



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
A Study of the Authority Relationship Between
Principals and Teachers in Schools

presented by

Suparvadee S. Mitrsoomwang

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Masters degree in Sociology

Philip M. Marcus
Major professor

Date August 24, 1977

A STUDY OF THE AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS

By
Suparvadee S. Mitrsoomwang

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1977

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS

By

Suparvadee S. Mitrsomwang

This study examined the relationship between decentralized authority and subordinates' communication, conflict, peer influence, and compliance. Many scholars have analysed business and industrial organizations, and found positive relationships; this study examined whether their findings were also true in a sample of the work group located within an educational organization.

The setting of this study was 53 public schools in five large Michigan school districts of approximately equal size. 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 to school principals.

Four dependent variables--pattern of communication, organizational conflict, influence from the peer groups, and organizational compliance--have been discussed in relation to the human relations style of decentralized supervision.

Other independent variables--specialization and division of labour--were sometimes taken into account in order to explain some unexpected results. Based upon the data collected from elementary and secondary schools, Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients were employed to measure the degree of the relationship between teacher decision index representing the degree of teachers' participation in decision-making and social exchange indexes representing the dependent variables. The correlations of these variables for the elementary school were calculated separately from those of the secondary schools.

The results show that the direction of the relation was frequently as hypothesized, but the strength of the relationship was much lower than in the previous studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My appreciation and sincere thanks go to Dr. Philip Marcus, my thesis advisor, for his criticism, encouragement and guidance throughout this study, especially at the data gathering stages.

To Dr. Duane Gibson and Dr. John T. Gullahorn, who served on my committee, I wish to express my deep gratitude for their helpful comments and patience to see me through this project.

I would also like to express my special appreciation to my husband, whose encouragement and helping hand contributed to the completion of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
THEORY AND LITERATURE.....	4
The Classical or Traditional Theory.....	4
A. Weber's 'Ideal' Type of Rational Authority..	4
B. Administrative Management Theory.....	6
The Human Relations Approach.....	8
AUTHORITY CORRELATES TO ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS.....	13
Authority Correlates to Organizational Communica-	
tion.....	13
Authority Correlates to Organizational Conflict...	17
Authority Correlates to Organizational Compliance.	23
Authority Correlates to Influence from Peer Groups	26
SETTING OF STUDY.....	31
MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES.....	36
The Independent Variables.....	36
Style of Supervision.....	36
Division of Labor and Specialization.....	37
The Dependent Variables.....	39
Pattern of Communication.....	40
Organizational Conflict.....	40
Influence of Peer Groups.....	41
Organizational Compliance.....	41
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	43
Organizational Communication Correlated to Teacher	
Decision Index.....	43
Tension Between Teachers and Principals Correlated	
to Teacher Decision Index.....	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS--continued

Page

Organizational Compliance Correlated to Teacher Decision Index.....	52
Influence From Peer Groups Correlated to Teacher Decision Index.....	55
CONCLUSIONS.....	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	63
APPENDIX.....	67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
I. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Decision Index and Communication Index Within the Elementary Schools.....	44
II. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Decision Index and Communication Index Within the Secondary Schools.....	46
III. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Decision Index and Compliance Index Within the Elementary Schools.....	53
IV. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Decision Index and Compliance Index Within the Secondary Schools.....	54
V. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Decision Index and Influence Index for the Elementary Schools.....	56
VI. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Decision Index and Influence Index for the Secondary Schools.....	56

INTRODUCTION

All organizations develop a structure and mechanisms to insure their survival.¹ To obtain this goal, the organization must secure both internal support from its members and external support from the society filled with competitors. Within an organization, a control system directs members toward the organizational goals by coordinating activities that have been organized into subunits so that they can be performed by groups of employees.

There has been a great amount of interest within the social sciences concerning the control structure. Many terms have been used to deal with it: leadership, power, status, authority, rank, prestige, influence, control, manipulation, domination, and so forth, and still the concept is not sufficiently defined.

Theoretically speaking, there are two important theories concerning organizational control, the classical or traditional theory and the human relations theory. According to the classical theory, the organization is a

¹Philip Selznick, "Foundation of the Theory of Organization," American Sociological Review, Volume 13, 1948, pp. 23-55.

great hierarchy of superior-subordinate relations in which the person at the top, assumed to be omniscient, gives the general orders that initiate all activities. His immediate subordinates make the orders more specific for their subordinates, the latter do the same for theirs, and so on, until specific individuals are carrying out specific commands. All authority, one form of control, is cascaded down in this way by successive delegations. There is complete discipline enforced from the top down to assure that these commands are faithfully obeyed. Responsibility is owed from the bottom up. To assure predictability and accountability, each position is narrowly defined as to duties and jurisdiction without overlapping or duplication. Problems that fall outside the narrow limits of the job are referred upward until they come to a person with sufficient authority to make a decision. Each person is to receive orders from and be responsible to only one other person--his superior.

The human relations school, on the contrary, conceives authority as consisting of emergent factors. Designated status and predetermined formal organizational structure appear to be eclipsed by a free-floating variable; namely, style of leadership. The role of the leader consists of decentralizing his authority to his subordinates so that they (subordinates) can participate in the organizational activities. In this case, the subordinates will have

opportunities to initiate and suggest their ideas to the leaders. Responsibility is shared by both the subordinates and superordinates. The leaders is also expected to coordinate and exchange relations among group members. This implies that the supervisors should be the agents who maintain inter-group and intra-group communication rather than simply being the agents of higher authority. Communication tends to be two-way rather than one-way.²

Based upon these preceding theories, many studies have focused upon the study of relationships between patterns of authority used in the organization and social exchange within organization such as pattern of communication, job satisfaction, organizational conflict and so on. This study focuses upon the relationship between patterns of authority used in the organization; namely, decentralized authority and centralized authority and social exchange within the organization, particularly those which deal with communication, conflict, compliance, and influence from peer group. The purpose is that of determining whether the findings of other scholars, who have analyzed business and industrial organizations; are also true in a sample of public school personnel.

²H. Shepard, "Superiors and Subordinates in Research," Journal of Business, Volume 29, 1959, p. 261.

THEORY AND LITERATURE

The Classical or Traditional Theory

A. Weber's 'Ideal' Type of Rational Authority

The original concept of "authority" was given by Max Weber. In his study of "Sociology of Domination," Weber defined the term domination ("authority"³) as the probability that certain commands would be obeyed by a given group of persons. In his definition of authority, Weber did not include every mode of exercising "power" or "influence" over other persons. Domination in his sense was based upon the most diverse motives of compliance all the way from simple habit to the most purely rational calculation of advantage. Hence, every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of voluntary compliance; that is, an interest based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance in obedience.⁴

³Weber put "Autoritat" in quotation marks and parentheses behind Herrschaft, referring to an alternative colloquial term, but the sentence makes it clear that this does not yet specify the basis of compliance. However, in his later chapter, he alternatively translated the legitimate domination to authority.

⁴Max Weber, Economy and Society. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (eds.). New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.

According to Weber, there are three pure types of authority: legal authority, traditional authority, and charismatic authority. For Weber, the most rational type of authority is legal authority or as he calls it "bureaucratic authority" for the public and lawful government, and "management" in the setting of private economic domination.⁵ Authority in this case is attached to particular offices within the organization, and not to the individual holding the office. It is institutionalized by rigid specification and articulated through rules, regulations, codes, norms, and standards.⁶

In his description of bureaucratic authority, Weber noted that bureaucratic authority rested upon the principles of office hierarchy and of levels of graded authority. That means the lower participants will be supervised and directed by the higher ones. In this case, the authority is assumed to be in the hands of the higher positions in the organization, and superiors direct and make the decisions on all the organizational activities. Weber concluded "such a system offers the governed the possibility of appealing the

⁵Max Weber, "Bureaucracy," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1970, p. 6.

⁶Webber, op. cit., 1968.

decision of a lower office to its higher authority, in a regulated manner."⁷

B. Administrative Management Theory

Among the earliest comprehensive attempts to state principles of management were those of Fayol, whose 14 "principles" consisted of division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to general interest, remuneration of personnel, centralization, secular chain, order, equity, stability, initiative, and esprit des corps.⁸ From the preceding principles we find Fayol emphasize the idea of centralized administration, in which authority has the right to give orders and the power to exact obedience.⁹ For any action whatsoever, an employee should receive an order from one supervisor only (unity of command). The head of the organization is responsible for planning a group of activities having the same objective (unity of direction), while subordinates are supposed to conform to orders from the top positions who employed the authority. Discipline is an essential part of the organizational principles.

⁷Weber, op. cit., 1970.

⁸For more details see Joseph L. Massie, "Management Theory," in James G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organization. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1965.

⁹Ibid., p. 390.

A second major attempt to provide a conceptual framework of management principles was made by Urwick. Urwick was influenced by Fayol and by J. D. Mooney and A. C. Reiley, whose book, Onward Industry, had been published in 1931. Urwick, representing the administrative management school, tends to confirm the stereotype of the engineer. People have their idiosyncracies and deviations and oddities, but that is really unimportant. If we take them into account, what emerges is chaos, not organization. As March and Simon point out about this thought system "the employee (is viewed) as an inert instrument performing the tasks assigned to him. So, there is a tendency to view personnel as a given rather than as a variable in the system."¹⁰

Loosely speaking, then, the classical organizational theory conceives authority as a centralized controlling system in the hands of the authority agents. Commands, orders, directions are given to the lower participants by the higher authority. Unity of command, unity of direction and hierarchical control structure are basic principles of this theory. Subordinates are expected to conform to the superior's directions and commands. In this case, it is quite difficult for the lower participants to participate in organizational activities directly. A person is treated

¹⁰J. G. March and H. A. Simon, Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958, p. 225.

as a machine rather than as a human being. As Bennis noted: "For the classical organizational theory ... organizational activities were or could be rationally planned and designed by some planner who sits at the drawing board and constructs the organization as he would design a machine."¹¹

The Human Relations Approach

There has been a distinctive shift in thinking about organization since the early 1930's. The dominant focus of organization was transformed from a rational model, free from the friction of man's emotions into a model which accepts the human components as essential elements in considering the actual operation of an organization.¹² That new look in organizational theory took cognizance of the unanticipated consequences of organizations; workers' feelings, beliefs, perceptions, ideas, and sentiments--exactly the non-rational elements Weber believed escaped calculation.

March and Simon, in their study, Organizations, call this model the "Human Relations Model". The Human Relations approach was established as a result of the Hawthorne

¹¹Warren G. Bennis, "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 4, 1960, p. 265.

¹²Bennis, *ibid.*

experiments, which were carried out at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works near Chicago by Roethlisberger and Dickson. From their famous studies of the Relay Assembly Test Room, the Mica Splitting Test Room, and the Bank-Wiring Observation Room, they concluded that social rewards were more important than material rewards in inducing workers to behave in line with or, in opposition to, managerial goals. They noted informal group behavior was fundamental to the operation of industrial and other organizations.¹³ It was noted in the Bank-Wiring Room Study that style of leadership was directly related to the group behavior. The superior was under great pressure to conform to the norm of the groups of which he was supposed to be in charge.¹⁴ The studies also showed that a foreman or a person in a supervisory position was more likely to be accepted if he exercised Human Relations style of leadership.

Another view of the Human Relations approach is "Management by Objective" by Douglas McGregor.¹⁵ McGregor has reformulated a number of principles that outline a new

¹³Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, "Human Relations," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), Sociology of Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1970, pp. 53-64.

¹⁴Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, p. 36.

¹⁵J. D. Mooney, The Principles of Organization. New York: Harper, 1947.

approach to organizational leadership or the authority structure exercised within the organization. First, McGregor clearly recognized that "the most central principle of conventional organizational theory is that of authority."¹⁶ He attempted to substitute for personal authority (that is, the prerogative of power simply through superior role incumbency) the task or situational or goal demands. Thus management by objective comes about through "target-setting", a collaborative process where superior and subordinate attempt to develop the ground rules for work and productivity. Second, there is the principle of "interdependence" or collaboration between superior and subordinate. This principle has to do with "the belief--evidenced in practice--that subordinates are capable of learning how to exercise effective self-control."¹⁷ According to this approach, extending autonomy and increasing participation enable the subordinates to satisfy their needs (physiological and safety needs, social needs, ego needs and above all self-targeting, where a subordinate is responsible for setting his own standards, the employee is encouraged to take a

¹⁶"Notes on Organizational Theory: The Human Side of Enterprise," Proceedings of the Fifth Anniversary Convocation of the School of Industrial Management, M.I.T., April 9: Management by Objectives (M.I.T. reprint), Role of Staff in Modern Industry (M.I.T. reprint, undated).

¹⁷Ibid.

larger responsibility for defining and planning his own contribution to business and this way the company is able to exploit his egoistic and self-fulfillment needs."¹⁸

Another contribution to the Human Relations approach is the study done by Kurt Lewin and his associates. In the study of participation within the organization, Lewin concluded that the leader was not necessarily an explicitly declared position, but he was conferred during group action, sometimes without either the group or the individual being aware of the process by which this was done. Leadership, according to Lewin, varies with the task of the group and may move from one individual to another as the group finds it suitable. This means that authority to control the group is not centralized in the hands of a single person. On the contrary, the authority is decentralized in such a way that everybody can have a chance to get involved either directly or indirectly with the organizational activities.

To summarize, then, the Human Relations approach is derived from the philosophy that believes in human dignity. Under this philosophy, the workers are urged to cooperate as partners in the organization. They should be treated as human beings rather than machines or robots. Decentralized authority is a major concept that the leader should employ

¹⁸ Joe Kelly, Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Ill.: R. D. Irwin, Inc., 1974, p. 107.

for manipulating the organizational affairs. This means that the leader should give more opportunities to his followers to participate in organizational decision-making processes. The role of the leader consists of coordinating and encouraging relations among group members rather than of directing and controlling the group members. Thomas Gordon's conclusion clearly described the Human Relations style of leadership: "The primary concern of the leader is in facilitating the group development, helping the group clarify and achieve its goals, aiding the group to activate itself."¹⁹

¹⁹Thomas Gordon, Group-centered Leadership: A Way of Releasing the Creative Power of Groups. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955.

AUTHORITY CORRELATES TO ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS

Authority Correlates to Organizational Communication

Communication, the exchange of information and transmission of meaning, is the very essence of a social system or an organization. It is the nervous system of an organization, which provides the information and facilitates the understanding necessary to achieve both high productivity and high morale. It is a powerful determinant of the organization's overall effectiveness; it may exert effects on the ability of the organization to grow, perform effectively, and to survive. Consequently, management gives increasing recognition to the importance of communication as an instrument of organizational administration.

Generally, in any organization, communication usually correlates directly to the organizational controlling system. Chester I. Barnard, in his study on "A Definition of Authority" gave an interesting definition of authority: "Authority is the character of a communication (order) in a formal organization by virtue of which it is accepted by a contributor or "member" of the organization as governing the action he contributes; that is as governing or determining

what he does or is not to do as the organization is concerned."²⁰

Based upon this definition, one will see that authority is viewed as a communication process in the organization--the process of distributing orders, directions, commands from the top position to the other members of the organization.

Many studies dealing with the relationship between patterns of authority imposed in the organization and communication processes have been conducted by several social scientists. W. Richard Scott implied in his study of social workers that patterns of authority used in the organization or style of supervision is directly related to communication processes in the organization.²¹ According to Scott, there are two styles of supervision, one is bureaucratic supervision or routine supervision, the other is therapeutic or professional supervision. The bureaucratic supervision emphasizes centralized authority (close-supervising, centralized decision-making, rule-following) while the

²⁰ Chester I. Barnard, "A Definition of Authority," in Robert K. Merton (ed.), Reader in Bureaucracy. New York: The Free Press, 1952, pp. 18-185.

²¹ W. Richard Scott, "Professional Employees in a Bureaucratic Structure: Social Work," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1969, pp. 82-134.

therapeutic supervisor prefers the flexibility of therapeutic treatment. The therapeutic supervisor does not issue directives to co-workers, nor does he threaten punitive action for non-compliance. Rather, he attempts to refrain from using the sanctions attached to his office as supervisor and controls instead with his supervisory knowledge and casework skills to guide and direct the subordinates. Moreover, he tends to delegate authority to subordinates, give them more chances to participate in organizational activities. In this case, the communication processes tend to be two-way and informal rather than one-way and formal.

Communication between the superior and subordinates tends to deal with suggestions, recommendations, consultations, exchange of information and so forth. That is, the communication tends to flow both upward and downward. Scott also noted that when the superior introduces decentralized authority into the organization, the subordinates tend to communicate with the superior more often than when the superior imposes centralized authority. On the contrary, the bureaucratic supervisor prefers to use one-way formal communication as a means of controlling the subordinates. Most of the communications are directions, commands, technological information which support the supervisor in controlling the subordinate closely. In this case, the subordinates tend to have formal communication with their superior

and they tend to communicate with their colleagues more often than with their superior.

Amitai Etzioni also studied the relationship between authority imposed in the organization and the pattern of communication systems. He suggested that in the organization where the supervisor imposed coercive power over the subordinates the pattern of communication tends to be vertical or, as he calls "instrumental communication", communication which deal with information, directions and technical information, while in the normative organization, where the supervisor does not directly control the subordinates and the subordinates have more opportunities to make their own decisions on organizational activities, the communication process tends to be "expressive", which provides some changes, or enforcement of attitudes, norm and values.²²

From these two studies we may hypothesize for the organizations we are studying that a) decentralized authority imposed in the organization is positively related to patterns of communication process. That is, the more the supervisor exercises decentralized authority, the more informal communication between the supervisor and the subordinates or the more the supervisor imposes centralized

²²For more details see Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

authority, the more formal communication between the supervisor and the subordinates there will be, and b) decentralized authority is positively related to the frequency of the communication between the supervisor and the subordinates. That is, the more the supervisor exercises decentralized authority with the subordinates, the more frequent the subordinates will communicate with the superior.

Authority Correlates to Organizational Conflict

Conflicts within organizations tend to arise because of the openness of the organization to the environment and the different types of relationships or interfaces which particular parts of the organization or individuals within it have with their environment. There are at least three different perspectives dealing with organizational conflicts. The first one is the conflict between individuals within the group. This conflict arises from the differences in individual values, beliefs, attitudes, roles, and frames of reference, that have a considerable influence on the individuals' perceptions and interpretations of their environment. Since it is inevitable to have different kinds of people within an organization, the likelihood of conflicts is considerable.

When these people with varying backgrounds get into the organization, they tend to group with people who have similar

perceptions. Since within the organization there are many groups, each group with its own major task, values, attitudes, formality of structure, the second type of conflict; namely, intergroup conflict, tends to arise.

The last category of conflict is intraorganizational. One of the major intraorganizational conflicts is between superior and subordinates that arises because of the different perceptions of organizational environment, the lack of legitimacy which subordinates invest in superior's directions, and the need of joint decision-making. Many studies have been done by several social scientists who are interested in this area. The different perception of organizational environment between the subordinates and superior, the need of joint decision-making and the lack of legitimacy which subordinates invest in superior's directions largely stem from the disagreement between authority structure and professional skills.

It is true that 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 those superiors in rank. Consequently, the application of knowledge is basically an individual act, at least in the sense that the individual professional has the ultimate responsibility for his own professional decision. They tend to perceive the organizational environment differently from their superior. They are less frequently identified as "company men" than others in the executive group.

Robert Peabody noted that authority conflict within the organization usually occurred when individuals experience anxiety because of the presence of two contradictory bases of authority; namely, the conflict between formal authority (the authority institutionalized in hierarchical positions throughout the organization and articulated in rule and procedure) and functional authority (authority growing out of technical skills, expertise and experience).²³ Victor Thompson has also suggested that intraorganizational conflict is a resultant of the interaction between the systems of authority, status and professional skills.²⁴ This is because

²³Robert L. Peabody, "Perception of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organization: Basic Studies. New York: The Free Press, 1970, pp. 319-329.

²⁴Victor A. Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 5, 1961, pp. 485-521.

the hierarchy structures interpersonal relations within organizations, creates authority relationships between superiors and subordinates, while the non-hierarchical nature of the authority vested in specialized professional competence conflicts with the authority of hierarchical positions. As a result, dependence upon highly trained specialists may engender great conflict with administrators, who have expectations of authority, status, and deference.

Among the several social scientists who studied organizational conflicts, one of them, Scott, has observed that some organizations employ participants who have varying degrees of expertise. Variations in expertise leads to problems of structuring. Organizations must cover all contingencies established by at least the expertise of the participants. In so doing, however, they incur hostility from the more expert participants who demand greater autonomy over their work. This sets in motion conflicting relationships between the most valued employees and the administration.²⁵

Parsons has observed that the articulation between managerial and technical levels in organizations suffers as the expertise of technical personnel increases. Parsons

²⁵H. A. Simon, "Authority," in C. M. Arenberg et al. (eds.), Research in Industrial Human Relations. New York: Harper, 1957, p. 106.

concluded: The more expert (that is, professional) the technical personnel become, the more restive they become about managerial decision-making concerning technical activities and about competence of the managerial personnel to supervise technical performance."²⁶

From these studies we find that the conflict between the bureaucratic authority and professional authority cannot be avoided. The degree of conflict depends upon the degree of bureaucratic authority and professional authority. If administrators employ highly bureaucratic authority and the organization's members also have high professional orientation, then the conflict in the organization will be high, too. On the contrary, if administrators accept the important role of professional orientation or reduce bureaucratic authority then the conflict in the organization will decrease.

McGregor, in his study of "Management by Objective", suggests that one way to compromise or minimize conflicts within the organization is to decentralize authority from the top position to the lower positions. In this way, lower participants will have a chance to participate in the organizational activities and will feel that their sense of belonging to the organization has been satisfied. Finally,

²⁶Talcott Parsons, in P. M. Blau and W. R. Scott, Formal Organizations. San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

they will have high morale and dissatisfaction will be decreased which implies that conflict tends to decrease as well.

This statement is confirmed when Tannenbaum and Massarick and Worthy have suggested that participation in decision-making about the organizational policies was directly related to high morale and conflict reduction. This is because the lower participants have more chances to use their own judgment and their professional skills for making decisions.²⁷ Likert summarizes in his principle of supported relationships: "The leadership and other process of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with 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 ... from each the available motives will be added to that from the others to yield a maximum of coordinated, enthusiastic effort and minimize conflicts."²⁸

²⁷James C. Worthy, "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale," American Sociological Review, Volume 15, 1959, pp. 169-199; Robert Tannenbaum and Fred Massarick, "Participation by Subordinates in the Managerial Decision-Making Process," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Sciences, Volume 16, 1950, pp. 408-418.

²⁸Rensis Likert, "The Principle of Supportive Relationships," in D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organizational Theory. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971, pp. 279-304.

Based upon the preceding literature, we may hypothesize, for the subjects of our study, that the degree of decentralized authority is negatively related to the degree of conflicts within the organization. That is, the more the superior employs decentralized authority in the organizational controlling system, the fewer conflicts the organization will have.

Authority Correlates to Organizational Compliance

Compliance is universal, existing in all social units. It is a major element of the relationship between those who have power and those over whom they exercise it.²⁹ Characteristics of organizations such as their specificity, size, complexity and effectiveness each enhances the need for compliance. In turn, compliance is systematically related to many central organizational variables.³⁰

According to Etzioni compliance refers both to a relation in which an actor behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power, and to orientation of

²⁹G. Simmel, "Superiority and Subordination as Subject-matter of Sociology," The American Journal of Sociology, Volume 2, 1896, pp. 167-189, 392-415.

³⁰Amitai Etzioni, "Compliance Theory," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organization: Basic Studies. New York: The Free Press, 1970, pp. 103-126.

the subordinated actor to the power applied.³¹ By supported, Etzioni means that those who have power manipulate means at their command in such a manner that certain other actors find following the directive rewarding, while not following it incurs deprivations. In this sense compliance relations are asymmetric. But it is not assumed that the subordinates have no power, only that they have less.

Regarding the orientation of the subordinated actor, Etzioni explained that it can be characterized as positive (commitment) or negative (alienation). It is determined in part by the degree to which power applied is considered legitimate by the subordinated actor, and in part by its congruence with the line of action he would desire.³² In sum, there are two parties to a compliance relationship: an actor who exercises power, and an actor, subject to this power, who responds to this subjection but with less commitment.

From this definition, Etzioni developed a compliance theory which dealt with the relationship between power³³ and

³¹Ibid., p. 103.

³²Ibid.

³³There are three categories of power. The first one is coercive power, which rests on the application of physical sanction. The second is remunerative power, which is based on control over material resources and rewards through allocation of salaries and wages. The last one is normative power, which rests on allocation and manipulation of esteem, prestige and ritualistic symbols.

pattern of compliance of the lower participants. He hypothesized that the more coercive power the high participants imposed over the lower participants, the less compliance the lower participants will give to the higher participants. On the contrary, if the higher participants exercised or used normative power over the lower participants, the lower participants will have more compliance to the organizational activities.³⁴

Etzioni's hypotheses were supported by other researchers who also found that the workers subjected to a close supervision style or punitive style of supervision tended to be aggressive and usually violated the work rules (implied low commitment). Katz and Kahn also reported finding this relationship between close supervision and aggressive feeling in a tractor plant.³⁵

Another contribution to this discussion is the study done by Marcus and House. In their study, Marcus and House found that the expressive superiors or the superiors who use a human relations style of supervision tend to get higher compliance from the lower participants than those

³⁴For Etzioni, power is regarded as legitimate by lower participants; thus, there is normative, remunerative and coercive authority.

³⁵Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, "Leadership Practices in Relation to Productivity and Morale," in Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Lander (eds.), Group Dynamics. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson and Co., 1960.

instrumental superiors who employ a close supervision style or centralized authority.³⁶

From these studies we may hypothesize for the organizations being examined in this thesis that the degree of decentralized authority in the organization is directly related to degree of compliance of the lower participants. That is, if the superiors employ centralized authority, the lower participants tend to give less compliance to the superiors. On the contrary, if the superiors utilize decentralized authority, the lower participants tend to give more compliance to the superiors. We may put it in this way, the more centralized authority the superiors impose over the subordinates, the less compliance they will get from their subordinates, and the more decentralized authority the superiors impose over the subordinates, the more compliance they will have from their subordinates.

Authority Correlates to Influence from Peer Groups

Groups are important components of any society. They are indigenous to all civilizations. They perform many functions for individuals, for organizations, and also for

³⁶Philip M. Marcus and James S. House, "Exchange Between Superiors and Subordinates in Large Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 12, 1973, pp. 209-222.

the society itself. Groups have a great deal of influence on human performance and attitudes. Many studies show that the individual is more likely to be positively stimulated when in the company of others than when alone. Groups also effect changes in individual attitudes and behavior. Homans postulated that group change is easier to bring about than similar changes of individuals separately.³⁷ Additionally, groups affect the individuals' perception. The study by Sherif is a good example of the effects of groups on individual perception.³⁸ Accordingly, we find that the influence of groups on individual performance is an important phenomenon in society. Every group we enter determines our behavior in the present and in the future. W. G. Bennis concludes: "Groups do exist ... group decisions may produce changes in individual behavior much larger than those customarily found to result from attempts to modify the behavior of the individual as an isolated individual."³⁹

³⁷George C. Homans, Social Behavior, Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1974, p. 103.

³⁸Reported in M. C. Olmsted, The Small Group. New York: Random House, 1959, p. 73.

³⁹W. G. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chen, The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., Chapters 6-12.

In work organizations, the work group is a major source of socialization and social support for the organizational members. Gross, in reviewing this area, suggested that such informal groups serve four major functions: 1) providing protection and assistance to members, 2) serving as important communication lines linking different parts of the organization, 3) controlling their member's behavior, and 4) serving as a context of self expression and providing personal satisfaction.⁴⁰ Evan, in a comparative study of new and experienced engineers and scientists, also suggested that the formation of peer group bonds was a necessary condition for successful socialization and integration of organizational members.⁴¹

In their discussion of the role of supervision within social welfare organizations, Blau and Scott also noted that informal groups were a fundamental source from which the organizational members got their social support.⁴² This idea is confirmed by the study done by Katz and Kahn. In their study, Katz and Kahn found that in the high-producing

⁴⁰N. Gross, "The Sociology of Education," in R. K. Merton, L. Broom, and L. S. Cottrell, Jr. (eds.), Sociology Today. New York: Harper & Row, 1959, pp. 128-152.

⁴¹William M. Evan, "Peer Group Interaction and Organizational Socialization: A Study of Employee Turnover," American Sociological Review, Volume 28, 1963, pp. 436-440.

⁴²Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1957.

groups, employees tended to express a more favorable evaluation of their section (work group) and of their division.⁴³ They also noted that within the high-producing groups where the supervisors used "employee-orientation" style of supervision, the groups tended to have more interaction among the group members than the lower-producing groups in which the supervisors employed "production-orientation" style of supervision.⁴⁴

Downs implies that within an organization where the authority is centralized in the hands of the top position, the information tends to flow from the top position down to the lower participants and back up to the top position. In this case, the relationship within the informal group will be less than when the top position decentralizes authority to the lower participants. This is because the lower participants tend to have opportunities to exchange their information, consultations, opinions, and so on with both their superiors and their peer groups. As a result, it is easy for the group to influence the group members.⁴⁵

⁴³Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, op. cit.

⁴⁴Katz and Kahn categorized two different kinds of style of supervision; employee orientation and production-orientation. These two concepts appear to incorporate the same basic ideas as human relations style of supervision and bureaucratic style of supervision.

⁴⁵Anthony Downs, Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1967.

From the above, the following hypothesis can be drawn for the organization in our study: the degree of decentralized authority is positively related to the degree of influence from the peer groups. That is, the more decentralized the authority the supervisors employ, the more influence from the peer group over the lower participants will be.

SETTING OF STUDY

The setting of this study was 53 public schools in five large Michigan school districts of approximately equal size. These districts were Dearborn, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing and Saginaw. Schools (grades K-12) were selected on the basis of a stratified, random sample of each district. Self-administered questionnaires were given both to teachers in the schools and to school principals. In this study, the teachers within the various schools were taken as comprising the various work groups. The principals were considered to be the formal leaders or supervisors of the work organization.

Schools, like any complex organization, have to develop their own organizational structure and mechanism to attain their goals; in order to function effectively a well organized organizational structure is required. That is, the school should have a set of specific rules, a hierarchical authority, a division of labor, a control system and so forth.

Within the school system, organizational control is an important mechanism for encouraging coordination within the organization. Consequently, most schools usually have

administrative groups to be responsible for controlling the organizational members; namely, the teachers, in order to coordinate and assure participation in the organizational activities. This administrative group consists of principal, superintendents, and Board of Education. In this study, the key administrative agent is the principal.

The principal is a key person in the administrative organization since in any given neighborhood the effectiveness of the local school may be the criterion by which people judge the effectiveness of the entire school system. Generally, the principal usually performs administrative tasks. Instructional leadership, community leadership, staff personnel decision and business management are all areas for which the principal is supposedly responsible.

Speaking generally, in any educational system, elementary school, secondary school or university, most teachers are expected to be responsible for the teaching-learning process. Traditionally, teachers have been involved only marginally and infrequently in administrative activities. The position of teacher in relation to administration is defined by the organizational structure and formal duties.

In schools today, however, the roles of teacher have changed. Teachers are more aware of administrative activities. They call for more opportunities to become involved in administrative activities, job autonomy and so forth.

These changes are affected by several changes; such as, change in teacher, change in external environment; namely, changes in educational progress, changes in the exposure to extra-school organizations; such as, professional associations, unions, and so on. Because of these changes, control systems within schools become more problematic.

Becker pointed out in his study of Chicago public school teachers that authority of administrators in relation to teachers was limited.⁴⁶ 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 area 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.

Another contribution to this subject is the study done by Scott (cited earlier) who outlined several areas of social conflict associated with the differences between the professional and bureaucratic models of organization, and the professional's resistance to bureaucratic supervision. The increasing specialization and expertise of teachers have

⁴⁶Howard S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1961, p. 243.

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. 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.⁴⁷ Marcus noted:

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 qualities or staff to devote their energies to teaching and not to vocal and interfering parents.⁴⁸

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 out several changes altering the traditional teacher-principal relationship.

⁴⁷Wesley Wildman, "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 46, 1964, p. 243.

⁴⁸Philip M. Marcus, "Bureaucratization and Professionalization: Converging Forces at the Negotiating Table in Public Education," in E. Friedson.

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 mean of affecting changes in their job situation was the major concern among the administrators in attendance.⁴⁹

Principals have become unwilling to relinquish some of their traditional supervisory prerogatives involving curriculum and assignments.

Because teachers and teacher organizations have become increasingly concerned about matters; such as, professionalization, the relationship between teachers and their bureaucratic supervisor, the principal, offered an excellent opportunity to study the relationship between styles of supervision and organizational behavior in the work group located within an educational setting.

⁴⁹"Teacher Militance No. 1 Issue," Lansing State Journal, February 17, 1969, p. 9.

MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES

The Independent Variables

Style of Supervision

Since the basic interest of this study is placed upon the relationship between supervision styles and social relationships in school organizations, the independent variable that we will take into account is "Styles of Supervision".

As mentioned in the Literature Review, there are two fundamental categories of supervision styles: bureaucratic style of supervision and human relations style of supervision. In this study, the human relations style of supervision is the one in which we are interested. The human relations style of supervision was represented by teachers' participation in decision-making processes. Teacher decisions were measured by asking the teachers of fifty-three public schools to respond to the following questions:

- Who actually has the most influence over selecting required textbooks?
- Who actually has the most influence over selecting supplementary reading matter?
- Who actually has the most influence over determining the percentage of students to be passed or failed?
- Who actually has the most influence over determining concepts and values to be taught in a course?

- Who actually has the most influence over determining methods teachers should use?
- Who actually has the most influence over hiring new teachers?

The ranks of the means of the responses within each school used to determine the particular school's prevailing degree of participation in decision-making of the teachers. In the analysis of the data the term "teacher decision index" will be used to refer to the degree of decentralization of authority in schools.

Division of Labor and Specialization

Division of labor and specialization are taken into account because in this study the samples we used are composed of both elementary schools and secondary schools. Generally speaking, those two levels of education are different. Campbell pointed out that the nature of organizational structures differs among elementary schools, junior high schools and senior high schools. Junior and senior high schools tended to have more complicated structures than the elementary schools, especially with respect to division of labor.⁵⁰

Speaking in terms of organizational structure, secondary schools have more division of labor than the elementary

⁵⁰R. F. Campbell, E. M. Bridges et al., Introduction to Education Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

schools. Because of the division of labor, teachers in high schools tend to have more specialization than those in elementary schools. It has been shown that specialization of the work groups has some influence on social relationship within the organization. Gouldner noted that experts tended to communicate with those in the same professional group more often than with their superiors.⁵¹ He also noted that the experts are more likely than others to esteem the good opinion of professional peers, and they are disposed to seek recognition and acceptance from their peer group rather than from the superiors.

Victor Thompson, in his discussion of conflict in the organizational setting, discussed earlier in this thesis, gave another perspective on the influence of specialization on organizational relationships within the organization in which he pointed out that where participants had high specialization, the participants tended to have more sense of autonomy. They preferred to handle their problems by their own professional knowledge. Within this kind of organization, the superior, Thompson contended, should employ the human relations style of supervision rather than the bureaucratic supervision style. Thompson noted that if the

⁵¹Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward An Analysis of Latent Social Roles," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1970, pp. 477-482.

supervision style was based upon the bureaucratic type, then conflict was unavoidable.⁵²

Because of the impact of these two variables; namely, division of labor and specialization, it is necessary to take them into account, by analyzing them separately, when we deal with the relationship of the styles of supervision and social relationship within school organizations.

The Dependent Variables

As noted earlier, the styles of supervision are hypothesized to be directly related to the organizational behavior of the work groups within the organizational setting. It was expected that different styles of supervision will have different effects on the organizational behavior of the work group within the organization. Specific aspects in which we are interested in this study are as follows:

- pattern of communication
- organizational conflict
- influence from the peer groups and
- organizational compliance.

⁵²Victor Thompson, op. cit.

Pattern of Communication

The rank of the means of the teachers' responses within both elementary schools and secondary school were used to determine the degree of information exchange between teachers and principals, and between teachers and their professional groups. The teachers responded to each item on five-point scales. The items used are as follows:

- To what extent do you exchange information, opinions, and ideas about doing your job with other teachers in your specialty (exchange information or communication with peer groups)?
- To what extent do you exchange information, opinions, and ideas about doing your job with principal of school (exchange information with principal or hierarchical communication)?
- To what extent do you exchange information, opinions, ideas about doing your job with other teachers not in your specialty (informal communication among informal group or horizontal communication)?

Organizational Conflict

Since it is quite difficult to measure organizational conflict directly, the word tension between teachers and principals replaced the term conflict. The rank of means of the responses of teachers of both elementary schools and secondary schools were used to determine the degree of tension between teachers and principals. Both teachers were asked to respond to five-point scales. The item used was:

- To what extent do schools have some disagreement or tension between teachers and principals?

Influence of Peer Groups

Another variable that has been discussed in relation to the styles of supervision is "influence from peer groups". In this study the influence from peer groups was measured by asking the teachers to respond to each item on a five-point scale. The items used were:

- How much influence do teachers in your school have over what actually goes on in your school?
- How much influence do you feel you have, personally, over what actually goes on in your school?
- How much influence does the principal in your school have over what actually goes on in your school?

Organizational Compliance

The last variable that was taken into account is organizational compliance. The teachers were asked to respond to the questions below on a five-point scale. The questions were:

- To what extent do you think you can expect cooperation and support from principal of your school?
- To what extent do you think you can expect cooperation and support from teachers in your specialty?
- To what extent do you think you can expect cooperation and support from teachers in the same building?

Like the other variables, the ranks of means of responses of both teachers and principals were employed to determine the degree of organizational compliance and influence from peer groups.

The independent variable (the style of supervision: decentralized authority type) is correlated to the other four dependent variables. The rank of means of the responses of teachers to the degree of participation in decision-making was correlated to the rank of means of the responses of teachers and principals to the degree of information exchange between teachers and principals and between teachers and their peer groups, the degree of organizational conflict, the degree of organizational compliance and the influence from peer groups. Spearman correlation coefficients were used to determine the relationships among these variables. The correlations of these variables for the elementary schools were calculated separately from those for the secondary schools.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Organizational Communication Correlated to Teacher Decision Index

Scott noted in his study that patterns of authority used in the organization or styles of supervision were directly related to communication processes in the organization. It was then expected that within the school organizations if the principal employed decentralization of authority in his supervision style, the teachers would have more informal communication with the principal. Moreover, it implied that the more the principal employed decentralization of authority in his school, the more often the teachers will communicate with him, in general, about any topic--formal or informal.

Based upon the results found in the elementary schools, it may be seen that when the teachers had more freedom to make their own decisions, they did tend to have more communication with their principal ($r = 0.07$). However, this result was not high.

On the contrary, communication among peer groups tended to be more important, since the rank order correlation between teacher decision index and exchange information with

8
4
:
t
m
l
o
I

T

Co

Ex
in

Ex

Ex
in

sch

teacher in non-specialty was 0.22. This means the more the teachers have their freedom to make their own decisions, the more communication among peer groups there will be.

Concerning the correlation between teacher decision index and exchange information with teachers in their specialty, it was found that there was a low positive relation between these two variables ($r = 0.07$). This finding implied that teachers tended to have more communication with teachers in specialty when they had more opportunities to make their own decision. However, this correlation was lower than the one between teacher decision index and exchange information with teacher in non-specialty (see Table I).

Table I. Spearman Rank Order Correlations Coefficients
Between Teacher Decision Index and Communication
Index Within the Elementary Schools

Communication Index	Teacher Decision Index
Exchange Information with Teacher in Specialty	0.07
Exchange Information with Principal	0.07
Exchange Information with Teacher in Non-specialty	0.22

From Table II it may be seen that, in secondary schools, there was a negative relationship between teacher

decision index and exchange information between teacher and principal index ($r = -0.05$). This finding was different from the one of the elementary schools. That is, within the secondary schools when the teachers had more freedom to make their own decisions they tended to communicate with the principal less than those teachers within the elementary schools (the correlation of the elementary schools was 0.07 while the correlation of the secondary schools was -0.05).

Like the correlation between teacher decision index and exchange information between teacher and principal, teacher decision index also negatively correlated to exchange information with teacher in non-specialty ($r = -0.23$). This correlation implied that teachers in the secondary schools tended to have less communication with their non-specialty peers (teachers in non-specialty) when they had more autonomy.

The correlation between teacher decision index and exchange information with teacher in specialty, on the other hand, showed a positive relationship ($r = 0.07$). Although correlation between teacher decision index and exchange information with teacher in specialty was not significant, the finding still implied that when the teachers had more opportunities to make their own decisions they tended to have more information exchange with their friends in the same specialty than with the principal and non-specialty peers.

Table II. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients
Between Teacher Decision Index and Communication
Index Within the Secondary Schools

Communication Index	Teacher Decision Index
Exchange Information with Teacher in Specialty	0.07
Exchange Information with Principal	-0.05
Exchange Information with Teacher in Non-specialty	-0.23

From these findings, one obvious thing we found is the difference of communication pattern in two different settings. Within the secondary schools, communication between teachers and their friends in the same specialty tended to be the most important. Teachers had more information exchange with their friends in the same specialty than they have with the other teachers. On the contrary, teachers in the elementary school tended to have more communication with their peer groups (teachers in non-specialty) than teachers in specialty. Moreover, we also found that within the secondary schools teachers had less communication with their principals than those teachers in the elementary schools. This can be explained by referring to the effect of division of labour within the organization on communication processes.

As we noted within the organization where there was an extensive division of labour, the participants tended to

have more expertise and specialization than those within the organization where there was a small amount of division of labour. These specialists preferred to share their knowledge with the ones in the same specialty to the superordinates. In addition, they tended to have more communication with their own groups than other members of the organization. The principal, according to these teachers, was an outsider in term of sharing common interests and knowledge. Most teachers viewed the principal as an opponent who had different ideas and interests. As a result, most teachers tended to avoid having too much communication with the principal.

Within the elementary schools the division of labour is simpler and has relatively less specialization, most teachers usually exchanged information and consulted with their immediate superior; namely, the principal, when they had to deal with academic problems. Consequently, even though the teachers had more opportunities to make their own decisions, they still depended upon the principal rather than the other teachers.

From this preceding discussion, it was found that communication process within any organization was affected not only by the styles of supervision of the superior but also by the degree of specialization within the organization. Without regarding the degree of specialization, the teachers tended to have more communication with the principal when

they had more freedom to make their own decisions on their jobs. Moreover, they tended to develop more informal communication with their peer groups. In this sense the hypothesis was slightly confirmed.

However, the hypothesis would be rejected if specialization of the participants was taken into account. That is, within the organization where participants possessed more specialization, communication with their superordinates or peer groups will decrease when they have more opportunities to make their own decision on their jobs (teachers in specialty). Finally, the conclusion is that with regard to the degree of specialization, the more specialization the teachers have, the less communication they will have with their superordinates and their peer groups when they have more chances to make their own decisions.

Tension Between Teachers and Principals Correlated to Teacher Decision Index

As mentioned in the preceding section, a teacher decision index was used to represent the degree of decentralization of authority of the principals. The following results will represent the correlation between the degree of decentralization of authority to the teachers and the degree of conflict between teachers and principals.

It was expected that within any organizational setting if the superior decentralized his authority to his subordinates, the conflict among them will decrease. William E. Turcotte noted that high dissatisfaction was found on various individual measurements when formal control was emphasized.⁵³ Marcus also noted in his study that conflict between subordinates and superiors was negatively related to the style of supervision. He found that when the superior employed expressive style of supervision, the conflict between superior and subordinates declined ($r = -0.47$).⁵⁴

Based upon the data collected from the elementary schools, it was found that there was a negative relationship between the index of tension between teachers and principals and the teacher decision index (degree of decentralization of authority-- $r = -0.32$). That means the more the teachers have opportunities to make their own decisions, the less the conflicts between teachers and principals will be. However, this relationship is not very strong since the correlation we found was quite low. In this case it can not be said that the above hypothesis is sufficiently confirmed.

Analysis of the secondary schools also showed a negative correlation between these two variables ($r = -0.24$).

⁵³William E. Turcotte, "Control System, Performance, and Satisfaction in Two State Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 19, 1974, pp. 60-74.

⁵⁴Marcus and House, op. cit.

Similarly, this correlation found was not to be significant either.

It should be noted that there was a difference between the index of tension between teachers and principals in the secondary schools and that for the elementary schools--the mean of the index of tension between teachers and principals in the elementary schools was less than that found in the secondary schools ($\bar{x}_e = 2.4$, $\bar{x}_s = 2.6$). Thus, among the secondary schools, the tension between teachers and principals was higher than among the elementary schools. Also, although in neither instance was the correlation significant, it was considerably higher for the secondary than for the elementary schools.

Victor Thompson noted in his study that specialization was one of the important factors which caused organizational conflict. He suggested that within an organization where the lower participants had high specialization, the organizational conflict was usually high.⁵⁵ His observation probably helps to explain the difference found between primary and secondary schools in this study, since secondary school teachers are expected to have a higher degree of specialization than those in elementary schools.⁵⁶ In secondary

⁵⁵Thompson, op. cit.

⁵⁶James G. Anderson, Bureaucracy in Education.
Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

schools specific subjects are required. So, there is an extensive division of labour in most secondary schools, with the accompanying necessity to select specific teachers for specific subjects.

Like the other professional groups, most of the teachers within more complex schools usually have their own reference groups; such as, professional associations, unions and so forth, and these extra-school organizations have altered the behavior of teachers--they have shifted from relative docility to aggressive militancy. This militant behavior seems to derive from a) personal desire to protect their autonomy or specialists, b) the intense competition between professional associations and unions for membership and for the recognition as bargaining agents and lastly c) from a growing feeling of a need to band together to foster their special interests.⁵⁷ These extra-school organizations are influential in persuading teachers to change their roles within schools and in encouraging teachers to ask for more participation in administrative activities. This cumulative effect of the extra-organizational factor has stimulated a great deal of tension between teachers and principals.⁵⁸

⁵⁷Ronald F. Campbell et al., op. cit.

⁵⁸Anderson, op. cit.

In summary, this second hypothesis was only slightly confirmed, in the sense that, though the direction of the finding was that which was hypothesized, the correlation was too low to be significant. The direction was that which was expected since the more the teachers had opportunities to make their own decisions, the less conflict between teachers and principals was found. That is, the degree of decentralization of authority is negatively related to the degree of tension between superiors and subordinates.

Organizational Compliance Correlated to
Teacher Decision Index

Based upon the Human Relations approach, it was hypothesized that if the superior employed decentralized authority over his subordinates he would get more conformity from them than when he centralized his authority. Marcus and House found that subordinates of expressive superiors tended to accept organizational rules or superiors' directions better than the subordinates of instrumental superiors.⁵⁹ The correlation between expressive index and compliance index was 0.29. This means, the more the superiors employed expressive supervision, the more compliance the subordinates would give to the superordinates.

⁵⁹Marcus and House, op. cit.

Table III. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients
Between Teacher Decision Index and Compliance
Index Within the Elementary Schools

Compliance Index*	Teacher Decision Index
Co-operation from Teacher in Specialty	-0.15
Co-operation from Principal	-0.03
Co-operation from Teacher in the Same Building	0.37

*See page 41 for the specific wordings of the questions on which these indexes were based.

According to Table III, co-operation from teacher in specialty, co-operation from principal, co-operation from teacher in the same building were used to represent compliance within schools. Teacher decision index showed that in the elementary schools teachers in the same building tended to give more compliance to the organization when they had opportunities to make their own decisions than the teacher in specialty. The teacher in specialty tended to give less co-operation to the organization when they have more freedom to make their own decisions on their jobs ($r = -0.15$). Similarly, the correlation between teacher decision index and co-operation from principal index was also negative ($r = -0.03$).

The results of the secondary schools, however, showed that teachers tended to give more compliance to the

organization when they had more freedom to make their own decisions. The correlation between teacher decision index and the other three variables; namely, co-operation from teacher in specialty, co-operation from principal, and co-operation from teacher in the same building, were positive (see Table IV).

Table IV. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Decision Index and Compliance Index Within the Secondary Schools

Compliance Index*	Teacher Decision Index
Co-operation from Teacher in Specialty	0.10
Co-operation from Principal	0.07
Co-operation from Teacher in the Same Building	0.02

*See page 41 for the specific wordings of the question in which the indexes were used.

It is suggested that teachers within the elementary schools tend to give less compliance when they have more chances to make their own decisions because they have support from their own groups. As mentioned before, when teachers had autonomy on their jobs, they tended to have more informal communication with their own peer groups. According to Scott, supports from groups play a very important role in creating confidence in a person. He noted

that if the teachers had a lot of support from their peer groups, they tended to give less compliance to their superiors. They might violate instructions when their groups supported them.⁶⁰

Influence From Peer Groups Correlated to
Teacher Decision Index

It was expected that within the organization where the lower participants had more freedom to make their own decision on their jobs or had more chances to give their superordinates some advice or suggestions, the lower participants would tend to have more communication with their peer groups. The lower participants tend to have more discussion with their peer groups in order to be able to make their judgment on their own jobs without violating the group norms. As a result, it was obvious that when the lower participants had more opportunities to make their own decision, the peer group usually had great influence on determining or guiding these decisions (see Table V, on the following page).

Analysis of both elementary schools and secondary schools showed that the index of teacher decision was positively related to the index of teacher influence over what goes on in their schools ($r = 0.23$ and $r = 0.17$).

⁶⁰ Scott, op. cit.

Table V. Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients
Between Teacher Decision Index and Influence Index
for the Elementary Schools

Influence Index*	Teacher Decision Index
Teacher Influence	0.23
Influence of Principal	0.08
Personal Influence	0.25

*See page 41 for the exact wording of the questions to which the teachers responded regarding who has influence over what happens in these schools.

These findings implied that the more teachers had opportunities to make their own decisions on their jobs, the greater the influence of teacher in organization will be (see Tables V and VI).

Table VI. Spearman Rank Order Correlations Coefficients
Between Teacher Decision Index and Influence
Index for the Secondary Schools

Influence Index*	Teacher Decision Index
Teacher Influence	0.17
Influence of Principal	-0.20
Personal Influence	-0.03

*See page 41 for the exact wording of the questions to which the teachers responded regarding who has influence over what happens in these schools.

This finding did support the direction of the relation which was hypothesized. Moreover, the results were also confirmed by the preceding findings (the correlation between teacher decision index and communication indexes). It was found that when the superordinates decentralized their authority to their subordinates, the subordinates tended to have more communication with both teachers in their specialty and teachers in non-specialty. By having more communication with each other, teachers tended to develop some influence over what happened in their schools since most teachers used group norms as guidelines to deal with the activities within schools.

Another interesting finding that should be noted was the relationship between teacher decision index and the index of principal influence over what actually goes on in his schools. Based upon the data of the elementary schools, it was found that there was a positive relationship between these two indexes. That meant, the more the teacher had opportunities to make their own decisions, the more influence of the principal over school's activities will be ($r = 0.08$). However, this result was different from that of the secondary schools. Within the secondary schools, principal tended to have less influence over school's activities when teachers had more freedom to make their own decisions on their jobs since, the correlation between teacher decision

index and the index of principal's influence over what actually goes on in school was negative ($r = -0.20$). This difference of these results may be also explained by referring to the impact of degree of specialization and an amount of division of labour in schools.

In the secondary schools, where there was an extensive division of labour, not only the degree of communication between the principal and his subordinates was very low when these teachers tended to have great expertise and specialization, but also the degree of the principal's influence correlated to teacher decision index was shown to be very negative. It can be explained that, first, specialized teachers, while having a chance to make decisions, were inclined to count on their autonomy and prefer the influence from peer groups to the principal's influence; second, secondary school principals who usually have high expertise in administration preferred not to influence the lower participants' decisions, but they had more concerns in school general policies and the task of coordination. In addition, some principals belonged to certain groups of teachers who had the same specialty. So, they tended to avoid influencing the teachers in other specialties.

Specialization and division of labour can also explain why the correlation of this relationship was shown to be positive for the elementary schools. With less expertise

and specialization, elementary school teachers tended to receive the principal's influence on their decisions even though the influence from peer groups was high. In addition, a simpler division of labour allowed the principals to keep more closely in touch with their subordinates and have more influence over every school activity.

Also from Tables V and VI, it was remarkable that the third correlations that showed the relationship between teacher decision index and personal influence index were quite different ($r_e = 0.25$, $r_s = -0.03$). The cause of this difference was nothing but the division of labour. Personal influence in the elementary schools had the highest correlation when decentralized authority was employed. That is because with less extended division of labour, the teachers were close to each other and felt that they could have a great deal of personal influence on each other. On the contrary, this correlation was shown to be negative for the secondary schools where there were a lot of specialties. The teachers tended to be so individualized that, when asked, their responses were mostly negative.

To conclude, the teacher decision index was positively related to influence of teacher index in both secondary schools and elementary schools, but this could hardly be confirmed since the correlation was quite low. However, it was still very true that decentralized authority is positively related to the influence of peer groups index.

CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was that of examining the relationship between styles of supervision, particularly the human relations style of supervision, and social exchange within school settings. It was believed that the human relations style of supervision was the most important factor to create a better relationship within the organization and improve the organizational participants' morale. Moreover, the human relations school also noted that when the superordinate employed this style of supervision over his subordinates, the latter tended to be more productive than when the superordinate used "task oriented style" of supervision.⁶¹

Based upon the human relations approach, several hypotheses were proposed in order to testify the relationship between decentralized authority, one form of human relations style of supervision, and social exchange within 53 public schools (secondary and elementary schools). The hypotheses were as follows:

⁶¹Robert Dubin, "Supervision and Productivity," in Robert Dubin et al., Leadership and Productivity. San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1965.

1. Decentralized authority is positively related to the patterns of communication process. That is, the more the supervisor employs decentralized authority, the more communication between the supervisor (principal) and his subordinates (teachers) there will be.

2. Decentralized authority is negatively related to conflicts within the organization. The more the supervisor employs decentralized authority, the less conflict between teachers and principal there will be.

3. Decentralized authority is positively related to the degree of compliance. The more decentralized authority the supervisor exercises with the subordinates, the more compliance he will have from his subordinates.

4. Decentralized authority is positively related to the degree of influence from peer groups. This implies that the more the supervisor performs decentralized authority, the more influence from the peer groups there will be.

By using Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients, it should be observed that the degree of the relationship found in the elementary schools was different from that which was found in the secondary schools. The first happened to be higher than the latter in the study of the first, second and fourth hypotheses, but lower in the study of the third hypothesis concerning the degree of compliance. The degree of the relationship found in the secondary schools

seemed to be lower because of the fact that the secondary school teachers had great expertise and specialization and were widely divided into various groups of specialty.

Though the findings of this study frequently supported the direction of the relation that was hypothesized, the degree of the relationship was still too low to be significant. Most results showed such low correlation that the above hypotheses could not be strongly confirmed. These results seemed to be different from the findings of other scholars who have analyzed business and industrial organizations. There are some possible explanations for this difference: perhaps school teachers frequently have higher education and better professional orientation, principals cannot observe their work; perhaps teachers are already decentralized; perhaps school personnel has a high proportion of women. Finally, it can be assumed that neither the human relations theory nor the classical theory explained clearly the attitude of the teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, James G. Bureaucracy in Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.
- Barnard, Chester I. "A Definition of Authority," in Robert K. Merton (ed.), Reader in Bureaucracy. New York: The Free Press, 1952.
- Becker, Howard. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Bennis, Warren G. "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 4, 1960.
- Bennis, W. G., Benne, K., and Chen, R. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1962.
- Blau, Peter M. and Scott, W. R. Formal Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1957.
- Campbell, R. F. et al. Introduction to Education Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Downs, Anthony. Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1967.
- Dubin, Robert. "Supervision and Productivity," in Robert Dubin et al. (eds.), Leadership and Productivity. San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1965.
- Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
- _____. "Compliance Theory," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organization: Basic Studies. New York: The Free Press, 1970.
- _____. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

- Evan, William M. "Peer Groups Interaction and Organizational Socialization: A Study of Employee Turnover," American Sociological Review, Volume 28, 1963.
- Gordon, Thomas. Group-centered Leadership: A Way of Releasing the Creative Power of Groups. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1970.
- Gross, N. "The Sociology of Education," in R. K. Merton, L. Broom and L. S. Cottrell Jr. (eds.), Sociology Today. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Homans, George C. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, Inc., 1974.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. "Leadership Practices in Relation to Productivity and Morale," in Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Lander (eds.), Group Dynamics. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson and Co., 1960.
- Kelly, Joe. Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1974.
- Likert, Rensis. "The Principle of Supportive Relationships," in D. S. Pugh (ed.). Organizational Theory. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971.
- March, J. G. and Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Marcus, Philip M. "Bureaucratization and Professionalization: Converging Forces at the Negotiating Table in Public Education," in E. Friedson.
- Marcus, Philip M. and House, James S. "Exchange Between Superiors and Subordinates in Large Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 12, 1973.
- Massie, Joseph L. "Management Theory," in James G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organization. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.
- Mooney, J. D. The Principles of Organization. New York: Harper, 1947.

Olmsted, M. C. The Small Group. New York: Random House, 1959.

Parsons, Talcott. Formal Organizations, in P. M. Blau and W. R. Scott (eds.). San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

Peabody, Robert L. "Perception of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organization: Basic Studies. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Roethlisberger, Fritz J., and Dickson, William J. "Human Relations," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), Sociology of Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Scott, W. R. "Professional Employees in a Bureaucratic Structure: Social Work," in Amital Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Selznick, Phillip. "Foundation of the Theory of Organization," American Sociological Review, Volume 13, 1948.

Shepard, H. "Superiors and Subordinates in Research," Journal of Business, Volume 29, 1959.

Simmel, G. "Superiority and Subordination as Subject-matter of Sociology," The American Journal of Sociology, Volume 2, 1896.

Simon, H. A. "Authority" in C. M. Asemberg et al (eds.), Research in Industrial Human Relations. New York: Harper, 1957.

Tannenbaum, Robert and Massarick, Fred. "Participation by Subordinates in the Managerial Decision-making Process," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Sciences, Volume 16, 1950.

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

Thompson, Victor A. "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 5, 1961.

Turcotte, William E. "Control System, Performance, and Satisfaction in Two State Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, Volume 19, 1974.

Weber, Max. "Bureaucracy," in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), The Sociology of Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

_____. Economy and Society, in Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (eds.). New York: Bedminister Press, 1968.

Wildman, Wesley. "Implication of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 46, 1964.

Worthy, James C. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale," American Sociological Review, Volume 15, 1959.

APPENDIX

THE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BY DISTRICT

District	Total Number of Certified Employees	Pupil- Teacher Ratio	Minimum Salary Schedules for 1967-1968	Total Number of Administrative Units in District
I	1,264	22.8	6,500	31
II	2,050	25.9	6,000	54
III	1,600	24.1	6,000	62
IV	1,750	20.9	6,000	56
V	1,024	24.7	6,200	47

Source: Michigan District Data Study, 1967-1968 by S. Hecker and T. Northy, MEA, 1968.

THE RESPONSE RATES FOR THE FIVE DISTRICTS

District	Percent of Returns
I	86.9
II	89.4
III	87.0
IV	82.4
V	86.4

Note: All five districts averaged 86.8 percent.

INTER-CORRELATION OF SOCIAL EXCHANGE WITHIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Tech. Decision																	
2. Tech. Satisfaction	.40																
3. Influence of Tech.	.23	.74															
4. Influence of Prin.	.08	-.14	-.24														
5. Personal Influence	.25	.43	.62	-.32													
6. Tension Between Tech. and Prin.	-.32	-.71	-.75	.20	-.45												
7. Exchange Information with TS*	.07	-.07	.01	.22	-.11	.09											
8. Exchange Information with Prin.	.07	.23	.31	.14	.00	-.51	.02										
9. Exchange Information with NTS*	.22	.30	.43	-.03	.31	-.22	.32	.03									
10. Influence over Prin.	.14	.49	.25	-.09	.16	-.38	-.03	.50	.20								
11. Influence over Tech.	.04	.22	.27	.00	.26	-.12	.21	.27	.26	.56							
12. Influence over TS*	.04	.02	.00	-.21	.10	.04	.35	-.35	.13	-.06	-.03						
13. Influence over NTS**	.11	-.16	-.19	.09	-.13	.22	.56	-.17	.28	.01	.14	.57					
14. Interference from Prin.	-.05	-.53	-.61	.17	-.51	.68	.07	-.21	-.11	-.17	-.04	-.13	.22				
15. Cooperation from TS	-.15	.27	.14	.05	.20	-.11	.44	.08	.45	.16	.23	.25	-.03	-.33			
16. Cooperation from Prin.	.37	.72	.59	.01	.24	-.73	-.03	.66	.23	.55	.28	-.20	-.28	-.45	.20		
17. Cooperation from Tech.	-.03	.28	.36	.04	.16	-.01	.26	.07	.51	-.03	.10	.16	-.12	-.05	.56	.18	

*Teacher in specialty.

**Teacher in non-specialty.

INTER-CORRELATION OF SOCIAL EXCHANGE WITHIN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Tech. Decision																	
2. Tech. Satisfaction	.15																
3. Influence of Tech.	.17	.55															
4. Influence of Prin.	-.20	.68	.19														
5. Personal Influence	-.04	.50	.71	.38													
6. Tension between Tech. and Prin.	-.24	-.77	-.71	-.43	-.57												
7. Exchange Information with TS*	.07	.56	.45	.36	.21	-.38											
8. Exchange Information with Prin.	-.05	.51	.52	.44	.87	-.59	.13										
9. Exchange Information with NTS**	-.23	-.03	.47	.26	.49	-.25	.24	.45									
10. Influence over Prin.	.16	.53	.46	.47	.72	-.53	.42	.82	.28								
11. Influence over Tech.	.15	.21	.29	-.03	.29	-.05	.37	.25	-.02	.54							
12. Influence over TS	.18	.16	.29	-.10	-.13	-.05	.57	-.03	.05	.26	.72						
13. Influence over NTS	-.08	-.04	.48	.00	.40	-.23	.53	.47	.35	.38	.51						
14. Interference from Prin.	-.27	-.82	-.26	-.55	-.31	.75	-.32	-.38	.15	-.44	-.00	.09	.24				
15. Cooperation from TS	.10	.50	.53	.32	.68	-.52	.69	.63	.48	.73	.55	.24	.28	-.30			
16. Cooperation from Prin.	.07	.80	.81	.55	.82	-.90	.46	.74	.42	.66	.20	.02	.25	-.64	.63		
17. Cooperation from Tech.	.02	.11	.49	.18	.70	-.42	.05	.77	.79	.52	.15	-.04	.61	-.01	.58	.58	

*Teacher in specialty.

**Teacher in non-specialty.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103449132