are to be treated as cases, regardless of personal consideration. Expanding on this dimension, Blau writes:

For rational standards to govern operations without interference from personal considerations, a detached approach must prevail within the organization and especially toward clients. . . . The exclusion of personal considerations from official business is a prerequisite for impartiality as well as for efficiency. . . . The official who does not maintain social distance and becomes personally

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>45</sup>Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations, p. 340.

<sup>46</sup>Blau and Scott, p. 33.

interested in the cases of his clients tends to be partial in his treatment of them, favoring those he likes over others. . . .<sup>47</sup>

In the pure-type bureaucracy, there would be no personal considerations, but "no organization can be completely rational."<sup>48</sup> Individual personalities enter into organizational decisions, regardless of attempts by complex organizations to structure themselves to the contrary. As long as people are working together in a formal organization, there will be some degree of interpersonal relationships, of which Getzels identifies two types: universalistic and particularistic.<sup>49</sup>

In a universalistic relationship, ". . . emotional considerations are secondary to functional ones. . ." and ". . . rights and obligations are determined on the basis of impersonal rather than personal factors."<sup>50</sup> The alternative to this is particularism, which reverses the above. The emphasis in a particularistic relationship is upon who is involved; whereas, in the universalistic relationship, it is upon what is involved.<sup>51</sup>

The research related to industry<sup>52</sup> indicates that particularism is more important at the lower levels of the hierarchy, but Getzels states that teachers cannot accept this sort of relationship with the

---

<sup>47</sup>Blau, p. 30.

<sup>48</sup>Anderson, p. 12.

<sup>49</sup>J. W. Getzels, "A Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration," The Harvard Educational Review, XXII:4 (Fall, 1952), p. 240.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

<sup>52</sup>Gouldner, pp. 184-189.

administrators.<sup>53</sup> The teachers, then, must advocate a universalistic relationship between themselves and the administrators. A similar relationship may develop between teachers and students or parents, and teachers may resort to behavior which is not adaptable to individual problems.<sup>54</sup> In other words, the impersonal treatment of all organizational participants is designed to bring about equity, and Robinson states that a school organized on a bureaucratic structure will be "good" when it operates

. . . on the basis that every person in the organization (administrators, teachers, pupils and parents) is to receive exactly the same kind of treatment, and that no personal feelings should have an effect on working relationships between teachers, administrators, students, and parents.<sup>55</sup>

#### Technical Competence

Employment and advancement in a bureaucratic organization are based upon the technical competence of the applicant or participant. Usually the person devotes full-time to his employment and ". . . tenure for life is presupposed. . . ."<sup>56</sup> The assignment of roles occurs on the basis of technical qualifications, ascertained through formalized, impersonal procedures.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>Getzels, p. 240.

<sup>54</sup>Anderson, p. 22.

<sup>55</sup>Norman Robinson, "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966), p. 152

<sup>56</sup>Weber, "Bureaucracy," p. 9.

<sup>57</sup>Merton, p. 49.

In a bureaucratically structured formal organization ". . . career advancements are 'according to seniority or to achievement, or both'."<sup>58</sup> Appointments and advancements are made from a technical point of view because the person selected to occupy the position receives the appointment as a result of functional considerations.<sup>59</sup> A person is expected to have the technical qualifications for his position and to learn the rules of his office as a part of his official responsibility. He is rewarded through such things as promotions if he is technically competent.

Formal organizations value loyalty also, but realize the irrationality of promotion based entirely upon loyalty. "Organizational concern with the skill and competence of its personnel exerts pressure against evaluating them in terms of loyalty."<sup>60</sup> Hall found that executives placed more emphasis on merit-based hiring and promotion than did nonexecutives, for which he offered two possible explanations. One is that the executives, through observation of promotions, see that those promoted have ". . . training and capabilities superior to those not promoted."<sup>61</sup> The other possible explanation is that the executives believe that ". . . they are better qualified than the nonexecutives and have attained their position solely on the basis of merit, when

---

<sup>58</sup>Blau and Scott, p. 33, quoted from From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Trans. and eds. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 334.

<sup>59</sup>Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, p. 201.

<sup>60</sup>Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles-I," Administrative Science Quarterly, II:3 (December, 1967), p. 291.

<sup>61</sup>Hall, "Intraorganizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model," p. 306.



other factors not related to merit may have been involved."<sup>62</sup>

Organizational rationality prohibits initial employment or promotion based solely upon loyalty, which would also violate the bureaucratic demand for impersonalization. Rather, promotion is based upon the technical competence shown by the employees.

### Professionalism

Professionalism results from improved technical training and permits the employee to exhibit a higher degree of occupational competence, which increases his discretionary skills.<sup>63</sup> This is one explanation for the rise in professionalism among teachers, and Boyan's analysis of the situation agrees, to a great degree:

Teachers bring to their work increased levels of preparation and expertise. The availability of new and enlarged . . . resources has spurred them to pursue continuous upgrading of their professional preparation.<sup>64</sup>

The professional derives his skills and expertise from knowledge based on systematic theory. He must be able to resolve disputes which arise related to his area of knowledge; in other words, he is the final judge in his area of expertise.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Gerald D. Bell, "Formality Versus Flexibility in Complex Organizations," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 73.

<sup>64</sup>Norman J. Boyan, "The Emergent Role of the Teacher in the Authority Structure of the School," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 202.

<sup>65</sup>Ernest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession," Social Work, II (July, 1957), pp. 45-46.

Professionals must also diagnose the needs of their clients, and clients should not be permitted to diagnose their own needs. This indicates a service orientation that is based on client interest, which professionals display.<sup>66</sup>

The authority of the professional is reinforced by the organizations to which he belongs. The peer organizations to which teachers belong have pressed teachers to act more like professionals and to "aspire to professional-level social and economic rewards,"<sup>67</sup> something that teachers have not done in the past.

These, then, are the distinguishing characteristics of a profession: (1) prolonged, specialized training in a body of abstract knowledge, and (2) a collectivity with a service orientation.<sup>68</sup> That teachers are becoming more professional is evidenced by a rise in the second characteristic above: There is a stronger collectivity among teachers, as can be seen by the increasing number of collective negotiations between teachers and boards of education.

#### Professional-Bureaucratic Conflict

That teachers are becoming more professional was indicated above and that schools are structured bureaucratically was also shown. Thus, there are professionals working in bureaucratically structured organizations, which could possibly lead to conflict. Although both professionals and bureaucrats advocate some similar organizational

---

<sup>66</sup>William Goode, "The Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?" Library Quarterly, XXXI (October, 1961), p. 312.

<sup>67</sup>Boyan, p. 201.

<sup>68</sup>Goode, pp. 306-320.

characteristics, there also seems to be some disagreement relative to certain characteristics.

One possible conflict-producing difference comes from the different manner in which authority is granted in bureaucracies and in professional organizations. The bureaucrat obtains his authority because of the office he holds; whereas, the professional grants authority to the person with the greater knowledge in the area.<sup>69</sup> The role of each individual is determined by the organizational hierarchy, which may lead to conflicts between the professional and the bureaucratic organization.<sup>70</sup> Of this, Getzels and Guba write:

Role-personality conflicts occur as a function of discrepancies between the pattern of expectations attaching to a given role and the pattern of need-dispositions characteristic of the incumbent of the role.<sup>71</sup>

The administrator is placed in a unique position of trying to achieve the desired goals of the bureaucratic organization through the use of professionals; thus, he attempts to reduce the role-personality conflict.<sup>72</sup> That bureaucratic and professional roles do conflict was found by Corwin in his study of nursing. Nurses who subscribed to both roles simultaneously were found to be less able to comply with their

---

<sup>69</sup>Ronald G. Corwin, "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.), p. 217.

<sup>70</sup>Victor A. Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," p. 486.

<sup>71</sup>J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, Winter, 1957, p. 431.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., pp. 435-439.

ideal roles than those subscribing to only one major role.<sup>73</sup>

Thompson believes that a conflict may arise because the personal goals of the specialist may be in contrast with the organizational goals.<sup>74</sup> The organization may not have utilized the individual's expertise in a manner conducive to that individual's personal goals. In other words, the division of labor dimension of bureaucracy does not seem to conflict with professional demands for specialization, and conflict would be more likely to result in organizations which did not adhere to specialization.

The bureaucratic structure puts pressure on its role incumbents to be methodical and disciplined in order to achieve "precision, efficiency, and reliability."<sup>75</sup> The professional, on the other hand, resists individual categorization of himself or of his clients, as shown below:

An over emphasis on rules and regulations is viewed by the professional as a utilization of means which serves to undermine the major goal activity as it pertains to his professional pursuits.<sup>76</sup>

The bureaucratic worker in industry is required to complete a certain task, and has no rational basis for making decisions related to objectives or means. Contrastingly, the professional has attained knowledge and skills that allow him to perform the entire task, and he

---

<sup>73</sup>Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965), p. 231.

<sup>74</sup>Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," pp. 488-490.

<sup>75</sup>Edwin M. Bridges, "Bureaucratic Role and Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Elementary Principal," Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring, 1965, p. 24.

<sup>76</sup>Robinson, "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations," p. 37.

expects to accept the responsibility for his actions. The professional who works in a bureaucracy, however, must sacrifice some of his autonomy and conform to some set of organizational standards.<sup>77</sup>

One of the dysfunctional consequences of rules and regulations is that often those which were introduced as means become ends.<sup>78</sup> Those people in authority positions may become so involved in enforcing the rules that the rules prohibit goal attainment. When the professional feels that adherence to these rules is in violation of the norms of his professional group, he may rebel.<sup>79</sup>

The rules also attempt to enforce impersonalization which prevents outside influence on the performance of the organization because of established standards for dealing with people,<sup>80</sup> which is contrary to the philosophy of recognizing individual differences espoused by teachers. Teachers may, because of strict adherence to rules, develop rigid patterns for dealing with students and parents; and impersonality may ". . . pervade this relationship."<sup>81</sup>

Both Anderson and Litwak believe impersonalization between teachers and clients to be dysfunctional. Litwak writes,

The capacity to motivate others to work, to cooperate, and to communicate with others . . . might well increase,

---

<sup>77</sup>Scott, pp. 269-270.

<sup>78</sup>Anderson, p. 17.

<sup>79</sup>Scott, pp. 270-271.

<sup>80</sup>Eugene Litwak, "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 85.

<sup>81</sup>Anderson, p. 22.

not decrease, as a consequence of positive emotional involvement.<sup>82</sup>

Robinson, contrary to his hypothesis, found highly professional teachers to have a desire for impersonality. He explained this finding by stating that impersonality is an extremely complex concept because it

. . . relates to relationships between superordinates and subordinates, the practitioner and his clients, and to relationships between members of the organization at similar levels of the organizational hierarchical ladder.<sup>83</sup>

Equally surprising, Moeller found that bureaucratic rules actually helped to increase the teachers' sense of power.<sup>84</sup> Similarly, Hearn found no relationship to exist between teachers' sense of alienation and the structure of the school system.<sup>85</sup> These findings seem to indicate that all bureaucratic structure does not cause conflict, but it is when this structure interferes with professional standards that conflict arises.

#### Teacher Militancy

Closely tied to the growing professionalism among teachers and to the professional-bureaucratic conflict is teacher militancy, as evidenced by the following statement: "Today, to be professional, one

---

<sup>82</sup>Litwak, p. 84.

<sup>83</sup>Robinson, "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations," p. 42.

<sup>84</sup>Gerald H. Moeller, "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," Administrator's Notebook, XI:3 (November, 1962), p. 1.

<sup>85</sup>James J. Hearn, "Teachers' Sense of Alienation With Respect to School System Structure," Phi Delta Kappan, LII:5 (January, 1971), p. 312.

must be militant."<sup>86</sup> Although this is an exaggerated statement, it serves to illustrate the growth of militancy among teachers in recent years. Teachers have become more militant for a number of reasons, one being that they have a sincere interest in how the child is educated.<sup>87</sup> Another, and perhaps the most important, reason for the increase in militancy is the "lack of machinery for resolving the conflict of bureaucratic and professional authority."<sup>88</sup>

Teachers are frustrated professionals. They are frustrated because they desire more freedom to teach, because of poor teaching-learning conditions, and because of low salaries.<sup>89</sup> In addition, the increased competency of teachers, which is a result of better preparation, creates frustration. They resent being forced to teach under conditions which are not commensurate with their qualifications.<sup>90</sup>

Teachers also become frustrated with the public, which gives lip service to public schools, but does not give education the financial support it deserves. In Oklahoma, for example, voters twice within one year refused to increase school support.<sup>91</sup> The reason was not that good schools were not desired by the people, but rather that they were unwilling to pay for them.

---

<sup>86</sup> Seymour Evans, "Teacher Militancy: The Responsibility of Power," The ISR Journal, I (Spring, 1969), p. 131.

<sup>87</sup> John W. Brubacher, "Why Teacher Militancy?" Educational Leadership, XXVII:1 (October, 1969), p. 30.

<sup>88</sup> Boyan, p. 202.

<sup>89</sup> Richard D. Batchelder, "Today's Militant Teachers," NEA Journal, LIV:6 (September, 1965), p. 18.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

All of these frustrations have contributed to the militancy which teachers have shown. Teachers want an increasing involvement in making decisions affecting the schools, and they have become more strongly united within their professional organizations seeking this end.

In a three year study sponsored by the Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education, Corwin investigated several aspects of staff conflicts in the public schools.<sup>92</sup> He saw the increasing teacher professionalism as a major contributor to teacher-administrator conflicts because teachers were infringing upon the traditional rights of lay boards and administrators.<sup>93</sup> He based this conclusion upon his finding that the more professionally oriented teachers were inclined to be more militant than those showing less professional orientation.<sup>94</sup>

Teachers, as they have become more professional, have sought to obtain more influence and control over educational decision-making; and as the teachers have tried to gain this influence, the boards and administrators have found themselves in conflict with the teachers.<sup>95</sup> In addition, teachers desire, as do all professionals, some degree of autonomy; but to increase their autonomy, they must challenge the

---

<sup>92</sup> Ronald G. Corwin, The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, Cooperative Research Project No. 1934 (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1963).

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., pp. 170-202.

<sup>94</sup> Corwin, A Sociology of Education, pp. 30-31.

<sup>95</sup> Wayne J. Urban, "Militancy and the Profession," Educational Leadership, XXVI:4 (January, 1969), pp. 344-346.



people who are in control.<sup>96</sup> If these authorities do not release their hold voluntarily, the profession "will defy them by objecting, criticizing, or by legal action and more ambitious forms of militancy."<sup>97</sup>

There may be, therefore, many contributors to the rise in teacher militancy, and one of these alternatives is conflict between the bureaucratically structured school and the professional teacher working in that organization.

### Rationale and Hypotheses

The hierarchy of authority dimension of bureaucracy is the extent to which the organization has prestructured the location of decision-making.<sup>98</sup> Such writers as Etzioni, Thompson, and others have pointed toward possible conflict between those who occupy the positions of authority and those professionals who work in the organizations. Etzioni was writing of this possible conflict when he wrote:

Administration assumes a power hierarchy. Without a clear ordering of higher and lower in rank, in which the higher in rank have more power than the lower ones and hence can control and coordinate the latter's activities, the basic principle of administration is violated; the organization ceases to be a coordinated tool. However, knowledge is largely an individual property: Unlike other organizational means, it cannot be transferred from one person to another by decree. Creativity is basically individual and can only to a very limited degree be ordered and coordinated by the superior

---

<sup>96</sup>Ronald G. Corwin, Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, Cooperative Research Project No. 2637 (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1966), p. 46.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid.

<sup>98</sup>Richard H. Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," Administrative Science Quarterly, XII:3 (December, 1967), p. 465.

rank. . . . Only if immune from ordinary social pressures and free to innovate, to experiment, to take risks without the usual social repercussions of failure, can a professional carry out his work effectively.<sup>99</sup>

The professional may be in conflict with the organizational hierarchy. Thompson takes a very similar position when he writes that innovative or creative ideas espoused by the professional are subject to hierarchical veto.<sup>100</sup> Teachers may often times be prevented from enacting new ideas because of vetoes from those in higher hierarchical positions.

Teachers are resisting the hierarchy of authority in the school organization, as evidenced by this statement by Boyan:

. . . They [teachers] also question the whole of the existing authority structure and its limitations on their opportunities to influence decisions on all organizational matters, not just decisions on educational program.<sup>101</sup>

In addition, Trask, in her study related to supervision, found that teachers adhere to autonomy; and from this, concluded that they would oppose supervision of their performance. However, at the same time she found the superintendents demanded that their subordinates, the principals, supervise the teachers.<sup>102</sup> Here, those in authority positions are forcing unfavorable situations upon professionals.

---

<sup>99</sup> Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 70.

<sup>100</sup> Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," p. 487.

<sup>101</sup> Boyan, p. 205.

<sup>102</sup> Anne E. Trask, "Principals, Teachers and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions," Administrator's Notebook, XIII:4 (December, 1964), p. 2.

Another area for possible conflict is pointed to by Argyris:

. . . Most human problems in organizations arise because relatively healthy people in our culture are asked to participate in work situations which coerce them to be dependent, subordinate, submissive, to use few of their more than skin-surface abilities.<sup>103</sup>

He further states that when these healthy people face dependence, subordination, and submissiveness, they often become frustrated. This, he writes, ". . . leads to regression, aggression, and tension. These in turn lead to conflict."<sup>104</sup>

Teachers, then, would appear to come into conflict with bureaucratic organizations if these organizations force them to be subordinate and submissive. Also, there appears to be a conflict between professionals and bureaucrats about who should make many decisions. Finally, the incidents used in constructing the measure of teacher militancy were based on actual conflicts between teachers and administrators;<sup>105</sup> therefore, it appeared that teachers would be more likely to take initiative action regarding administrative demands if they found themselves in opposition to the demands. It was therefore hypothesized that

H.1. Teachers perceiving a high degree of hierarchy of authority in the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

---

<sup>103</sup>Chris Argyris, "Individual Actualization in Complex Organizations," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 190.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid.

<sup>105</sup>Corwin, Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, p. 142.

The organization divides the work tasks based upon functional specialization, or a division of labor. Weber said that this division of labor would promote expertness and efficiency in an organization.<sup>106</sup> A similar belief is held by professionals, and each professional is trained as an expert in his area of specialization and is expected to deal with problems in that area with a great deal of expertise.<sup>107</sup>

Abbott mentions the division of schools into elementary and secondary units and the departmentalization of subject matter areas as characteristics of the specialization dimension of bureaucracy.<sup>108</sup> Schools adhere to this dimension of bureaucracy as long as ". . . staff members are assigned to the subject matter areas or grade levels for which their specialized training and experience have equipped them."<sup>109</sup>

Teachers have been trained as specialists in particular areas and have become competent in certain socially valued functions.<sup>110</sup> It would seem that the only time a conflict would be found to exist in a school setting, relative to the area of specialization, would be when the school failed to recognize the teacher's areas of specialization, in relation to such things as class assignment or extra-curricular activity assignment. As no conflict would appear to exist between administrators and teachers in relation to specialization, and as both

---

<sup>106</sup>Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, p. 196.

<sup>107</sup>Blau and Scott, p. 60.

<sup>108</sup>Abbott, p. 46.

<sup>109</sup>Robinson, "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations," p. 38.

<sup>110</sup>Abbott, p. 46.

"... believe in the advantages of specialization as it is the key to expertise,"<sup>111</sup> it was hypothesized that

- H.2. Teachers perceiving a low degree of adherence to specialization within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

It has been suggested that the control of the behavior of organizational members is aided by the presence of rules and regulations, which specify the degree to which this behavior is subject to organizational control and the extent to which organizationally defined procedures must be followed.<sup>112</sup>

Organizational decisions involve the determination of ends as well as the means to achieve those ends. The means are determined by persons dominated by the organizational ends instead of personal ends. The decisions are a deliberate adoption of means to ends.<sup>113</sup> The adoption of the means for achieving the organizational goals involves the application of the rules and regulations established by the organization.

In his pure-type, Weber thought that rules and regulations would lead to goal attainment in the most rational manner possible.<sup>114</sup> However, Merton observes that rules and regulations may inhibit goal attainment instead:

---

<sup>111</sup>Robinson, "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations," p. 35.

<sup>112</sup>Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," p. 465.

<sup>113</sup>Barnard, pp. 184-186.

<sup>114</sup>Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, pp. 330-331.

1. An effective bureaucracy demands reliability of response and strict devotion to regulations.
2. Such devotion to the rules leads to their transformation into absolutes; they are no longer conceived as relative to a set of purposes.
3. This interferes with ready adaptation under special conditions not clearly envisaged by those who drew up the general rules.<sup>115</sup>

Professionals view rules and regulations more like Merton than Weber. They act because they believe the act to be the right one, but ". . . The ultimate justification of an administrative act . . . is that it is in line with the organization's rules and regulations . . . ." <sup>116</sup>

The professional comes into an organization equipped with a set of standards established by his peer group, and often times, the standards do not coincide with the bureaucratic procedures.<sup>117</sup> Hall, realizing this, suggests that ". . . as a group becomes more professional, conflict with the organization will increase unless the organization lessens organizationally based control systems."<sup>118</sup> His argument is that an equilibrium must be achieved between the professional norm and the ". . . level of organizationally generated norms of bureaucracy,"<sup>119</sup>

Teachers often face this problem because ". . . that which is to be learned by the students and the means by which the learning is to

---

<sup>115</sup>Merton, p. 53.

<sup>116</sup>Etzioni, p. 71.

<sup>117</sup>Scott, p. 272.

<sup>118</sup>Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," p. 476.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid.

be accomplished . . ." are organizational givens.<sup>120</sup> This is in conflict with two professional characteristics stated by MacKay: adaptability and the desire for behavioral alternatives, in contrast to the organizational demand for defined procedures and specified behavior, rules and regulations.<sup>121</sup>

Based on the idea that professionals do not desire the bureaucratic rules and regulations, and because teachers tend to initiate action to overcome administrative decisions with which they disagree,<sup>122</sup> it was hypothesized that

H.3. Teachers perceiving a high degree of adherence to rules and regulations within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

There appear to be many facets of impersonalization involved in the school setting. It pervades all levels of the organization and affects both the interpersonal interaction between teachers and superiors and interaction between teachers and pupils. Individual qualities are ignored when dealing with either members of the organization or outsiders if the concept of impersonalization is practiced.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup>J. W. Getzels and Herbert A. Thelen, "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System," The Dynamics of Instructional Groups (NSSE Yearbook), LIX:2, 52.

<sup>121</sup>D. A. MacKay, "Using Professional Talent in a School Organization," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), pp. 230-231.

<sup>122</sup>Corwin, Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, p. 142.

<sup>123</sup>Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," p. 465.

As students are the most important aspect of the teacher's work, ". . . they should account for many of the successes and good feelings that teachers have."<sup>124</sup> If a poor relationship exists between teachers and students, there is a greater probability of teacher dissatisfaction, so good interpersonal relations are desirable.<sup>125</sup>

That teachers desire to stress the individual person rather than adhere to the bureaucratic demand for impersonalization was discussed by MacKay, who pointed to this as one area of possible conflict between professionals and administrators.<sup>126</sup>

Bureaucrats demand impersonalization, emphasizing that personal conditions must not interfere with the operations of the organization, and that ". . . a detached approach must prevail within the organization and especially toward clients."<sup>127</sup> However,

. . . The impersonal treatment of affairs which are at times of great personal significance to the client gives rise to the charge of 'arrogance' and 'haughtiness' of the bureaucrat.<sup>128</sup>

Similarly, Litwak believes that more personal involvement is necessary in organizations dealing with social skills than is allowed in Weberian bureaucracy.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup>Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers," Organizations and Human Behavior, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 257.

<sup>125</sup>Ibid,

<sup>126</sup>MacKay, p. 230.

<sup>127</sup>Blau, p. 30.

<sup>128</sup>Merton, p. 55.

<sup>129</sup>Litwak, p. 84.



If teachers adhere to rigid impersonalization in dealing with students or parents, the teachers ". . . may begin to develop categories . . ." regarding them, which is contrary to the philosophy that recognizes individual differences so often expressed by teachers.<sup>130</sup>

It appears that teachers would desire more interpersonal relations with their clients, and Robinson states that there is evidence to indicate that teachers do not desire impersonality between themselves and their principal.<sup>131</sup> Because of this apparent conflict between teachers, who desire interpersonal relationships, and administrators, who stress impersonalization, the behavior of the teacher is likely to be that of taking initiative to overcome the conflict. Therefore, it was hypothesized that

H.4. Teachers perceiving a high degree of impersonalization in the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

It has been asserted that both professionals and bureaucrats advocate a high level of technical competence within the organization.<sup>132</sup> This dimension of bureaucracy refers to the organization's policy for recruitment and career advancement being based upon the competence of the individual.<sup>133</sup>

That schools attempt to meet this bureaucratic requirement is illustrated by Abbott's statement that employment in school ". . . has

---

<sup>130</sup>Anderson, p. 22.

<sup>131</sup>Robinson, "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations," p. 42.

<sup>132</sup>McKay, p. 230.

<sup>133</sup>Robinson, "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations," p. 29.

been based upon technical competence and has constituted for most members a professional career."<sup>134</sup> The teacher and the administrator both achieve status because of technical competence, as indicated by Hall:

On this dimension, it would appear that a higher level of bureaucratization or more emphasis on technical competence would be quite compatible with professional standards in that the practitioner is selected for employment and advancement on the basis of ability. In this case, the real source of conflict for someone employed in a professional department would be the use of criteria other than performance in personnel policies.<sup>135</sup>

Teachers are recognized for promotion and prestigious assignments based upon such criteria as qualifications and their past teaching performance, which is the basis for the technical competence dimension of bureaucracy to be applied to the school. That both teachers and administrators are desirous of this dimension is illustrated by MacKay:

Teachers and principals hold as a kind of occupational norm, that competence . . . is desirable and worthwhile; therefore, administrators who emphasize professionalism in their schools and systems are at least attempting to meet the needs of their staff members.<sup>136</sup>

As both professionals and bureaucrats adhere to the idea of recruitment and advancement based upon some designated criteria, there appears to be no conflict between teachers and administrators. Based upon the above, hypothesis number five was that:

---

<sup>134</sup>Abbott, p. 45.

<sup>135</sup>Hall, "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship," pp. 476-477.

<sup>136</sup>D. A. MacKay, "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relations to the Characteristics of School Organizations (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964), p. 172.

H.5. Teachers perceiving a low degree of adherence to technical competence within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### Introduction

The purpose of Chapter III is to describe the research techniques used in the study. More specifically, the chapter includes a description of the sample, the method of data collection, a description of the instruments employed, and the statistical procedures used.

#### The Sample

The ten secondary school faculties which were asked to participate in this study were randomly selected from a total of twenty-seven public secondary school faculties in Oklahoma which met two criteria: all were in districts that held membership in the Oklahoma Public School Research Council, and each school had at least thirty faculty members. The secondary schools contained either grades nine or ten through twelve.

The ten faculties which were selected represented eight different districts, and the total faculty per school ranged from thirty to eighty-nine. The total pool of possible subjects in these ten schools was 579; the sample which participated by returning usable responses was 375 (65 percent). Three unusable responses were also received. In some cases, parts of the requested biographical data were omitted from

the responses, but the responses to the instruments were complete; therefore, they were included in the data analysis.

#### Data Collection

Because of administrative policies of three of the participating districts, the research instruments were administered in slightly different methods in two groups composed of five schools each. In one group, the researcher attended a faculty meeting where the study was explained, and instructions were given for responding to the instruments. An attempt was made to contact those teachers who did not attend the faculty meeting, but who were at school that day. When contacted, they were given, on an individual basis, the same instructions that were given in the faculty meeting. The respondents were asked to return the completed instruments to the researcher either during the day or by mail.

The faculty members in the other five schools were asked to participate via the school mail. They received the instruments, answer sheets, instructions, and a letter explaining the study. The instructions given were similar to those given verbally to the faculty members of the other schools. All responses of these faculty members were returned by U. S. mail. The teachers in these schools received a letter or memorandum asking the ones who had not yet completed the instruments to do so.

Both the school with the highest percentage of returns (94 percent) and the school with the lowest percentage of returns (55 percent) were in the group where the researcher visited a faculty meeting to describe the research. Of the teachers in the group of schools visited

by the researcher, 68 percent of 262, or 177, returned usable responses. Of the teachers in the group of schools not visited by the researcher, 62 percent of 317, or 198, returned usable responses. The response from the total sample was 65 percent.

An F test for homogeneity of variance was conducted between the responses to The Way You See It of the two groups of teacher respondents to ascertain if, in fact, the two groups came from the same population. The obtained F of 1.40 was found not to be significant at the .02 level of significance; therefore, it was concluded that the variances were homogeneous.<sup>1</sup>

Another precaution was taken to assure that the difference in collection methods did not have an adverse effect on the responses. The multiple correlation coefficient relating teacher militancy, hierarchy of authority, specialization, rules and regulations, impersonalization, and technical competence was obtained for each group of five schools. Both coefficients of multiple correlation were found to be significant beyond the .05 level. From the F test and the comparison of the R's, it was concluded that the dual methods of data collection had no contaminating effect upon the data which were utilized in testing the stated hypotheses.

---

<sup>1</sup>W. James Popham, Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), pp. 145-147.

## Instrumentation

The Measurement of Teacher Militancy

The Way You See It was developed by Corwin<sup>2</sup> for the purpose of measuring teacher militancy within the schools. The scale consists of eleven hypothetical situations which could potentially cause conflict between administrator and teacher. Although all eleven are hypothetical, they are based upon real situations which have been reported. It was designed to determine the extent to which a teacher would initiate action as a result of some action by a superior, or comply with the action of the superior. One of these hypothetical situations follows:

The administration requested teachers not to use a standard textbook in American Government because it was "socialistically" inclined. A history teacher felt that the book was the best available and proceeded to submit an order for it.<sup>3</sup>

The respondent is then asked, "What would you do in the situation described above?"<sup>4</sup> There are six possible responses to this which range from high compliance, "Comply with superior's request,"<sup>5</sup> to high initiative, "Quit the job."<sup>6</sup> The responses are scored one through six, with the higher score indicating more militancy.

---

<sup>2</sup>Ronald G. Corwin, Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, Cooperative Research Project No. 2637 (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1966), p. 142.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 489.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

The split-half reliability was found to be  $r=.74$  on Corwin's sample; it was calculated to be above  $r_n=.85$  when corrected by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula. Too, "the total respondent scores for each part of the 11 items are internally consistent using critical ratio and scale value difference methods."<sup>7</sup>

#### The Measurement of Bureaucracy

The instrument used to measure the level of each of the dimensions of bureaucracy, as perceived by the teacher respondents, was the School Organizational Inventory. This instrument was named the Organizational Inventory by Hall, who developed it to measure the dimensions of bureaucracy in commercial and governmental organizations.<sup>8</sup> MacKay<sup>9</sup> adapted the Hall instrument for use in schools, and the instrument used in this study was a modification by Robinson, who renamed it the School Organizational Inventory.<sup>10</sup>

Hall's instrument was developed to measure six dimensions of bureaucracy, and the total bureaucratization score for an organization was a summation of the six subscales, which were (1) Hierarchy of Authority, (2) Specialization, (3) Rules for Members, (4) Procedural

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 143.

<sup>8</sup>D. A. MacKay, "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relations to the Characteristics of School Organizations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964), p. 46.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Norman Robinson, "A Study of the Professional Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).



Specifications, (5) Impersonality, and (6) Technical Competence. For use in this research, the rules for members and procedural specifications subscales were combined to form the rules and regulations dimension of bureaucracy. To insure that the reliability of the subscale was maintained, an odd-even reliability coefficient was obtained. The Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was applied to this obtained coefficient, and a reliability coefficient of  $r=.82$  was obtained.<sup>11</sup>

Each subscale consisted of ten items except scale one, which had twelve.<sup>12</sup> The Spearman-Brown formula for split-half reliability was applied and the reliability coefficients for the six subscales ranged from  $r=.80$  to  $r=.90$ .<sup>13</sup>

Hall validated the instrument in the following manner: He selected organizations for his study which were judged to be at the extremes, high or low, on at least one of the six dimensions of bureaucracy. A two-tailed t-test indicated that a relationship between the subscale score and the estimated degree of bureaucratization existed and was significant at the .05 level.<sup>14</sup>

Adapting Hall's sixty-two item Organizational Inventory for use in schools was accomplished by MacKay who substituted educational terminology for that which was specific to commercial or governmental settings. However, he did not change any of the major concepts which

---

<sup>11</sup>Robert L. Thorndike and Elizabeth Hagen, Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969), pp. 182-185.

<sup>12</sup>Robinson, p. 30.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

had been developed. In refining the instrument, MacKay found the technical competence dimension to be significantly and negatively correlated with four of the other scales. From this he concluded that this dimension measured some different phenomenon within bureaucracy than the other dimensions.<sup>15</sup>

In an attempt to improve the clarity of the instrument for use in the schools, Robinson rewrote some of the items. While doing this, he also tested the subscales for internal consistency and the items for discriminating power. He reduced the number of items to 48 and concluded that his improvements increased the discriminating power of the items. Robinson found that his refinements increased the correlational value between each item of the subscale and the total subscale scores.<sup>16</sup>

In addition, Robinson confirmed MacKay's findings that technical competence and specialization were positively related and that the other dimensions--hierarchy of authority, rules for members, procedural specifications, and impersonality--were positively related. He also found that the first two and last four dimensions were significantly related in a negative direction.<sup>17</sup>

Later, Punch made a similar finding in his study.<sup>18</sup> He concluded that technical competence and specialization were measuring some other element of organizational life than were hierarchy of authority,

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Keith Francis Punch, "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationship to Leader Behavior: An Empirical Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1967), pp. 192-197.

procedural specifications, rules for members, and impersonality. In this study, the entire School Organizational Inventory was used to measure five bureaucratic dimensions: hierarchy of authority, specialization, rules and regulations, impersonalization, and technical competence.

#### Statistical Treatment

The responses to the instruments were transferred to data cards and were scored by computer. The score on each of the five subscales of the School Organizational Inventory was then correlated with the total score on The Way You See It to obtain a multiple correlation coefficient.

The multiple and the partial correlational coefficients were obtained through the use of a multiple regression computer program. The program was developed by the UCLA Health Sciences Computing Facility and was used in the Oklahoma State University Computer Center.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of Chapter IV is to present the data that were collected to test the hypotheses stated in Chapter II. Each of the five hypotheses was tested by the multiple and partial correlational techniques described in Chapter III. The total subscale scores on the School Organizational Inventory and the total score on The Way You See It were used to compute the correlation coefficients.

Each of the five hypotheses are discussed in the first part of this chapter, and the partial correlation coefficients relative to the hypotheses are presented in tabular form. Following that, the multiple correlation coefficient is presented and discussed, and the correlation matrix presented. The correlations between the subscales of the School Organizational Inventory are discussed, and the final section of the chapter will present the supplementary data which were collected.

#### Hypothesis One

- H.1. Teachers perceiving a high degree of hierarchy of authority in the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

The partial correlation coefficient between the teachers' total scores on the hierarchy of authority subscale and teacher militancy, as

shown in Table I, was  $r_{12} = -.047$ . To be statistically significant at the required .05 level, a correlation coefficient of  $r = .102$  is required when there are 374 degrees of freedom. The hypothesis was not supported, and the negative correlation coefficient did not indicate a significant relationship.

TABLE I  
PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

Variables	Correlation
Teacher Militancy and Hierarchy of Authority	$r_{12} = -.047$
Teacher Militancy and Specialization	$r_{13} = -.209^{**}$
Teacher Militancy and Rules and Regulations	$r_{14} = -.092$
Teacher Militancy and Impersonalization	$r_{15} = -.002$
Teacher Militancy and Technical Competence	$r_{16} = -.110^*$

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

N = 375

#### Hypothesis Two

- H.2. Teachers perceiving a low degree of adherence to specialization within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

The coefficient of partial correlation between the respondents' scores on the specialization subscale and the total score on teacher militancy was found to be  $r_{13} = -.209$ . This obtained correlation coefficient was significant beyond the  $r = .133$  required for significance at the .01 level with 374 degrees of freedom.

The hypothesis was supported as the correlation coefficient indicated a negative relationship significant beyond the .01 level between specialization and teacher militancy.

#### Hypothesis Three

- H.3. Teachers perceiving a high degree of adherence to rules and regulations within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

The obtained correlation coefficient between predictor variable three, rules and regulations, and the criterion variable, teacher militancy, was found to be  $r_{14} = -.092$ , as reported in Table I. The required correlation coefficient at degrees of freedom = 374 and the .05 level of significance was  $r = .102$ ; thus, hypothesis three was rejected. Although there was a negative correlation coefficient between rules and regulations and teacher militancy, it did not indicate a significant relationship.

#### Hypothesis Four

- H.4. Teachers perceiving a high degree of impersonalization in the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

The correlation coefficient showing the relationship between impersonalization and teacher militancy, shown in Table I, was  $r_{15} = -.002$ . With 374 degrees of freedom, a correlation coefficient of

$r=.102$  was required for significance at the .05 level.

Hypothesis four was rejected, and the obtained correlation coefficient indicated no significant relationship between impersonalization and teacher militancy.

#### Hypothesis Five

H.5. Teachers perceiving a low degree of adherence to technical competence within the organization will score high on teacher militancy.

Table I shows the correlation coefficient between teacher militancy and technical competence to be  $r_{16} = -.110$ . This was found to be significant beyond the .05 level, which required an  $r=.102$ , with 374 degrees of freedom. The correlation coefficient supported hypothesis five by showing that teacher militancy was negatively related to technical competence.

#### The Multiple Correlation Coefficient

The coefficient of multiple correlation,  $R=.2889$  (see Table II), indicates the strength of the relationship between teacher militancy and the five subscales of bureaucracy taken together. The multiple correlation is related to the intercorrelations among the predictor variables as well as their correlations with the criterion variable.

Although each predictor variable correlated negatively with the criterion variable, teacher militancy, Table II shows that the multiple correlation coefficient of  $R=.2889$  is positive. With 374 degrees of freedom and six variables, a coefficient of correlation of  $R=.20$  was

required for the .01 level of significance.<sup>1</sup> There was found to be, then, a significant, positive relationship between teacher militancy and the five subscales of bureaucracy combined.

TABLE II  
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

Variable	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>1</sub>
X <sub>2</sub>	1.00	-.41	.69	.43	-.40	-.01
X <sub>3</sub>		1.00	-.29	-.20	.43	-.22
X <sub>4</sub>			1.00	.44	-.25	-.07
X <sub>5</sub>				1.00	-.23	-.01
X <sub>6</sub>					1.00	-.16
X <sub>1</sub>						1.00

R=.2889

N=375

Revealed in Table II is the correlation matrix, which led to the multiple correlation coefficient. The variables are identified as

<sup>1</sup>J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), p. 581. (Table of Coefficients of Correlations adapted from H. A. Wallace and G. W. Snedecor, Correlations and Machine Calculation, Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College, 1931).



follows:  $X_1$ =Teacher Militancy,  $X_2$ =Hierarchy of Authority,  $X_3$ =Specialization,  $X_4$ =Rules and Regulations,  $X_5$ =Impersonalization, and  $X_6$ =Technical Competence. This matrix shows the relationship of each variable to each of the other five variables, with the influence of the remaining four variables included in the correlation coefficients that are given. The R value is the total multiple correlation coefficient, showing the interrelationship of the five predictor variables with the criterion variable, teacher militancy.

The difference between the correlation coefficients showing the relationship between teacher militancy and the five predictor variables presented in Tables I and II can be explained as follows: Shown in Table I are the partial correlation coefficients, which show the relationship of each of the predictor variables with the criterion variable, with the influence of all other predictor variables held constant; whereas, in Table II, the correlation coefficients that are presented were computed with the influence of all predictor variables included.

#### Correlations Between Bureaucratic Subscales

The correlation coefficients showing the relationship of each subscale of the bureaucracy measure to the other four subscales were shown in Table II. The demanded coefficient of correlation for six variables at the .01 level of significance with 374 degrees of freedom was  $r=.20$ . The scores on the hierarchy of authority subscale were found to be significantly related to each of the other four subscales, two positively and two negatively. The positive correlation coefficients were  $r_{24} = .69$  between hierarchy of authority and rules and

regulations, and  $r_{25} = .43$  between hierarchy of authority and impersonalization. The subscales negatively correlated with hierarchy of authority were specialization,  $r_{23} = -.41$ ; and technical competence,  $r_{26} = -.40$ .

The specialization subscale was also found to be significantly related to each of the other four subscales at or beyond the .01 level of significance. A positive relationship was found between specialization and technical competence,  $r_{36} = .43$ . Specialization correlated negatively with the three remaining subscales: hierarchy of authority,  $r_{32} = -.41$ ; rules and regulations,  $r_{34} = -.29$ ; and impersonalization,  $r_{35} = -.20$ .

Table II showed that variable four, rules and regulations, related significantly with each of the other four subscales of bureaucracy higher than the  $r = .20$  demanded at the .01 level. A positive relationship was found between hierarchy of authority and rules and regulations,  $r_{42} = .69$ . There was also a positive relationship,  $r_{45} = .44$ , between hierarchy of authority and impersonalization. The two dimensions which were related negatively with rules and regulations were specialization,  $r_{43} = -.29$ , and technical competence,  $r_{46} = -.25$ .

Specialization and technical competence were positively related with each other,  $r_{36} = .43$ ; but both were negatively correlated with the other three subscales. On the other hand, the other three subscales--hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonality--were all positively related with each other, but negatively related with specialization and technical competence.

## Supplementary Data

Some biographical data were requested from each respondent, and in this section, that which was supplied is given as a more complete description of the sample which actually participated. Secondly, it is analyzed in relation to the scores on the measure of militancy, The Way You See It.

The sample population included 150 males and 223 females with two respondents not designating their sex. The distribution of the respondents by age categories is reported in Table III, which shows that the largest percentage of teacher respondents ranged in age from 45 to 55 years. The lowest percentage was for the group between 30 and 35 years of age.

TABLE III  
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY AGE

Age	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
Below 25	52	13.86
25-30	74	19.73
30-35	40	10.66
35-45	66	17.60
45-55	86	22.93
Over 55	56	14.93
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>.29</u>
Totals	375	100.0

Presented in Table IV is a breakdown of the levels of formal preparation of the secondary teachers in the sample. The largest single group of teachers had completed only the bachelors degree. This may be explained in part by the rather high percentage of teachers with five or fewer years of total teaching experience, shown in Table V.

TABLE IV  
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY LEVEL  
OF FORMAL PREPARATION

Preparation	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
Bachelors Degree	107	28.53
Bachelors Degree + 16 hours	91	24.28
Masters Degree	92	24.53
Masters Degree + 16 hours	47	12.53
Masters Degree + 30 hours or Ed.S.	35	9.33
Ed.D. or Ph.D. Degree	0	00
No Response	<u>3</u>	<u>.80</u>
Totals	375	100.0

TABLE V  
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY  
TOTAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Total Years Teaching	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
1-5	139	37.07
6-10	65	17.33
11-15	51	13.60
16-20	34	9.07
Over 20	83	22.13
No Response	<u>3</u>	<u>.80</u>
Total	375	100.00

Table V indicates that the highest percentage of teachers responding to the instruments had from one to five years of total teaching experience. The second highest percentage, however, was that group of teachers having taught over twenty years.

On the militancy measure, The Way You See It, the highest possible score was sixty-six, which would have represented the response "Quit the job," to all eleven hypothetical situations. In Table VI, the mean scores and standard deviations of the respondents to The Way You See It appear, divided according to sex.

TABLE VI  
MEAN SCORES ON MILITANCY MEASURE  
CATEGORIZED BY SEX

Sex	Number of Teachers	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	<u>t</u>
Male	150	33.55	8.52	.3945
Female	223	33.14	7.48	
$p > .05$				

A pooled variance t-test<sup>2</sup> was applied to determine if there was a significant difference in responses from men and women. The .05 level of significance for infinite degrees of freedom demanded that  $t=1.96$ ; thus, the obtained  $t=.3945$  was found not to be significant.

The mean scores on teacher militancy according to the age of the respondents are presented in Table VII. The range of means shows the lowest mean score to be for the age group of 45 to 55 years, and the highest mean score for the group aged from 25 to 30.

When Spearman's rank-order correlation method was applied to these data, a significant, negative relationship was found. The rho coefficient was a  $-.829$ , exactly that required for significance at the .05 level. There would appear to be a significant negative relationship between the age of the respondent and his level of militancy, the

---

<sup>2</sup>W. James Popham, Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), pp. 146-147.

younger teachers scoring higher on the militancy measure.

TABLE VII  
MEAN SCORES ON MILITANCY MEASURE  
CATEGORIZED BY AGE

Age	Number of Teachers	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
Below 25	52	35.67	5.85
25-30	74	36.28	8.01
30-35	40	32.08	7.66
35-45	66	32.79	6.88
45-55	86	31.48	8.18
Over 55	56	31.55	8.82

rho= -.829

Table VIII presents the mean scores on teacher militancy in relation to the level of formal preparation the respondents had at the time they completed the instruments. The group averaging the highest was that group of teachers with a bachelors degree. On the other hand, those scoring the lowest were those teachers with the most formal education, a masters degree plus thirty semester hours or an Ed.S. degree.

TABLE VIII  
 MEAN SCORES ON MILITANCY MEASURE CATEGORIZED  
 BY AMOUNT OF FORMAL PREPARATION

Preparation	Number of Teachers	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
Bachelors Degree	107	34.23	6.96
Bachelors Degree + 16 Hours	91	33.70	8.40
Masters Degree	92	32.51	7.94
Masters Degree + 16 Hours	47	33.98	8.58
Masters Degree + 30 Hours or Ed.S.	35	30.83	8.13

rho= -.70

The Spearman rank-correlation coefficient obtained from these data was -.70. This negative correlation coefficient was not a significant one, as an N of five demands a correlation of .90 for the .05 level of significance. This finding would seem to indicate that there was no significant relationship between the amount of formal education the respondent had obtained and the level of militancy.

The data collected relative to the total teaching experience of the respondents and the mean scores on the militancy measure are presented in Table IX. The teachers who had taught the fewest years had the highest mean score on teacher militancy; whereas, the lowest mean score on teacher militancy was made by teachers having taught sixteen to twenty years.



TABLE IX  
 MEAN SCORES ON MILITANCY MEASURE CATEGORIZED  
 BY TOTAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Total Years Teaching	Number of Teachers	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
1-5	139	35.37	6.87
6-10	65	32.38	8.01
11-15	51	32.92	7.98
16-20	34	31.41	7.34
Over 20	83	31.52	8.58

rho= -.80

A Spearman's rank order correlation technique was also applied to these data, and again no significant relationship was found. The correlation coefficient was rho= -.80. With an N of 5, .90 is required for significance at the .05 level, so there was found no significant relationship between the length of time the respondents had taught and their level of militancy.

The final data presented are in Table X, dealing with the length of time the respondents had been in their present position and their mean scores on teacher militancy. The highest mean score was made by teachers who had served two to three years in the same position. Those teachers having taught over ten years in their current position had the lowest mean score.

TABLE X  
 MEAN SCORES ON MILITANCY MEASURE CATEGORIZED  
 BY YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION

Total Years in Present Position	Number of Teachers	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
1	67	34.66	7.59
2-3	99	34.83	6.85
4-6	80	33.08	7.91
7-10	39	32.95	7.64
Over 10	85	30.88	8.43

rho= -.90

The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient for these data was -.90, which was found to be significant at the .05 level. This finding indicated that there was a negative relationship between the length of time a person has been in one position and his level of militancy, those teaching in that position the fewest years being the more militant.

#### Summary

The results of the data were presented in this chapter. Two of the five hypotheses which were tested were accepted; the others rejected.

No significant relationship was found between hierarchy of authority and teacher militancy, rules and regulations and teacher militancy,

or impersonalization and teacher militancy. There was found to exist a significant, negative relationship between both specialization and teacher militancy, and technical competence and teacher militancy; these findings supported the hypotheses related to them.

A negative correlation coefficient was found between all of the predictor variables and teacher militancy, only two of which showed a significant relationship. However, the obtained multiple correlation coefficient was positive and significant beyond the .01 level of significance.

The correlation coefficients between the five bureaucratic subscales indicated a significant relationship among them. Two of the subscales, specialization and technical competence, were positively related to each other but negatively related to the other three: hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization. These three were positively related to each other, but negatively related to the other two.

In the final part of the chapter, some supplementary data were presented. The mean scores on teacher militancy were given, categorized according to the sex, age, formal preparation, total years teaching experience, and total years in the present position of the respondents. A t-test indicated no significant difference between male and female respondents' mean scores on teacher militancy. A Spearman's rank-order was computed on the remainder of the demographic data as it related to teacher militancy. A significant negative relationship was found between the age of the respondents and the scores on the militancy measure, the older teachers indicating less militancy.

No significant relationship was found between the level of formal preparation of the respondents and the level of militancy or between the total teaching experience and the level of militancy. A significant negative relationship was found, however, between the length of time respondents had been in their present positions and the level of teacher militancy, those being in the position the more years being the less militant.

The final chapter, Chapter V, will present some conclusions based upon the findings presented in Chapter IV. Some recommendations for further study will also be given.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

This final chapter is divided into four parts. The first part is a summary of the study and findings. Part two is devoted to some conclusions and implications drawn from the findings. In the third section, some suggestions for further study are presented, and part four is a discussion of the study.

#### Summary of Findings

This study was focused upon the relationship of teacher militancy and selected aspects of bureaucracy. Specifically, the study was designed to determine if there was a significant relationship between any of the five selected dimensions of bureaucracy and the level of militancy of the teachers in the selected secondary schools. To measure the level of teacher militancy, The Way You See It was administered. The School Organizational Inventory was administered to the teachers to ascertain their perceptions of the levels of each of the five selected characteristics of bureaucracy.

The respondents were teachers in ten randomly selected Oklahoma secondary schools. The schools were randomly selected from among the secondary schools located in districts which were members of the Oklahoma Public School Research Council, and that had a minimum of

thirty teachers. The teachers in the schools were asked to respond to the two instruments, and a total of 375 usable returns were received from 579 teachers, 65 percent.

A multiple correlation technique was used to statistically test the five hypotheses.

Hypothesis one was rejected. The relationship found between hierarchy of authority and teacher militancy was not a significant one, and that found was in the opposite direction from that hypothesized.

The second hypothesis was supported as the obtained correlation coefficient indicated a significant, negative relationship between teacher militancy and specialization.

The hypothesis relating rules and regulations to teacher militancy was rejected. The negative correlation coefficient found did not indicate a significant relationship between rules and regulations and teacher militancy.

Hypothesis four, predicting a positive relationship between impersonalization and teacher militancy, was rejected. There was no significant relationship found between these two variables.

The final hypothesis was supported. A significant, negative relationship was found between teacher militancy and the technical competence dimension of bureaucracy.

Although all of the five dimensions of bureaucracy included in the study were found to be negatively correlated with teacher militancy, the coefficient of multiple correlation was positive and significant. The multiple R was related not only to the correlations of the predictor variables and the criterion variable, but also to the intercorrelations among predictor variables. These intercorrelations indicated

that the predictor variables were related to each other in differing directions.

Specialization and technical competence were related to each other positively and each was negatively related to the other three dimensions of bureaucracy. The hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization dimensions were all positively related to each other. The correlation coefficients between these three variables were  $r_{24}=.69$ ,  $r_{25}=.43$ , and  $r_{45}=.44$ . These high internal correlation coefficients may account for the significant R when all partial correlation coefficients between predictors and the criterion variable were negative.

#### Conclusions and Implications

There was found to be a significant relationship between two dimensions of bureaucracy and teacher militancy. The other three selected dimensions of bureaucracy were not significantly related to teacher militancy; however, all were negatively correlated, the opposite direction from that hypothesized for hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization.

Although there was found to be a significant relationship between teacher militancy and the specialization and technical competence dimensions of bureaucracy, it was a negative relationship, as had been hypothesized. This finding appeared to support the rationale for these two hypotheses which indicated that both professionals and bureaucrats would desire these dimensions of bureaucracy.

The hypotheses relating teacher militancy and each of the other bureaucratic dimensions were rejected, and there was a negative

correlational coefficient found; whereas, a positive relationship had been predicted. The finding of no significant relationship between hierarchy of authority and teacher militancy seemed to indicate that there was little likelihood of conflict arising between the teachers and those in the hierarchy who impose authority because of their differing positions within the organization. This suggests that teachers could be just as militant in a highly hierarchically differentiated organization as in one less highly structured.

This finding seems to support Hearn's finding of no relationship between teachers' sense of alienation and the school system structure.<sup>1</sup> If no alienation existed, as his findings suggested, less chance for conflict would probably exist; therefore, the findings of this study indicated that professional teachers did not see hierarchy of authority as conflicting with their professional roles, so teacher militancy should be less likely to occur.

Moeller,<sup>2</sup> in his study of bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power, found that the teachers' sense of power was increased with bureaucratization. His explanation of this was that teachers who knew and understood the bureaucratic procedures would utilize those procedures for goal attainment purposes. He also surmised that the rules and regulations prevalent in a bureaucratically structured school functioned as a shield against those who might threaten a teacher's status. As militancy was not found to be related to organizational rules and

---

<sup>1</sup>James J. Hearn, "Teachers' Sense of Alienation With Respect to School Structure," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII:5 (January, 1971), p. 312.

<sup>2</sup>Gerald H. Moeller, "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," Administrator's Notebook, XI:3 (November, 1962), pp. 1-2.



regulations, the possibility exists that bureaucratic rules and regulations do, in fact, reduce teacher-administrator conflict.

The correlation coefficient found between teacher militancy and rules and regulations was  $r_{14} = -.092$ , which was not found to be significant at the demanded .05 level. That no significant relationship was found might be explained as follows: Rules and regulations apparently do not contribute to administrator-teacher conflicts to the degree that teachers will take militant actions to overcome them; teachers may actually desire bureaucratically specified procedures. As Moeller suggested, teachers may see these rules and regulations as conducive to their functioning within the organization.

That no relationship was found between teacher militancy and impersonalization was surprising. One possible explanation for this finding is that teachers desire some impersonalization imposed between them and their superiors. Another is that teachers may actually prefer to treat their students in an impersonal manner; if so, they see the bureaucratic demand for impersonalization as conducive to their desires rather than as conflict producing. The items in the impersonalization subscale of the School Organizational Inventory dealt with impersonalization at all levels of organizational life: teachers and students, parents, and superiors. No conflict apparently resulted from the impersonalization; at least, the relationship between impersonalization and teacher militancy was not a significant one.

The finding of a positive multiple correlation coefficient when all partial correlation coefficients between the five predictor and the criterion variables had been negative may be explained, in part at least, by the high positive relationship among three of the predictor

variables. When computing a multiple correlation coefficient, all interrelationships are included in the final R; thus, high internal relationships can, at times, inflate the multiple correlation coefficient.<sup>3</sup> These highly correlated subscales indicated duplication, the testing of very similar aspects relating to the criterion variable.<sup>4</sup>

The high correlates among the hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonalization subscales and their negative relationship with technical competence and specialization appear to support Punch's,<sup>5</sup> Kolesar's,<sup>6</sup> and Robinson's<sup>7</sup> findings. Each found similar relationships in his study; and they speculated that there were two categories of phenomena within bureaucracy, which Kolesar designated the authority dimension and the expertise dimension.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to the findings directly related to the hypotheses, some further implications were gleaned from the supplementary data presented in Chapter IV, Tables VI through X. The finding of no significant difference between male and female respondents' mean scores on

---

<sup>3</sup>Anne Anastasi, Psychological Testing (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954), pp. 145-149.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 146.

<sup>5</sup>Keith Francis Punch, "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationship to Leader Behavior: An Empirical Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1967).

<sup>6</sup>Henry Kolesar, "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967).

<sup>7</sup>Norman Robinson, "A Study of the Professional Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).

<sup>8</sup>Kolesar.

teacher militancy did not support Corwin's<sup>9</sup> contention that male teachers were more militant than female teachers.

The Spearman rank-order correlational technique was applied to the remainder of the demographic data related to teacher militancy. This technique, although it approximates the Pearson Product Moment, may have yielded inflated coefficients. It might be noted that the ranking process involved a loss of information in two ways: the distributions were represented only by the means, and the essentially discrete original data were reduced to ordinal form.

A rank order correlation coefficient between respondents' age and the mean scores of the militancy measure of  $-.829$  was obtained. This indicated that the older teachers were less militant than younger ones.

No significant relationship was found between teacher militancy and the level of formal education the teachers had obtained. The rho of  $-.70$  did not indicate a significant relationship.

There was no significant relationship found between the amount of teaching experience and the level of teacher militancy; however, a significant negative relationship did emerge between the length of time the respondents had been in their current positions and the level of militancy. This relationship indicated that those teachers having been in their present positions for a greater number of years were less militant than those serving a fewer number of years.

---

<sup>9</sup>Ronald G. Corwin, Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, Cooperative Research Project No. 2637 (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1966), p. 456.

### Recommendations for Further Study

One product of an empirical study consists of the suggestions for possible further research which it produces. Several possibilities for future studies which were indicated by the findings of this research are presented below:

1. Because of the negative correlation coefficient found between rules and regulations and teacher militancy, some further study might seek to determine if, in fact, rules and regulations is a bureaucratic characteristic which professional teachers desire.

2. The negative relationships found between the technical competence and specialization dimensions of bureaucracy and teacher militancy indicate a possible need for additional study. Specifically, a study might be conducted investigating the degree of militancy teachers express related to their perception of their assignment's being within their area of specialization.

3. Similar studies could be conducted at other levels of the school organization to determine if similar relationships are found.

4. Because the results of this study failed to indicate a positive relationship between any of the bureaucratic dimensions and teacher militancy, future studies might seek to examine other possible causes of teacher militancy. For example, studies could be conducted to determine if there is a relationship between teacher militancy and (a) the salaries teachers receive, or (b) the quality of educational facilities in which teachers work.

5. The supplementary data that were analyzed in relation to teacher militancy showed two significant relationships, one between the length of time teachers had been in their present positions and the

level of teacher militancy, and the other between respondent age and the level of teacher militancy. Because of the strong possibility of age and length of time in current position being directly related, further studies might be conducted to examine these variables separately.

In conclusion, the findings of this research project did not support much of the literature related to teacher militancy, professional-bureaucratic conflict, and the selected dimensions of bureaucracy. Analysis of the demographic data showed significant relationships between age of the respondent and teacher militancy and length of tenure in present position and teacher militancy, and no other significant relationships were found. However, before any final conclusions can be made concerning the variables examined in this study, further research related to teacher militancy and the bureaucratic structure of the school must be conducted.

#### Discussion

The findings of this study, because they were for the most part unexpected, lend themselves to some degree of speculation. Teachers, it appears, do not perceive a bureaucratic structure as conflicting with their professional demands to the extent that it produces militancy. The implications of the finding relative to each bureaucratic dimension indicate that the likelihood of the existence of teacher militancy is lessened by a bureaucratic structure.

It may be, therefore, that teacher militancy, or the likelihood thereof, might be reduced if the organization utilizes rules and regulations for the teacher to follow. If these impose impersonalization

upon the organizational participants and assist in enforcing adherence to the hierarchy of authority within the organization, it could be that teachers would perceive them as desirable characteristics rather than as conflicting with their professional orientations.

The multiple correlation coefficient relating all five subscales of bureaucracy to teacher militancy, however, indicated a significant positive relationship. This and the high correlation coefficients between certain subscales of the School Organizational Inventory permit further speculation. The correlation coefficient between the hierarchy of authority and the rules and regulations dimensions was so high that it indicated that the two subscales could be measuring very similar characteristics of the organization, as perceived by the teachers. This promotes the question of whether these two SOI subscales measure similar things, or whether it might be that these two dimensions of bureaucracy are actually overlapping and are one and the same. In other words, do rules and regulations reinforce the hierarchical authority existing in the organization?

A very similar question can be asked concerning rules and regulations and impersonalization: Do rules and regulations force the organizational participants to be treated with impersonalization? Or, did the finding indicate only an overlapping of the items on the School Organizational Inventory?

Further speculation can be made about the instrument used to measure teacher militancy. Teacher militancy was defined as the teacher's tendency to initiate action because of administrative decisions rather than to comply with the requests of administrators, and it was assumed that the instrument accurately measured a teacher's

initiative or compliance. However, the common usage of the term "teacher militancy" connotes a phenomenon relatively different from initiative or compliance. Teacher militancy is usually thought of as an overt act to overcome some situation which the teacher perceives to be untenable. Therefore, it appears that The Way You See It may measure a teacher's perception of his tendency toward militancy rather than militancy itself.

The instrument, then, appears to be of value in that it measures a teacher's perception of what he thinks he would do in certain situations. It appears that the instrument should not be used to measure overt actions, which can only be gauged in retrospect.

One possible improvement of The Way You See It suggested by many respondents was that the final statement of each of the hypothetical situations presented be eliminated. The teacher respondents indicated that they could have more easily expressed their probable action if they had not been told what the teacher who was actually involved in the situation did. For example, item number eight states,

A chemistry teacher took an active stand in favor of water fluoridation in a community that was divided on the issue. The superintendent requested him to avoid becoming further involved in the issue. He refused. (See Appendix A)

The respondents indicated that the final sentence should be eliminated. Although the inclusion of such statements does not negate the true perception of the respondent, the possibility that it influenced their answers remains. The instrument might, therefore, be improved if this situation were corrected. These suggestions relative to The Way You See It may possibly deserve consideration by others contemplating using it in future research.

Although this section of the report presents ideas which go beyond the actual data analysis, it may stimulate additional questions related to the variables under investigation. It may also spur close examination of both instruments which were used in the research for this study.



#### A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Max G. "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 42-50.
- Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.
- Anderson, James G. "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority." Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter, 1966, pp. 7-33.
- Argyris, Chris. "Individual Actualization in Complex Organizations." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 189-199.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Batchelder, Richard D. "Today's Militant Teachers." NEA Journal, LIV: 6 (September, 1965), 18-19.
- Bell, Gerald D. "Formality Versus Flexibility in Complex Organizations." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 71-81.
- Blau, Peter M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Blau, Peter M., Wolf V. Heyderbrand, and Robert E. Stauffer. "The Structure of Small Bureaucracies." American Sociological Review, XXXI:2 (April, 1966), 179-191.
- Blau, Peter M., and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1960.
- Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher in the Authority Structure of the School." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 200-211.

- Bridges, Edwin M. "Bureaucratic Role and Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Elementary Principals." Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring, 1965, pp. 19-26.
- Brubacher, John W. "Why Teacher Militancy?" Educational Leadership, XXVII:1 (October, 1969), 30-33.
- Comner, Forrest E., and George B. Redfern, eds. The School Administrator and Negotiation. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1968.
- Corwin, Ronald G. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965.
- Corwin, Ronald G. "Professional Persons in Public Organizations." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 212-227.
- Corwin, Ronald G. Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools. Cooperative Research Project Number 2637. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1966.
- Corwin, Ronald G. The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools. Cooperative Research Project Number 1934. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1963.
- Darland, D. D. "The Profession's Quest for Responsibility and Accountability." Phi Delta Kappan, LII (September, 1970), 41-44.
- DuBois, Philip H. An Introduction to Psychological Statistics. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.
- Evans, Seymour. "Teacher Militancy: The Responsibility of Power." The ISR Journal, I:2 (Spring, 1969), 127-132.
- Getzels, J. W. "A Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration." The Harvard Educational Review, XXII:4 (Fall, 1952), 235-246.
- Getzels, J. W., and E. G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." The School Review, Winter, 1967, pp. 423-441.
- Getzels, J. W., and Herbert A. Thelen. "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System." The Dynamics of Instructional Groups (NSSE Yearbook), LIX:2, 53-82.
- Goode, William J. "The Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?" Library Quarterly, III (October, 1961), 306-320.

- Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles-I." Administrative Science Quarterly, II:3 (December, 1967), 281-306.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954.
- Greenwood, Ernest. "Attributes of a Professional." Social Work, II (July, 1957), 44-55.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.
- Hall, Richard H. "Intraorganizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model." Administrative Science Quarterly, VII:3 (December, 1962), 295-308.
- Hall, Richard H. "Professionalization and Bureaucratization." American Sociological Review, XXXIII:1 (February, 1968), 92-104.
- Hall, Richard H. "Some Organizational Considerations in the Professional-Organizational Relationship." Administrative Science Quarterly, XII:3 (December, 1967), 461-478.
- Hearn, James J. "Teachers' Sense of Alienation With Respect to School System Structure." Phi Delta Kappan, LII:5 (January, 1971), 312.
- "Is It Militancy or School Board Provocation?" NEA Reporter, IX:7 (September 18, 1970), 2.
- Kleinman, Jack H. "Professional Sanctions: What, Why, When, Where, and How." NEA Journal, LVII:1 (January, 1968), 42-44.
- Kolesar, Henry. "An Empirical Study of Client Alienation in the Bureaucratic Organization." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967).
- Litwak, Eugene. "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 82-90.
- MacKay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relations to the Characteristics of School Organization." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964).
- MacKay, D. A. "Using Professional Talent in a School Organization." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 228-234.
- March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

- Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. Ed. Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969, pp. 47-59.
- Moeller, Gerald H. "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power." Administrators' Notebook, XI:3 (November, 1962).
- Moeller, Gerald H., and W. W. Charters. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 235-248.
- Park, George. "The Educational Dilemma." Journal of Learning Disabilities, III:6 (June, 1970), 40-41.
- Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967.
- Punch, Keith Francis. "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationship to Leader Behavior: An Empirical Study." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1967).
- Robinson, Donald W. "Teacher Militancy Around the Nation." Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (June, 1968), 554.
- Robinson, Norman. "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
- Robinson, Norman. "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations." Canadian Education and Research Digest, VII:1 (March, 1967), 29-45.
- Scott, W. Richard. "Professionals and Complex Organizations." Professionalization. Eds. Howard M. Vollner and Donald L. Mills, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Selznick, Philip. "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations." A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. Ed. Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969, pp. 19-31.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." Organizations and Human Behavior. Eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, pp. 249-260.
- "Teacher Strikes, 1960-61 to 1969-70." NEA Research Bulletin, XLVIII:3 (October, 1970), 69-70.
- Thompson, Victor A. "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict." Administrative Science Quarterly, V:4 (March, 1961), 485-521.

- Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organizations. New York: Alfred A. Knoph and Company, 1961.
- Thorndike, Robert L., and Elizabeth Hagen. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Trask, Anne E. "Principals, Teachers and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions." Administrator's Notebook, XIII:4 (December, 1964), 1-4.
- Udy, Stanley H., Jr. "'Bureaucracy' and 'Rationality' in Weber's Organizational Theory: An Empirical Study." American Sociological Review, XXIV:6 (December, 1959), 791-795.
- Urban, Wayne J. "Militancy and the Profession," Educational Leadership, XXVI:4 (January, 1969), 344-346.
- Weber, Max. "Bureaucracy." The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies. Eds. Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller. New York: Free Press, 1970, pp. 5-23.
- Weber, Max. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Trans. and eds. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, and ed. Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1947.
- Weber, Max. "The Three Types of Legitimate Rule." A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. Ed. Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969, pp. 6-15.

APPENDIX A

THE TEACHER AND THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

DISSERTATION

RESEARCH PROJECT

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA

D. Kent King  
Project Director

Dr. Kenneth St. Clair  
Committee Chairman

General Information

You are being asked to participate in this project by answering the enclosed questions on the answer sheets provided. We ask you to complete the biographical information and answer each question as honestly and frankly as possible.

We are indebted to you for your cooperation and plan to do everything possible to insure that your efforts will contribute to knowledge in the field of educational administration. Although your responses will become a part of the project data, they will remain strictly confidential.

## SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY\*

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In the items below, please indicate to what extent each characterizes your school. Please do not evaluate the items as characteristic of either "good" or "bad" conditions. For each statement, circle the answer on the answer sheet which you feel best describes your school organization. The five possible choices are: Always True, Often True, Occasionally True, Seldom True, and Never True.

1. A person who wants to make his own decisions would quickly become discouraged in this school.
2. There is an overlap in the job responsibilities of the Principal and Vice-Principal.
3. Rules stating when teachers arrive and depart from the building are strictly enforced.
4. The use of a wide variety of teaching methods and materials is encouraged in this school.
5. We are expected to be courteous, but reserved, at all times in our dealings with parents.
6. Promotions are based on how well you are liked.
7. Staff members of this school always get their orders from higher up.
8. Teachers are required to sponsor extra-curricular activities for which they have no suitable background.
9. The time for informal staff get-togethers during the school day is strictly regulated by the administration.
10. In dealing with student discipline problems teachers are encouraged to consider the individual offender, not the offense, in deciding on a suitable punishment.
11. Staff members must possess above-average qualifications before they are placed in this school.
12. Staff members are allowed to do almost as they please in their classroom work.
13. Teachers in this school receive help from the custodial staff in setting up audiovisual equipment for classroom use.
14. The teacher is expected to abide by the spirit of the rules of the school rather than stick to the letter of the rules.
15. We are to follow strict operating procedures at all times.
16. The administration sponsors staff get-togethers.
17. Promotion is not based on personal preference of the selectors, but on an objective evaluation of teacher capabilities.
18. Nothing is said if you get to school just before roll call or leave right after dismissal occasionally.
19. Going through proper channels is constantly stressed.

20. Teachers are encouraged to become friendly with groups and individuals outside the school.
21. Past teaching experience plays a large part in the assignment of a teacher to this school.
22. Teachers have to do their own typing of stencils for classroom use.
23. There can be little action until an administrator approves a decision.
24. Assignment of teaching duties is made without regard for the teacher's experience or training.
25. The teachers are constantly being checked for rule violations.
26. There isn't much chance for a promotion unless you are "in" with the administration.
27. Teachers who have contact with parents and other citizens are instructed in proper procedures for greeting and talking with them.
28. Many teachers are hired simply because they have attractive personalities.
29. The school has a manual of rules and regulations for teachers to follow.
30. We have to do a lot of paper work which could be done by the school office staff.
31. Each staff member is responsible to an administrator to whom the member regularly reports.
32. In order to get a promotion, you have to "know somebody."
33. The instructional program is departmentalized into specific subject areas with specific teachers assigned.
34. A person can make his own decisions without checking with anyone else.
35. There is only one way to do the job--the Principal's way.
36. In dealing with student behavior problems the school has standard punishments for standard offenses regardless of the individual involved.
37. Promotions are based entirely on how well a person does his job.
38. I have to ask the principal before I do almost anything.
39. No one can get necessary supplies without permission from the principal or vice-principal.
40. Written orders from higher up are followed unquestioningly.
41. The same procedures are to be followed in most situations.
42. Students are treated within the rules of the school, no matter how serious a problem they have.



43. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.
44. Teachers are expected not to leave their classroom without permission.
45. Whenever we have a problem, we are supposed to go to the same person for an answer.
46. No matter how special a pupil's or parent's problem appears to be, the person is treated the same way as anyone else.
47. Any decision I make has to have my superior's approval.
48. Red tape is often a problem in getting a job done in this school.

---

\* The School Organizational Inventory was developed by D. A. MacKay and Norman Robinson, University of Alberta, and is used with permission.

## THE WAY YOU SEE IT\*

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of incidents which have occurred in different schools throughout the country. We are interested in getting your reaction to these situations. There is no right or wrong answer. Just imagine yourself in each situation and answer the following questions by circling the appropriate response on the answer sheet.

What would you do in the situation described?

1. The assistant principal told a teacher that he was too "outspoken" in criticizing certain policies of the school and that this was causing unrest among faculty members. The teacher continued to be critical of certain administrative policies.
2. A mathematics teacher was told by the principal that he was not presenting his subject in the most effective way, and that he should revise his course content and the methods of teaching it. He refused to change his practices on the grounds that his professional society had recommended his procedures.
3. The principal requested a teacher not to invite a well-known author to speak to his class because of the speaker's alleged "socialistic leanings." The teacher felt the allegations were unfounded, and that his students would benefit by hearing what he had to say. He proceeded to invite the speaker.
4. The school board rules explicitly stated that teachers should not participate in the local school board elections. One teacher made a public statement that one of the present board members was a professional politician, and otherwise actively engaged in the campaign. He was told to desist.
5. A principal occasionally changed the grade given by one of his teachers if a student's complaint to him seemed to justify a higher grade. One teacher protested and was told by the principal that he had the final authority over whatever happened in his school, and asked her to understand.
6. The administration requested teachers not to use a standard textbook in American Government because it was "socialistically" inclined. A history teacher felt that the book was the best available and proceeded to submit an order for it.
7. The administration changed a course of study which included philosophy and music appreciation to one which was based strictly on the sciences and mathematics. A committee of teachers went to see the principal and voiced disapproval; they were told that the administration was in a better position to make a decision due to the complexity of the issue. One teacher complained to the school board.

(Continued on next page)

8. A chemistry teacher took an active stand in favor of water fluoridation in a community that was divided on the issue. The superintendent requested him to avoid becoming further involved in the issue. He refused.
9. The administration issued a directive that teachers should help to improve parent-teacher relations. A parent-teacher committee was established to select textbooks. One math teacher refused to participate, stating that the parents of such a committee are not qualified to select textbooks.
10. One school system did not permit students to read several American literature classics by Faulkner, Hemingway, Steinbeck, and others. One teacher actively sought to have the policy repealed by soliciting the support of certain influential citizens in the community. The principal asked her to desist her campaign against the policy because she was stirring up trouble for the school. She refused saying that her action had the support of the National English Teacher's Association.
11. In one school, male teachers received preference in promotions. A group of women teachers at the school complained to the school board. They were told that the situation would be changed, but it was not. One female teacher who was passed over for a promotion wrote a letter to the NEA and State Department of Education. The principal ordered her to stop stirring up trouble.

---

\* The Way You See It was developed by Ronald G. Corwin, Ohio State University, and is used with permission.

## ANSWER SHEET

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

Please circle the appropriate response on the basis of the following key:

AT-Always True  
OFT-Often True

OCT-Occasionally True

ST-Seldom True  
NT-Never True

- |        |     |     |    |    |        |     |     |    |    |
|--------|-----|-----|----|----|--------|-----|-----|----|----|
| 1. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 25. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 2. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 26. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 3. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 27. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 4. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 28. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 5. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 29. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 6. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 30. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 7. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 31. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 8. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 32. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 9. AT  | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 33. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 10. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 34. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 11. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 35. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 12. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 36. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 13. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 37. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 14. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 38. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 15. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 39. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 16. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 40. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 17. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 41. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 18. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 42. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 19. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 43. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 20. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 44. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 21. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 45. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 22. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 46. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 23. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 47. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |
| 24. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT | 48. AT | OFT | OCT | ST | NT |

## ANSWER SHEET

THE WAY YOU SEE IT

Please circle the appropriate response on the basis of the following key:

- 1--Comply with superior's request
- 2--Try to compromise
- 3--Seek support of colleagues
- 4--Ask for an investigation by a professional organization
- 5--Refuse to comply with request
- 6--Quit the job

- |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 9.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 10. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 11. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |

## BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
  - 1=below 25
  - 2=25-30
  - 3=30-35
  - 4=35-45
  - 5=45-55
  - 6=over 55
2. Sex \_\_\_\_\_
  - 1=Female
  - 2=Male
3. Formal Preparation Completed \_\_\_\_\_
  - 1=Bachelor's Degree
  - 2=Bachelor's + 16
  - 3=Master's Degree
  - 4=Master's + 16
  - 5=Master's + 30 or Ed.S.
  - 6=Ed.D. or Ph.D.
4. Teaching Experience in years (include this year)
 

4a. Total teaching _____	4b. In present position _____
1=1-5	1=1
2=6-10	2=2-3
3=11-15	3=4-6
4=16-20	4=7-10
5=over 20	5=over 10

APPENDIX B

SUBSCALE BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOL

ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY

Hierarchy of Authority is measured by the following items in the School Organizational Inventory:

1, 7, 12, 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 43, 47

Specialization is measured by the following items in the School Organizational Inventory:

2, 8, 13, 22, 24, 30, 33

Rules and Regulations is measured by the following items in the School Organizational Inventory:

3, 4, 9, 14, 15, 18, 19, 25, 29, 35, 40, 41, 44, 45, 48

Impersonality is measured by the following items in the School Organizational Inventory:

5, 10, 16, 20, 27, 36, 42, 46

Technical Competence is measured by the following items in the School Organizational Inventory:

6, 11, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 37

VITA

Don Kent King

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF BUREAUCRACY  
AND THE MILITANCY OF SECONDARY TEACHERS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Preston, Missouri, September 19, 1943, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Morris King.

Education: Attended elementary school at Preston, Missouri, 1949-1957; was graduated from Skyline High School, Hickory County R-I School District, Urbana, Missouri, 1961; received the Bachelor of Science in Education degree from Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Missouri, in 1964, with a major in English and a minor in Social Studies; was granted the Master of Education degree by Drury College, Springfield, Missouri, in 1967, with majors in English and Educational Administration; attended Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Missouri, in 1969 and 1970; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1972.

Professional Experience: English Teacher, Houston High School, Houston, Missouri, 1964-1967; Principal of Houston Junior High School, Houston, Missouri, 1967-1970; Staff Assistant for Instruction to Vice President for Academic Affairs, Oklahoma State University, 1970-1971.