

STRUCTURAL EFFECTS: PREVAILING
ORIENTATIONS OF TEACHERS TOWARD
TEACHER STRIKES, COLLECTIVE
NEGOTIATIONS, AND PRINCIPAL'S
AUTHORITY AND PRINCIPALS'
ORIENTATIONS TOWARD BUREAUCRATIC
SUPERVISION

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
LARRY DEAN THOMPSON
1969

THESIS



~~117R~~

~~201101070 125~~

2055

ABSTRACT

STRUCTURAL EFFECTS: PREVAILING ORIENTATIONS OF TEACHERS TOWARD TEACHER STRIKES, COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS, AND PRINCIPAL'S AUTHORITY AND PRINCIPALS' ORIENTATIONS TOWARD BUREAUCRATIC SUPERVISION

by

Larry Dean Thompson

The primary purpose of this study was that of examining a method of ascertaining the possible group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within organizational settings. Because professional groups were likely to emphasize collegial values and resist bureaucratic supervision, the relationship between professionals and bureaucratic supervisors offered an excellent opportunity to study the possible group determination of leadership behavior.

The setting of this study was the school. Five large Michigan school districts of approximately equal size were examined in this study. These districts were Dearborn, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing and Saginaw. Fifty-three public schools (Grades K-12) were selected on the basis of a stratified, random sample of each district. Self-administered questionnaires were given both to the teachers in the schools and school principals.

Blau's technique for isolating structural effects was modified as to isolate a structural effect upon a single member of a group, the formal leader. Three measures of social values in the schools--the prevailing value orientation of the teachers toward the principal's authority, collective negotiations, and teacher strikes--were expected to exert external influences concerning the principals' responses to questions of supervisory or leadership practice, independent of the principals' individual value orientations.

The results of the study have indicated that no substantive relationship can definitely be established between the principal's responses to questions of supervisory practice and the prevailing value orientation of the teachers in a school on any of the three social value variables studied.

However, although there was no consistent pattern of relationships, the expected results of direct structural effects of social values were observed in several cases. Thus, it is believed that this study has demonstrated the viability of utilizing modifications of Blau's technique for isolating structural effects as a method for studying group determination of leadership behavior.

STRUCTURAL EFFECTS: PREVAILING ORIENTATIONS OF
TEACHERS TOWARD TEACHER STRIKES, COLLECTIVE
NEGOTIATIONS, AND PRINCIPAL'S AUTHORITY
AND PRINCIPALS' ORIENTATIONS TOWARD
BUREAUCRATIC SUPERVISION

By

Larry Dean Thompson

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1969

956223

6-25-69

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Philip M. Marcus for his patience, encouragement and advice throughout the preparation and writing of this project.

I would also like to thank Dr. Peter K. Manning and Mr. Vincent Salvo for their continued aid and thoughtful advice.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to Miss Brenda Taggart. Miss Taggart's help and encouragement have been invaluable to me throughout the preparation of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
THEORY AND LITERATURE.	4
The Human Relations School	4
Influence of Group	9
Blau's Technique for Isolating Structural Effects.	12
SETTING OF STUDY	15
HYPOTHESES AND STUDY DESIGN.	19
A Modification of Blau's Technique	19
Dependent Variables.	20
Independent Variables.	22
Hypotheses	24
Considerations	26
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.	29
Principal's Authority.	29
Collective Negotiations.	38
Teacher Strikes.	42
Overview of Relationships.	47
CONCLUSIONS.	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
APPENDIX	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Performance Scores by Rate and Frequency of Discussion (Blau's Hypothetical Data)	13
2. Relationship Between Attitude Toward Union and Supervisory Style (Hypothetical Data)	20
3. School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Principal's Authority, Principal's Value Orientation Toward Authority, and Principal's Response to Items Concerning Supervisory Practice.	31
4. School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Collective Negotiations, Principal's Value Orientation Toward Collective Negotiations, and Principal's Response to Items Concerning Supervisory Practice	40
5. School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, Principal's Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, and Principal's Response to Items Concerning Supervisory Practice	43
6. School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, Principal's Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, and Principal's Response to Items Concerning Leadership Behavior	46
7. Summary of Results	48

soci

The

group

refe

soci

to t

group

this

Humar

ship

betwe

by Li

Surve

tions

and b

tion

New Yo

Cliffs

INTRODUCTION

There has been a great amount of interest within the social sciences concerning leadership and group behavior. The interest in this relationship between leadership and group behavior has largely stemmed from what has come to be referred to as the "Human Relations School" of industrial sociology, social psychology and psychology. Faunce referred to this approach, noting the influence of Kurt Lewin, as the group dynamics point of view.¹ However, for purposes of this study, Human Relations will be the term used. The Human Relations school pointed out the importance of leadership for setting and enforcing group norms and the difference between formal and informal leadership.² Research conducted by Likert and his associates at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center has further advanced the Human Relations approach. Likert has stated that supervisory attitudes and behavior are major "causal influences" in the determination of group behavior. Simply stated, in the Human Relations

¹William A. Faunce, Readings in Industrial Sociology, New York, Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1967, p. 286.

²Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, p. 36.

approach, leadership or supervisory style was taken to be the independent variable while group behavior or group climate was taken to be the dependent variable.

However, social psychologists have noted that leader behavior was subject to group determination. The social psychologist, Gibb, reported that the expectations of followers, the nature of the tasks, and the institutionalization of the group were all factors that contributed to group determination of leadership behavior. Most of the studies that demonstrate group determination of leadership behavior were conducted, using the language of Homans, in small, autonomous experimental groups. This can be contrasted with the fact that a great deal, if not most, of the Human Relations studies were conducted within an organizational setting.

Yet, concerning work groups located within organizational settings, the question can be raised, "What is the association between leadership behavior and possible group influence?"

Do the relationships noted in small, experimental groups concerning group determination of leadership behavior suddenly vanish in a more diffuse setting? What was clearly needed in this area was a method to study the possible group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within organizational settings.

Because professional groups were likely to emphasize collegial values and resist bureaucratic supervision, the

re

vis

gro

relationship between professionals and bureaucratic supervisors offered an excellent opportunity to study the possible group determination of leadership behavior.

THEORY AND LITERATURE

The Human Relations School

The Human Relations school pointed out the importance of leadership for setting and enforcing group norms and the difference between informal and formal leadership. This was especially demonstrated on the important Bank Wiring Room Study. However, it was noted in the Bank Wiring Room Study that the supervisor was under great pressure to conform to the norms of the groups of which he was supposed to be in charge.³ Later Human Relations studies showed that a foreman or a person in a supervisory position was more likely to be accepted if he exercised what had become known as the Human Relations style of leadership. In recent years, American business and management personnel devoted a great amount of time and money to training programs emphasizing the Human Relations style of leadership. The assumption underlying all of this work was that the nature of human relations in the plant or any setting was primarily determined by the Human Relations skills of the people in the leadership position.⁴

³Ibid., p. 36.

⁴William F. Whyte, "Human Relations--A Progress Report," in Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations, New York, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1961, p. 100.

In the tradition of the Human Relations school, one of the earliest and most important studies demonstrating the influence of leadership upon a group's behavior was conducted by Lippit and White.⁵ Lippit and White assigned three types of leaders--authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire--to direct children in arts and craft work in four different clubs. It was found that the groups reacted differently to the three types of leadership.

Indirectly related to the various attempts to apply Lippit and White's findings to groups in industrial and other organizational settings to improve the effectiveness of formal leadership was the study by Coch and French.⁶ Coch and French demonstrated that democratic-type leadership permitted participation which greatly affected the workers' attitudes toward changes in their jobs.

Perhaps some of the most important and certainly representative of Human Relations studies were those done by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. Under the guidance of Rensis Likert, the Survey Research Center has had great influence

⁵Ronald Lippit and Ralph K. White, "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Maccoby et al (ed.), Readings in Social Psychology, New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1958, p. 233.

⁶Lester Coch and John R. P. French, Jr., "Overcoming Resistance to Change," in Maccoby et al (ed.), Readings in Social Psychology, New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1958, p. 233.

in establishing certain assumptions concerning leadership and supervisory styles. The results of the work conducted by Likert at the Survey Research Center confirmed what was suggested by earlier Human Relations research. Likert noted that many supervisors adhered to the traditional concepts of management characterized by the Scientific Management school of thought of Frederick Taylor. However, Likert reported that supervisors in the high--as opposed to the low--producing work groups utilized human relations skills in leadership.⁷ Likert termed these human relations oriented supervisors as being "employee-centered." Supervisors adhering to the more traditional concept of management were termed as "job-centered."⁸

Likert noted that Katz and his associates found that general rather than close supervision was associated with high rather than a low level of productivity.⁹ High-producing supervisors were characterized by giving their subordinates operational freedom to perform the job. Supervisors in charge of low-producing units tended to spend more time with their subordinates than did the high-producing supervisors, and the time was divided into many short periods in which they gave specific instructions.¹⁰

⁷Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961, p. 12.

⁸Ibid., p. 12.

⁹Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 14.

Likert stated that the pattern of results in these studies suggested a general principle underlying the behavior of the effective supervisor. Likert termed it the principle of supportive relationships:¹¹

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships within the organization each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance.

Tannenbaum summarized Likert's principle and stated that it in general implied that (1) the supportive supervisor was sensitive to the needs and feelings of his subordinates, (2) he respected and trusted his subordinates, (3) he was receptive to their ideas and suggestions, (4) he had a sincere interest in the welfare of his men.¹² Explicit throughout the Michigan Survey Research Center's studies was the assumption that the effective supervisor emphasized the human relation function as leadership style. In fact, Likert stated that the results of his research indicated that "supervisory attitudes and behavior tend to be major causal influences."¹³

Human Relations research has had great influence in establishing the importance of leadership and supervisory

¹¹Ibid., p. 103.

¹²Arnold S. Tannenbaum, Social Psychology of Work Organization, New York, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1965, p. 74.

¹³Likert, p. 12.

style on group behavior. Miller and Form noted that in most of these research designs productivity was taken as the dependent variable, supervisory practice as the independent variable and morale as the intervening variable.¹⁴ However, one can simply state that leadership or supervisory style was taken to be the independent variable while group behavior or group climate was taken to be the dependent variable.

The purpose of this study was not to challenge the results of those many Human Relations studies that indicated the importance of leadership practices in affecting changes in group behavior and climate. Using a different type of work situation that characterized most Human Relations studies, we planned to explore a question that had been raised by social psychologists. The question concerned the relationship between the leader and the group. Was the leader the important determinant of group behavior? Or, was the leader's behavior a result of group influence? In terms of Human Relations research, were the adjustments and performance of subordinates the result or the cause of supervisory practice? What was sought in this study was not a determination of causal relationships but rather a greater understanding of the association between group influence and leadership or supervisory behavior.

¹⁴Delbert Miller and William H. Form, Industrial Sociology, New York, Harper and Row, 1964, p. 689.

Influence of Group

The importance of social values in relation to the influence the group has upon its members had been noted by students of social structure. Social values may be defined as common orientations toward social conduct that prevail in a society or group.¹⁵ Since Durkheim, students of social structure have been concerned with the question of whether or not the prevalence of social values in a community or group exerted social pressures upon patterns of individual conduct that were independent of the influences exerted by individual internalized orientations.¹⁶ This was the question with which Durkheim was concerned in his classic study, Suicide. Durkheim demonstrated that anomie in the marital institutions of society--operationally measured by divorce rates--was more responsible for high suicide rates than the individual psychological state of the divorcee. To do this, Durkheim demonstrated that married as well as divorced individuals have higher suicide rates in societies where divorce is more prevalent than those where it was less so.¹⁷

In relation to this Blau has noted:¹⁸

¹⁵Peter M. Blau, "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, Volume 25, 1960, p. 179. ✓

¹⁶Ibid., p. 179.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 179.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 179.

The structural effects of a social value can be isolated by showing that the association between its prevalence in a community or group and certain patterns of conduct is independent of whether an individual holds this value or not.

Homans pointed out that in terms of leadership in a small group, the leader controlled the group, yet he was in a sense more controlled by it than the other members. It was a condition of his leadership that the leader's actions and decisions conform more closely than those of the others to an abstract group norm.¹⁹

Gibb noted that leader behavior was found to be subject to group determination. The expectations of the followers, the nature of the task, and the institutionalization of the group were all factors in the situation within which the leader behaved and was influenced.²⁰

Gibb also pointed out the importance of bureaucracy and leadership. Leadership in a formal organization differed from leadership in the informal organization. The leader in the large bureaucratic organization could not be as representative in his behavior as could the informal leader of a smaller primary group.²¹ Selznick pointed out various restraints and devices the bureaucratic leader had to employ

¹⁹George C. Homans, The Human Group, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1950, p. 188.

²⁰Cecil A. Gibb, "Leadership," in Linzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley Co., 1954, p. 917.

²¹Ibid., p. 921.

toward the maintenance of his position.²² Selznick termed the bureaucratic leader as "an agent of the led." Thus, a leader who got too far away from the interests and attitudes of members in such a bureaucratic organization could lose his following or influence.

An experimental study by Merei using groups of children demonstrated that the leader did not always determine organizational goals and performance. The results of Merei's observations were that the children's groups absorbed the leader and forced their traditions upon him.²³

As the preceding discussion has shown, leadership behavior had been found to be subject to group determination. However, like Merei's study, most studies which showed group determination of leader behavior were conducted using small, antonomous experimental groups.²⁴ Few studies had been conducted within the context of an organization setting. What was clearly needed in this area was a method to study the possibility of group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within an organizational setting.

²²Philip Selznick, "The Leader as Agent of Led," in Dubin (ed.), Human Relations in Administration, New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951, p. 289.

²³Ferenc Merei, "Group Leadership and Institutionalization," in Maccoby et al (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology, New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1958, p. 522.

²⁴See, however, David Mechanic, "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 7, 1963, p. 349.

Blau's Technique for Isolating
Structural Effects

Peter M. Blau's technique for isolating structural effects offered such a method. Blau's technique for isolating structural effects may be summarized as follows:²⁵

1. An empirical measure (this can be termed Z) was obtained that pertained to a characteristic of individual group members that had direct or indirect bearing upon their relations to each other (e.g., group identification, social values, or rate of communication).

2. The scores from measure Z, which described individuals, were combined into one index for each group, and this index no longer referred to any characteristic of individuals but to a characteristic of the group, Zgp. Thus, any individual could be characterized in terms of his own score along, variable Z and his group's score, variable Zgp.

3. To isolate a structural effect, the relationship between group attribute (Zgp) and some dependent variable, (this can be termed W) was determined while the characteristic of individuals (Z)--or an individual--was held constant. The structural effect thus referred to the effect of Zgp on W.

²⁵This section closely follows Peter M. Blau "Formal Organizations: Dimensions of Analysis," American Journal of Sociology, Volume 63, 1957, pp. 58-69 and Arnold S. Tannenbaum and Jerold G. Bachman, "Structural Versus Individual Effects," American Journal of Sociology, Volume 69, 1964, pp. 585-595.

This method was illustrated by Blau through hypothetical data presented in Table 1 in which five hundred persons were assumed to be arranged in fifty groups of about ten members each. Blau suggested that a structural effect was demonstrated by the differences in average performance scores between the two columns in the table. Blau stated, "This finding would show that even when the effect of the individual's discussion rate of his problems on his performance is eliminated, just to be in a group where communication flows freely improves performance--other things being equal."²⁶

Table 1.--Performance Scores by Rate and Frequency of Discussion (Blau's Hypothetical Data)

Individuals Who Discuss Their Problems	Group Most of Whose Members Discuss Their Problems	
	Rarely	Often
Often	.65	.85
Rarely	.40	.70

Regarding structural effects, it was recognized that one may define structural constructs as opposed to purely individual variables for purposes of group or organizational theory. Blau noted that his method of isolating structural

²⁶Blau, "Formal Organizations . . .," p. 64.

effects differentiated the effects of structural variables upon patterns of action from the influence exerted by characteristics of individual level relationships.²⁷

Blau divided structural effects into two categories. The first was concerned with the consequences of the common values or shared norms of a collectivity, and the second dealt with networks of social relationships or distribution of social positions.²⁸ Also, Blau noted that either of these two basic aspects of the social structure could have direct effects, inverse effects, and contingency effects.²⁹ (These effects will be examined later in this study.)

Structural effects of common values indicated the influence upon an individual that resulted from the shared values of the other members of the group.³⁰

Structural effects of relational networks attempted to theoretically remove the supportive or constraining force exerted by the social organization of the relationships between individuals in a collectivity from the influences of each member's (or member) interpersonal relationships or social status.³¹

²⁷Blau, "Structural Effects," p. 191.

²⁸Ibid., p. 191.

²⁹Ibid., p. 191.

³⁰Ibid., p. 191.

³¹Ibid., p. 191.

SETTING OF STUDY

The setting of this study was the school. Five large Michigan school districts of approximately equal size were examined in this study. These districts were Dearborn, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing and Saginaw. Fifty-three public schools (Grades K-12) were selected on the basis of a stratified, random sample of each district. Self-administered questionnaires were given both to the teachers in the schools and school principals. In this study, the teachers within the various schools were taken as comprising the various work groups. The principals were taken as the formal leaders or supervisors of the work organization. It was noted that there were important differences between teachers who represented a professional occupation and the industrial and clerical workers who were used in most Human Relations studies in terms of training, status, autonomy in work situation and importance of collegial values. However, it was not the purpose of this study to test the assumptions of the Human Relations studies but rather to gain a greater understanding of group determination of leader behavior.

Bidwell noted in his summary discussion of authority structures in the school that the positions of Waller and Getzels offered alternative points of view: dominative

authority resulting from a basic difference in the orientation of teachers and administrators as opposed to collegial authority based upon the common occupational background of teachers and administrators.³²

Becker pointed out in his study of Chicago public school teachers that the authority of administrators in relation to teachers was limited.³³ In the area of student-parent relations, the teachers accepted the official authority of the principal as legitimate. These teachers, on the other hand, did not accept the principal's official authority as legitimate in the areas of curriculum and instruction. Here they viewed the principal as a colleague and expected him to base his supervision of instruction on professional competence, giving advice rather than orders.

Becker's study was especially relevant because it indicated that group determination or influence upon leader behavior was possible within professional work groups located within an organizational setting. There was evidence of the collegial authority of teachers and the principal's apparent limited acquiescence in the face of its realization.

Like many large-scale organizations, the schools have encountered the problems of professionals in organizations.

³²Charles Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1965, p. 1004.

³³Howard S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," in Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations, New York, Holt, Reinhart, and Winston, Inc., 1961, p. 243.

Scott outlined several areas of role conflict associated with the differences between the professional and bureaucratic models of organization and among them was the professional's resistance to bureaucratic supervision.³⁴ The increasing specialization and expertise of teachers have given rise to teacher demands for autonomy and professionalization. This has conflicted with school administrative needs for bureaucratic authority and for mechanisms of integration and coordination. Wildman noted that as a result of such conflicting forces, teachers have become more active in teacher professional organizations which are adding collective negotiations to their responsibilities.³⁵ These organizations have reinforced the professional image of teachers by disseminating information about the job and providing symbols which could be shared by all members. Marcus stated:³⁶

The professional organizations then, become a mechanism for standardizing the relationship between teachers and administrators. The number of directives and proliferation of rules that administrators can initiate unilaterally are limited without teacher involvement. . . . Administrators are forced to adopt new roles for themselves and acquire new abilities or staff to devote their energies to teaching and not to vocal and interfering parents.

³⁴W. R. Scott, "Professionals in Bureaucracies-Areas of Conflict," in Vollmer and Mills (eds.), Professionalization, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 265-275.

³⁵Wesley Wildman, "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 46, 1964, pp. 152-158.

³⁶Philip M. Marcus, "Bureaucratization and Professionalization: Converging Forces at the Negotiating Table in Public Education," in progress.

Thus we can see that professional teacher organizations have begun to force readjustments between teachers and administrators. Recent teacher organization militancy in the state of Michigan has brought about several changes altering the traditional teacher-principal relationship.³⁷ Officials at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators stated that teacher militancy--expressed in the increasing tendency among teacher organizations toward collective negotiations and strikes as a viable means of affecting changes in their job situation--was the major concern among the administrators in attendance.³⁸ Principals have become unwilling to relinquish some of their traditional supervisory prerogatives involving curriculum and job assignments.

Because teachers and teacher organizations have become increasingly concerned about matters such as professionalization, the relationship between teachers and their bureaucratic supervisors, principals, offered an excellent opportunity to study the possibility of group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within an organizational setting.

³⁷"Teacher Militance No. 1 Issue," Lansing State Journal, February 17, 1969, p. 9.

³⁸Ibid.

HYPOTHESES AND STUDY DESIGN

A Modification of Blau's Technique

It was the basic assumption of this study that by utilizing Blau's method of isolating structural effects, group determination of leadership behavior could be demonstrated. Blau's technique was modified to isolate a structural effect upon a single member of a group. Instead of looking at the influence of structural effects upon each member taken across dichotomous collectivities, attention was focused upon a single individual that occupied a particular status or position. For example, in the situation of the work group located within an organizational setting, this position was that of the formal leader. Using this technique, it was possible to test the hypothesis of group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within organizational settings.

This modification of Blau's technique could be demonstrated through the following hypothetical data. Fifty-three work groups and their leaders were classified according to their attitudes concerning employee unions. The leaders were classified according to their attitudes toward supervision. The results of an analysis of these data are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.--Relationship Between Attitude Toward Union and Supervisory Style (Hypothetical Data)

Style of Supervision	Group Attitude Toward Union		Favorable Unfavorable	
	Leader's Attitude	Leader's Attitude	Leader's Attitude	Leader's Attitude
	+	-	+	-
General	70%	65%	60%	30%
Close	30	35	40	70

From this table, it was demonstrated that even when the effect of an individual's attitude toward the union was held constant, to be in a group where attitude toward the union was high influenced a leader's orientation toward supervisory style.

Dependent Variables

The responses of fifty-three public school principals to selected items were used to indicate orientation toward various leadership or supervisory practices. The principals responded to each item on a five-point scale. The items used were as follows:

It should be permissible for a teacher to violate a rule if he believes the student's best interests will be served. (Permissible to violate rule)

Every teacher's procedures, assignments and rate of progress through a course should be unique to him and his own sense of judgment. (Teacher's own sense of judgment)

Teachers should not be transferred from one course to another as the need arises. (Transfer)

The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions should be exercised by the teachers in the subject area. (Ultimate authority by teachers)

A teacher should be able to make his own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom. (Teacher make own decisions)

Extent exchange information, opinions, and ideas about doing your job with the building representatives of the MEA or MFT in your school. (Exchange information with building representative)

Extent eager to organize principals into a bargaining unit separate from teachers and superintendents. (Organize principals)

Extent eager to unite with teachers in their bargaining unit. (Unite with teachers)

Each of these items represented various aspects of bureaucratic leadership or supervisory practice that were relevant to the formal leader position of school principal. A favorable response to these items represented the general, supportive style of supervision advocated by Likert and his associates. The items that dealt with "organize principals" and "unite with teachers" did not portray dimensions of Likert's management concepts, but rather, were included because they represented relevant observations concerning the influence of the social value items that dealt with teacher strikes and collective negotiations. The expected association of the leadership or supervisory practice items with each other was that of a consistent interrelationship. In other words, it was expected that each of the supervisory practice items would be related to the independent variables in the same direction.

Independent Variables

As noted the structural effects of common values indicated the influence upon an individual that resulted from the shared values of other members of the group. Becker noted that the authority of principals in relation to teachers was limited. Wildman noted that strong and increasingly militant professional teacher organizations forced readjustments in the relationships between principals and teachers. It was expected that the prevailing value orientation within the school toward collective negotiations and teacher strikes would influence the principals' responses to questions concerned with leadership or supervisory practice. These two independent variables represented general indicators of the prevailing value orientation within the schools toward the militance of teacher organizations. Teachers in schools in which the prevailing value orientation toward teacher strikes and collective negotiations was favorable were expected to favor the complex of issues and problems that have become the concern of teacher organizations, including that of professionalization. Thus they could force readjustments in the traditional relationship between teachers and principals by challenging traditional bureaucratic supervisory prerogatives.*

*The two independent variables--the prevailing value orientation of the school toward teacher strikes and collective negotiations--were correlated with the question: "To what extent are you active in teacher organization." For collective negotiations the $r_s = -0.22$. For teacher strikes the $r_s = 0.27$, $DF = 51$, $p < .05$.

The responses of fifty-three public school principals to selected items were used to determine the principals' value orientation to specific questions. The means of the teachers' responses in each school were used to determine the prevailing value orientations of the various schools.

The principals and individual teachers responded to each item on a five point scale. The items used were as follows:³⁹

How much approve of teacher strikes? (Teacher strikes)

How beneficial will collective negotiations be to teachers in the next five years? (Collective negotiations)

One item was used in which the individual teachers and principals responded to a dichotomized set of answers. They responded to "as much authority as needed" and "not as much authority as needed" to the following:

Does principal have as much authority as needed in regard to: Deciding to take or reject a new or transferred employee? Speaking to staff members about being late or quitting early? Initiating action to promote staff? Granting few hours off to staff? Changing staff procedures?

The ranks of the means of the teachers' responses within each school were used to determine the particular school's prevailing value orientation. The combined responses

³⁹This approach has placed primary emphasis upon the influence exerted by contextual variables. However, the selection of principals into the existing context of values and the mutual association of both principals and teachers can be related to the principals' responses to supervisory practice items.

of the principals were dichotomized by examination of the marginals for each item used to represent a particular social value orientation. The ranks of the means of each school were also dichotomized at the median for each item used. The principals then were classified two ways: according to which dichotomized category of prevailing value orientation their school was located and according to their own individual value orientations. Thus, to isolate the structural effect of the prevailing value orientation of a principal's school, the relationship between the school's prevailing value orientation and the principal's response to the supervisory practice item was determined while the principal's individual value orientation was held constant.*

Hypotheses

Based upon the preceding discussion, one would expect the following results from a study using Blau's technique of isolating structural effects to examine the relationship between teachers and principals in regard to bureaucratic supervision:

REGARDLESS OF INDIVIDUAL VALUES, PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS
IN WHICH THE PREVAILING VALUE ORIENTATION WAS RELATIVELY
FAVORABLE TOWARD TEACHER STRIKES WOULD BE MORE LIKELY TO

*The interview schedules were coded and put onto IBM cards. The data including the ranks of the schools were tabulated by the CD 3600 computer at Michigan State University.

EXHIBIT A TEACHER-CENTERED ORIENTATION CONCERNING QUESTIONS OF LEADERSHIP OR SUPERVISORY PRACTICE THAN PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE PREVAILING VALUE ORIENTATION WAS RELATIVELY UNFAVORABLE.

REGARDLESS OF INDIVIDUAL VALUES, PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE PREVAILING VALUE ORIENTATION WAS RELATIVELY FAVORABLE TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE MORE LIKELY TO EXHIBIT A TEACHER-CENTERED ORIENTATION CONCERNING QUESTIONS OF LEADERSHIP OR SUPERVISORY PRACTICE THAN PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE PREVAILING VALUE ORIENTATION WAS RELATIVELY UNFAVORABLE.

REGARDLESS OF INDIVIDUAL VALUES, PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE PREVAILING VALUE ORIENTATION WAS RELATIVELY FAVORABLE TOWARD THE PRINCIPAL HAVING AS MUCH AUTHORITY AS NEEDED WOULD BE MORE LIKELY TO EXHIBIT A TEACHER-CENTERED ORIENTATION CONCERNING QUESTIONS OF LEADERSHIP OR SUPERVISORY PRACTICE THAN PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH THE PREVAILING VALUE ORIENTATION WAS RELATIVELY UNFAVORABLE.

The items that were used to measure the prevailing value orientation toward teacher strikes and collective negotiations were general indicators of teacher militancy within a school. An operationalization of exhibiting a teacher-centered orientation was made by stating that it would be indicated by having a response that was favorable on the items concerned with supervisory practice. Schools and principals were determined as favorable or unfavorable to

the social value items by dichotomizing the responses into high and low categories.

Considerations

This study did involve some difficult methodological problems and important interpretive limitations. The study was based upon a secondary analysis of a larger project.⁴⁰ Because the original study was not designed with an analysis of structural effects in mind, one major problem encountered was that of adapting the data gathered from the original study for purposes of studying structural effects. Therefore, although single-item indicators were used as measures of social values, it was realized that the depth of analysis would probably be not as great as that that might have been attained if multiple item indicators were used as measures of analysis. For example, other areas of social influence upon the principals' responses to questions of supervisory behavior such as expertise, autonomy, occupational commitment, and ethical responsibility could have been examined.⁴¹

Two basic assumptions of Blau's technique for isolating structural effects were those of constancy both within rows and columns. However, Tannenbaum and Bachman have

⁴⁰Marcus, "Bureaucratization"

⁴¹George Strauss, "Professionalism and Occupational Associations," Industrial Relations, Volume 2, 1963, pp. 8-10.

pointed out that the dichotomous categories that Blau employed in his technique failed to hold the individual variable and the group variable strictly constant. They noted that dichotomous categories failed to take into account the continuous nature of these variables and suggested that consideration be given to the analysis of structural variables along a continuum.⁴² Tannenbaum and Bachman's points, although well taken, were impossible to realize since the restrictions imposed upon this study because it was a secondary analysis made dichotomous classification the best possible method for the examination of structural effects. This was compatible to the primary purpose of this study: the examination of Blau's technique for isolating structural effects as a method to study group determination of leadership behavior.

Since both high schools and elementary schools were involved in the sample, the question of the basic differences between the two was raised. Tannenbaum and Bachman noted that an investigator who was primarily interested in examining the presence of structural effects need not be overly concerned with a spurious individual level effect as a result of a

⁴²Tannenbaum and Bachman, p. 586. Also Blau has pointed out that structural effects cannot be expected to account for all of the variance in dependent variables. For example, the factor of time is not taken into account. However, since there were only fifty-three cases divided into four unequal columns, only large differences would be statistically significant. For further information see for example James A. Davis, Joe L. Spaeth, and Carolyn Huson, "A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Compositions," American Sociological Review, Volume 26, 1961, pp. 215-225.

failure to hold group characteristics strictly constant. However, the investigator should be concerned if an isolated structural effect was spurious because of a failure to hold individual characteristics constant.⁴³ Consequently, contained in the Appendix are the results of the principals' responses to the items used in the study analyzed by means of median tests for high school and elementary school principals.

⁴³Tannenbaum and Bachman, p. 589.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Principal's Authority

It was expected that regardless of individual orientations, principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was high concerning viewing the principal as having as much authority as needed would be more likely to exhibit a teacher-centered orientation concerning questions of leadership or supervisory practice than principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was low.

Teachers in a school in which the prevailing value orientation was high concerning viewing the principal as having as much authority as needed would influence the principal's response to questions of supervisory practice. Thus, principals in a school in which the prevailing value orientation was different than that of their own individual orientations would be influenced by the external constraint presented by the group's prevailing value orientation that had an expected influence upon the principals' responses to the supervisory practice questions. For example, principals whose individual value orientations were low concerning the principal having as much authority as needed but were in schools in which the prevailing value orientations were high would more likely be high on the supervisory practice items

than principals whose value orientations were low but were in schools in which the prevailing value orientations were also low. Also, principals whose individual value orientations were high concerning the principal having as much authority as needed and were in schools in which the prevailing value orientations were also high would more likely be high on the supervisory practice items than principals whose value orientations were high but were in schools in which the prevailing value orientations were low.

According to Blau, what we expected to observe were the direct structural effects of common values. This would indicate that the individual principal's response to the supervisory practice items was influenced not only by the motivational force of his own value orientation, but also by the social pressure resulting from the shared values of the teachers within the school.⁴⁴

As shown in Table 3, the results of the principals' responses on two of the supervisory practice items did conform to these expectations. The principals' responses to the supervisory practice item "permissible to violate rule" showed that principals who were high on their value orientations concerning having as much authority as needed were more likely to be high on the supervisory practice item than principals who had a lower value orientation. However, regardless of their own individual value orientations, principals

⁴⁴Blau, "Structural Effects," p. 181.

Table 3.--School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Principal's Authority,
Principal's Value Orientation Toward Authority, and Principal's
Response to Items Concerning Supervisory Practice

Principal's Responses (High)	School's Prevailing Value Orientation			
	Principal's High	High Orientation Low	Principal's High	Low Orientation Low
1. "Violate Rule"	82%	70%	71%	63%
2. "Decisions"	80	80	71	36
3. "Judgment"	73	50	59	82
4. "Transfer"	73	40	59	73
5. "Ultimate Authority"	60	40	71	91
N=	(15)	(10)	(17)	(11)

of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was high concerning the principal having as much authority as needed were more likely to be high on the supervisory practice item than principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was low. Although the differences between the columns were small, the results were in the expected direction to indicate the direct structural effect of common values. Also, although the differences in the proportion of principals who were either high or low on the supervisory practice item associated with schools with contrasting value orientations were small, they were equivalent to those associated with contrasting individual principal value orientations.

The same pattern of relationships were observed with the supervisory practice item that dealt with "teachers make own decisions." Again, regardless of their own individual value orientations, principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was high concerning the principal having as much authority as needed were more likely to be high on the supervisory practice item than principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was low. Principals whose individual value orientations were low concerning the principal having as much authority as needed but were in schools in which the prevailing value orientations were high were more likely to be high on the supervisory practice item than principals whose value orientations were low but were in schools in which the prevailing value

orientations were also low. This same relationship held for principals with high value orientations concerning the principal having as much authority as needed.

Concerning the supervisory practice item "teachers make own decisions," the combination of group and individual value orientation made a considerable difference. A little less than two-fifths of the principals who neither had a high value orientation concerning the principal having as much authority as needed nor were in schools where the prevailing value orientation was high were high on the supervisory practice item. On the other hand, four-fifths of those principals who had both a high value orientation and were in schools in which the prevailing value orientation was also high were high on the supervisory practice item. Concerning the two supervisory practice items, "permissible to violate rule," and "teachers make own decisions," it can be said that the social values concerning the principal having as much authority as needed that prevailed in the school did exert external constraints (as demonstrated by structural effects) upon the principal in terms of his responses to questions of supervisory practice.

The results of the comparison of three other supervisory practice items with the prevailing value orientations of the schools and the value orientations of the individual principals were different. As shown in Table 3, the results associated with the supervisory practice items "transfer"

and "teacher's own sense of judgment" did not indicate the direct structural effects of common values. The results associated with these two items were similar to Blau's contingency structural effects of common values. The contingency structural effects of common values would indicate that the relationship between the individual's orientation and another variable was contingent on the prevalence of a particular value in the group.⁴⁵ According to Blau, the extreme case of contingency effect would be where the relationship between the individual's orientation and some other factor had become reversed, dependent on the prevalence of the value orientation in the group.⁴⁶ The principals' responses to the supervisory practice items "transfer" and "teacher's own sense of judgment" did not meet these conditions.

What was important concerning these two supervisory practice items was the homogeneity of the individual principal's values with that of the prevailing value orientation of the school in which he was located. Therefore, a structural relationship, in the sense to which Blau referred, between the school's prevailing value orientation and the supervisory practice items did not exist. It was not the nature of the school's prevailing value orientation that

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 183.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 183.

mattered, but rather the homogeneity of the value orientation of the principal and the school in which he was located.

The principals' responses to the supervisory practice item "ultimate authority by teachers" was somewhat perplexing. The results were somewhat similar to what might indicate an inverse structural effect of common values. According to Blau, inverse structural effects of common values would indicate that group values were not parallel to the effects of the individual's value orientation and would have opposite implications for the individual's conduct.⁴⁷ The principals' responses to this supervisory practice item did not indicate a case of an inverse structural effect but simply a case in which principals in one group of schools were higher on the dependent variable than principals in another group of schools. Also, the relationship between contrasting individual principals within schools with similar prevailing value orientations was not consistent between groups of schools whose prevailing value orientations were different so as to rule out the case of inverse structural effects.

Each of the supervisory practice items were expected to be related to the independent variables in the same direction, that of the direct structural effects of common values. While this relationship did not necessarily have to hold true when the results were finally analyzed, an adequate

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 183.

substantive explanation of the relationship between the independent variable and supervisory practice items should be offered. However, the relationship between the item "ultimate authority by teachers" and the school's prevailing value orientation concerning the principal having as much authority as needed was without an adequate substantive explanation.

This was indirectly related to one of the problems involved in this study. As noted, this study was a secondary analysis of available data. Thus, one of the problems of this study was the availability of adequate measures. This was especially the case in regard to selecting variables that would represent relevant and important social values that might act as a constraining influence upon the principals' responses to questions of leadership or supervisory practice. This was important because the conclusion that a given social value would have structural effects on the principals' responses rested on the assumption that the relationships observed were not spurious and the social value in question was the independent variable.

Such social value variables that might have been used in this study were limited. Some variables that might have been considered ideal in terms of the relationship to supervisory practice could not be used because of methodological problems. Also, the variables that were selected for use in this study did have some disadvantages.

The indicator that was used for the authority variable had two main problems. First, the several items that comprised the authority question on the original questionnaire did not all relate to the principal's authority vis-a-vis the teacher in the manner that this study proposed. The second major problem involved the interpretation of the key phrase "as much authority as needed." In this study the phrase was interpreted in a limiting sense--that the principal had enough authority and did not want or need anymore. However, that this phrase can be interpreted in another manner was realized.

Because of these problems, the measure used for the authority variable cannot be viewed as completely accurate. However, it was not the primary purpose of this study to provide any substantive demonstration concerning the relationship between any of the variables that measure social values and the supervisory practice items. The primary purpose of this study was to examine modifications of Peter M. Blau's technique for isolating structural effects as a method for the study of group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within organizational settings.

Was there a relationship between the indicator used to measure the values toward the authority of the principal and the supervisory practice items examined? Obviously, each of the supervisory practice items were not related to

the social value variable in the same direction of direct structural effects. Because of this, we cautiously interpreted the results of this study by stating that we could not determine if there was an association between the social values that prevailed in a school concerning the principal having as much authority as needed and the principal's response to questions of leadership or supervisory practice. However, the responses of the principals on two of the supervisory practice items--"permissible to violate rule" and "teachers make own decisions"--did conform to the expected results of direct structural effects. This has demonstrated the viability of utilizing Blau's technique for isolating structural effects, or modifications thereof, as a method for examining the possible group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within organizational settings.

Collective Negotiations

It was expected that regardless of individual value orientations, principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was high concerning viewing collective negotiations as being beneficial to teachers would be more likely to exhibit a teacher-centered orientation concerning questions of supervisory practice than principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was low. Teachers in a school in which the prevailing value orientation was

high toward collective negotiations would influence the principal's response to questions of supervisory practice independent of the principal's value orientation toward collective negotiations. Again, what we expected to observe were the direct structural effects of common values.

As shown in Table 4, the results of the principals' responses on two of the supervisory practice items did conform to these expectations. Concerning these two items--"permissible to violate rule" and "teacher's own sense of judgment," it was shown that regardless of their own individual value orientations toward collective negotiations, principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was high toward collective negotiations were more likely to have responded high on the two supervisory practice items than principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was low. Concerning principals with similar individual value orientations toward collective negotiations but who were in schools with contrasting prevailing value orientations toward collective negotiations it was found that principals located within schools with high prevailing value orientations toward collective negotiations were more likely to have responded high on the two supervisory practice items. Also, the combination of schools with low prevailing value orientations toward collective negotiations and principals with low value orientations made a considerable difference in the responses to the two supervisory practice items.

Table 4.--School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Collective Negotiations,
Principal's Value Orientation Toward Collective Negotiations, and
Principal's Response to Items Concerning Supervisory Practice

Principal's Responses (High)	School's Prevailing Value Orientation			
	Principal's High	High Orientation	Principal's High	Low Orientation
1. "Violate Rule"	82%	70%	71%	44%
2. "Judgment"	71	70	65	56
3. "Transfer"	54	82	67	33
4. "Ultimate Authority"	71	50	82	44
5. "Decisions"	53	80	71	78
6. "Exchange Information"	59	30	47	56
N=	(17)	(10)	(17)	(9)

Shown in Table 4 are the results of the principals' responses on the supervisory practice items that dealt with "transfer," "teachers make own decision," "exchange information with building representative," and "ultimate authority by teachers." The results associated with "transfer" seemed to indicate a contingency structural effect whereby the relationship between the principal's orientation and the supervisory practice item had become reversed, dependent on the prevailing value orientation in the school. However, this finding was without adequate substantive explanation.

The results associated with "teachers make own decisions" did not indicate either structural effects or individual-level effects. The homogeneity of values in terms of the principal's value orientation and the prevailing value orientation of the school was important as shown in the results of "exchange information with building representative." However, this again did not indicate either structural effects or individual-level effects. The results associated with "ultimate authority by teachers" did indicate individual-level effects of common values.

What was the general relationship between the social values that prevailed in a school toward collective negotiations for teachers and the principals' responses to questions of supervisory practice? In terms of the results indicating consistent structural effects or individual-level affects, there was not an association between the social

values of a school toward collective negotiations and the principals' responses to questions of supervisory practice. However, the responses of the principals on two of the supervisory practice items did conform to the expected results of direct structural effects.

Teacher Strikes

It was expected that regardless of individual value orientations, principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was that of viewing teacher strikes as favorable would be more likely to exhibit a teacher-centered orientation concerning questions of supervisory practice than principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was low. Teachers in a school in which the prevailing value orientation was high toward teacher strikes would influence the principal's response to questions of supervisory practice independent of the principal's value orientation toward teacher strikes. As with the two other variables relating to social values in the school, we expected to observe the direct structural effects of common values.

As shown in Table 5, the principals' responses to two of the supervisory practice items--"permissible to violate rule" and "ultimate authority by teachers"--did conform to the expectations. Regardless of their individual value orientations toward teacher strikes, principals of schools

Table 5.--School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, Principal's Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, and Principal's Response to Items Concerning Supervisory Practice.

Principal's Responses (High)	School's Prevailing Value Orientation			
	Principal's High	High Orientation Low	Principal's High	Low Orientation
1. "Violate Rule"	82%	75%	75%	57%
2. "Ultimate Authority"	100	63	75	36
3. "Judgment"	64	68	67	64
4. "Transfer"	73	50	75	64
5. "Decisions"	55	75	58	79
N=	(11)	(16)	(12)	(14)

in which the prevailing value orientation was high toward teacher strikes were more likely to have responded high on the two supervisory practice items than principals of schools in which the prevailing value orientation was low. Concerning principals with similar individual value orientations toward teacher strikes but were in school with contrasting prevailing value orientations toward teacher strikes, it was found that principals located within schools with high prevailing value orientations toward teacher strikes were more likely to have responded high on the two supervisory practice items. Also, the combinations of school with low prevailing value orientation--principal with low value orientation and school with high prevailing value orientation--principal with high value orientation made a considerable difference in the principal's response to the supervisory practice item "ultimate authority by teachers."

Shown in Table 5 are the results of the principals' responses to the supervisory practice items that dealt with "teacher's own sense of judgment," "transfer," and "teachers make own decisions." The results associated with "teacher's own sense of judgment" did not indicate either structural or individual-level effects. A type of inverse individual-level effect was shown by the results associated with "teachers make own decisions." The results associated with "transfer" indicated inverse structural effects. These diverse kinds of relationships did not form any kind of discernible pattern.

Three items concerned with leadership behavior that were closely related to teacher negotiation organizations were compared with the social value variable that dealt with teacher strikes. It was expected that the relationship between these three items and the social value variable would be that of a direct structural effect of common values.

As shown in Table 6, the results of the principals' responses to two of the leadership behavior items--"exchange information with building representative" and "unite with teachers"--conformed to these expectations of the direct structural effects of common values. The combination of a school with a low prevailing value orientation toward teacher strikes and principal with a low value orientation toward teacher strikes made a considerable difference in the principal's responses to the two leadership behavior items, especially "unite with teachers." None of the principals who neither had high individual value orientations toward teacher strikes nor where in schools in which the prevailing value orientation was high were willing to unite with the teachers' bargaining unit while nearly one-third of the principals who either had high individual value orientations or where located within schools in which the prevailing value orientation was high were willing to unite with the teachers' bargaining unit.

The results associated with "organize principals" indicated a contingency structural effect of common values.

Table 6.--School's Prevailing Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, Principal's Value Orientation Toward Teacher Strikes, and Principal's Response to Items Concerning Leadership Behavior

Principal's Responses (High)	School's Prevailing Value Orientation			
	Principal's High	High Orientation Low	Principal's High	Low Orientation
1. "Exchange Information"	55%	53%	50%	38%
2. "Unite with Teachers"	32	31	33	0
3. "Organize Principals"	27	81	75	36
N=	(11)	(16)	(12)	(14)

The relationship between the individual principal's orientation and the leadership behavior item had become reversed, dependent on the prevailing value orientation in the school. The results were as expected in schools in which the prevailing value orientation toward teacher strikes was low. However, the relationship was reversed in the case of schools in which the prevailing value orientation toward teachers strikes was high. A possible explanation for this would be that in the case where the principal was high and the school was also high the principal did not desire to organize principals, preferring instead to identify with teachers. However, in the case where the principal was low and the school was high, the principal possibly because he felt threatened, preferred the organization of principals.

In terms of the results indicating consistent structural or individual-level effects, it could not be determined if there was an association between the social values that prevailed in schools toward teachers strikes and the principals' responses to questions of supervisory practice and leadership behavior. However, the responses of the principals on four of the items examined did conform to the expected results.

Overview of Relationships

As mentioned previously, each of the supervisory practice items represented the same broad dimension of

general, supportive supervisory behavior. Therefore, each of the supervisory practice items were expected to be related to the social value variables in the same direction of direct structural effects of common values. Shown in Table 7 is an overview of the relationships between the supervisory practice items and the social value variables.

Table 7.--Summary of Results

	Principal's Authority	Collective Negotiations	Teacher Strikes
1. "Violate Rule"	ds	ds	ds
2. "Judgment"	N	ds	N
3. "Transfer"	N	N	is
4. "Ultimate Authority"	N	il	ds
5. "Decisions"	ds	N	il

ds = Expected Results of Direct Structural Effects

is = Inverse Structural Effects

cs = Contingency Structural Effects

il = Individual-Level Effects

N = No Structural or Individual Effects

Only one of the supervisory practice items--"permissible to violate rule"--exhibited a direct structural effect over each of the social value variables. Each of the other supervisory practice items that exhibited a direct structural effect did so only once. Each social value variable was related to the direct structural effects of common values on only two of five supervisory practice items.

Finally, there was no consistent pattern of inverse, contingency or direct structural effects or individual-level effects that was related to any of the social value variables.

CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was that of examining a method of ascertaining the possible group determination of leadership behavior in work groups located within organizational settings. Blau's technique for isolating structural effects was modified as to isolate a structural effect upon a single member of a group, the formal leader. Three measures of social values in the schools--the prevailing value orientation of the teachers toward the principal's authority, collective negotiations, and teacher strikes--were expected to exert external influences concerning the principals' responses to questions of supervisory or leadership practice, independent of the principals' individual value orientations.

The results of the study have indicated that no substantive relationship can definitely be established between the principal's responses to questions of supervisory practice and the prevailing value orientation of the teachers in a school on any of the three social value variables studied.

Although there was no consistent pattern of relationships, the expected results of the direct structural effects of social values were observed in several cases. Principals within schools in which the prevailing value

orientation was high concerning a particular social value were more likely to have responded high on questions of leadership or supervisory practice independent of their own individual value orientations.

This study has demonstrated the viability of utilizing modifications of Blau's technique for isolating structural effects as a method for studying group determination of leadership behavior. However, further investigations in this area should take into account the limitations of Blau's method and consider the methodologies that have been suggested in articles by Davis, Spaeth and Huson and Tannenbaum and Bachman.

Of great interest were the results associated with the social value variable that dealt with teacher strikes and the three leadership behavior items (Table 6). Each of these items demonstrated a structural effect of common values. Since these items were more directly related to the functions of teacher negotiating organizations and the social value variable teacher strikes, this relationship possibly indicated that a more direct or functional relationship between independent and dependent variables is advisable in further investigations.

Finally, this study did have implications for determining exactly what leadership or supervisory factors might be subject to group influence. As shown in Table 7, the supervisory practice item "permissible to violate rule"

exhibited a direct structural effect over each of the social value variables. This item could be interpreted as being different than the other supervisory practice items in that it represented a more limited span of teacher autonomy and operational freedom that the principal was willing to tolerate. Viewed in this manner, the results associated with Table 7 indicated that the social values that prevailed in a school did influence the principal's response to questions of leadership or supervisory practice independent of the principal's individual value orientation--but only to a limited extent. The principal was subject to group influence to the extent the supervisory functions affected were within the dimensions of favoring limited teacher autonomy and operational freedom. Beyond this, the principal was unwilling to surrender his traditional supervisory prerogatives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Becker, Howard. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public Schools," in Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Bidwell, Charles. "The School as a Formal Organization," in March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Blau, Peter M. "Formal Organizations: Dimensions of Analysis," American Journal of Sociology, Volume 63, 1957.
- Blau, Peter M. "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, Volume 25, 1960.
- Coch, Lester and Franch, John R. P. Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change," in Maccoby et al (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958.
- Davis, James A., Spaeth, Joe L., and Huson, Carolyn. "A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Composition," American Sociological Review, Volume 26,
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Faunce, William A. Readings in Industrial Sociology. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1967.
- Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership," in Linzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Co., 1954.
- Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1950.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Menzel, Herbert. "On the Relation Between Individual and Collective Properties," in Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

- Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.
- Lippitt, Ronald and White, Ralph K. "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Maccoby et al (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958.
- Marcus, Philip M. "Bureaucratization and Professionalization: Converging Forces at the Negotiating Table in Public Education," in progress.
- Mechanic, David. "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 7, 1963.
- Merei, Ferenc. "Group Leadership and Institutionalization," in Maccoby et al (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958.
- Miller, Delbert and Form, William H. Industrial Sociology. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Scott, W. R. "Professionals in Bureaucracies--Areas of Conflict," in Vollmer and Mills (eds.), Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Selznick, Philip. "The Leader as Agent of Led," in Dubin (ed.), Human Relations in Administration. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.
- Strauss, George. "Professionalism and Occupational Associations," Industrial Relations, Volume 2, 1963.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Social Psychology of Work Organization. New York: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1965.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S., and Bachman, Jerold G. "Structural Versus Individual Effects," American Journal of Sociology, Volume 69, 1964.
- "Teacher Militance No. 1 Issue." Lansing State Journal. February 17, 1969.
- Whyte, William F. "Human Relations--A Progress Report," in Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Wildman, Wesly. "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 46, 1964.

APPENDIX

MEDIAN TESTS FOR HIGH SCHOOL AND ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Items		Test Results		
1.	"Organize Principals"	$x^2=0.00$	DF=1	$p>.05$
2.	"Exchange Information"	$x^2=0.01$	DF=1	$p>.05$
3.	"Violate Rule"	$x^2=0.72$	DF=1	$p>.05$
4.	"Ultimate Authority"	$x^2=0.81$	DF=1	$p>.05$
5.	"Teacher Strikes"	$x^2=1.50$	DF=1	$p>.05$
6.	"Collective Negotiations"	$x^2=3.35$	DF=1	$p>.05$
7.	"Ultimate Authority"	$x^2=0.07$	DF=1	$p>.05$
8.	"Unite with Teachers"	$x^2=0.70$	DF=1	$p>.05$
9.	"Decisions"	$x^2=0.73$	DF=1	$p>.05$
10.	"Judgment"	$x^2=0.07$	DF=1	$p>.05$
11.	"Transfer"	$x^2=0.01$	DF=1	$p>.05$

If $x^2=p>.05$ accept hypothesis that the distributions of the responses of high school and elementary school principals are the same.

MAY 16 1969

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03177 3868