

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

CARNAHAN, PAMELA J.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, WORK VALUES AND CONFLICT

Iowa State University

PH.D.

1980

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

Organizational structure, work values and conflict

by

Pamela J. Carnahan

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Educational
Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

~~For~~ the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Critical Questions	6
Statement of the Problem	6
Hypotheses to Be Tested	8
Subordinate Hypotheses	10
Potential Value	11
Delimitations	11
Definitions	12
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
Bureaucracy: Scope and Development	18
Educational Bureaucracy	20
Work Values: A Cumulation and Complication	22
Structure and work values	26
Conflict	29
Definition of conflict	29
The process of conflict resolution	30
Types of conflict	30
Conflict in education	32
Summary	35
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	37
Instrumentation	37
School Organizational Inventory (SOI)	37
Teacher Preference Inventory (TPI)	38
Conflict Assessment Questionnaire (CAQ)	38
Sample	39
Collection of Data	39

	Page
Treatment	40
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	45
Hypothesis One	53
Hypothesis Two	55
Hypothesis Three	56
Hypothesis Four	56
Subordinate Hypotheses	57
Hypothesis five	57
Hypothesis six	58
Hypothesis seven	59
Hypothesis eight	59
Hypothesis nine	59
Hypothesis ten	60
Hypothesis eleven	62
Hypothesis twelve	63
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	65
Summary	65
Limitations	67
Conclusions	69
Discussion	70
Recommendations for Further Research	73
Recommendations for Practice	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	85
APPENDIX A. SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY ITEMS AND TEACHER PREFERENCE INVENTORY ITEMS	86
APPENDIX B. TEACHER PREFERENCE INVENTORY ITEMS	87
APPENDIX C. CONFLICT ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	88

	Page
APPENDIX D. LETTER TO EDUCATORS	89
APPENDIX E. FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO EDUCATORS	91
APPENDIX F. TEACHER PREFERENCE INVENTORY	93
APPENDIX G. SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL INVENTORY	97
APPENDIX H. CONFLICT ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE	101
APPENDIX I. TABLES WITH DATA OF NONSIGNIFICANCE	104

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Summary data classifying schools according to organizational structures.	48
Table 2. Correlations of authority and expertise on the School Organizational Survey	49
Table 3. Descriptive data concerning authority and expertise on the SOI.	49
Table 4. Summary data classifying schools according to work values	50
Table 5. Correlation of work values as measured by the TPI. . .	51
Table 6. Correlations of the components in the Conflict Assessment Questionnaire	53
Table 7. Summary data comparing conflict between authoritarian schools with professional work values and authoritarian schools with social or organizational work values.	54
Table 8. Analysis of variance comparing conflict between authoritarian schools with professional work values and authoritarian schools with social or organizational work values.	54
Table 9. Summary data comparing conflict between collegial schools with social work values and collegial schools with professional and organizational work values . . .	55
Table 10. Analysis of variance data comparing conflict between collegial schools with social work values and collegial schools with professional and organizational work values.	56
Table 11. Summary data comparing conflict between authoritarian schools and collegial, Weberian and chaotic schools regardless of work values.	57
Table 12. Analysis of variance data comparing conflict between authoritarian schools and collegial, Weberian and chaotic schools regardless of work values.	57

	Page
Table 13. Summary data of work values orientations between secondary and elementary teachers.	58
Table 14. Summary data on perceived conflict between elementary and secondary teachers.	61
Table 15. Summary data on perceived conflict between men and women teachers	61
Table 16. Summary data on teacher tenure and perceived conflict in the building.	62
Table 17. Analysis of variance on teacher tenure and perceived conflict in the building	63
Table 18. Summary data on perceived conflict and age of teachers	64
Table 19. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict and age of teachers.	64
Table 20. Summary data of work values orientation between secondary and elementary teachers.	105
Table 21. Summary data of work values orientations between men and women.	105
Table 22. Summary data of work values orientation between teacher's tenure in the building: Social work values.	106
Table 23. Analysis of variance data of work values orientation between teacher's tenure in the building: Social work values.	106
Table 24. Summary data of work values orientation between length of teaching in the building: Organizational.	106
Table 25. Analysis of variance data of work values orientation between length of teaching in the building: Organizational.	107
Table 26. Summary data of work values orientations between length of teaching in the building: Professional.	107
Table 27. Analysis of variance data of work values orientations between length of teaching in the building: Professional	107

	Page
Table 28. Summary data on work values orientations between age groups: Social work values.	108
Table 29. Analysis of variance data on work values orientations between age groups: Social work values.	108
Table 30. Summary data on work values orientations between age groups: Organizational work values.	108
Table 31. Analysis of variance data on work values orientations between age groups: Organizational work values.	109
Table 32. Summary data on work values orientations between age groups: Professional values	109
Table 33. Analysis of variance data on work values orientations between age groups: Professional values	109
Table 34. Summary data on perceived conflict between elementary and secondary teachers	110
Table 35. Summary data on perceived conflict between men and women teachers	111
Table 36. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Decision-sharing.	112
Table 37. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Decision-sharing.	113
Table 38. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Student relationships	113
Table 39. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Student relationships.	113
Table 40. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Administrative relationships.	114
Table 41. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Administrative relationships.	114

	Page
Table 42. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Staff relationships. . . .	114
Table 43. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Staff relationships	115
Table 44. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Desirable physical working conditions.	115
Table 45. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Desirable physical working conditions	115
Table 46. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Material inducements . . .	116
Table 47. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Material inducements.	116
Table 48. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Personal nonmaterial opportunities.	116
Table 49. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: Personal nonmaterial opportunities.	117
Table 50. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: School priorities and standards.	117
Table 51. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and tenure in the building: School priorities and standards	117
Table 52. Summary data on perceived conflict between teachers and experience in the building: Total conflict.	118
Table 53. Analysis of variance data on perceived conflict between teachers and experience in the building: Total conflict	118
Table 54. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Desirable physical working conditions	118

	Page
Table 55. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Desirable physical working conditions.	119
Table 56. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Material inducements	119
Table 57. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Material inducements.	119
Table 58. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Personal nonmaterial opportunities.	120
Table 59. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Personal nonmaterial opportunities.	120
Table 60. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: School priorities and standards.	120
Table 61. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: School priorities and standards.	121
Table 62. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Decision-sharing	121
Table 63. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Decision-sharing.	121
Table 64. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Student relationships. . . .	122
Table 65. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Student relationships.	122
Table 66. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Administrative relationships.	122
Table 67. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Administrative relationships.	123

	Page
Table 68. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Staff relationships.	123
Table 69. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Staff relationships.	123
Table 70. Summary data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Total conflict	124
Table 71. Analysis of variance data on perceived level of conflict between teachers and age groups: Total conflict	124

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. Four-fold typology of organizational structure.	21
Figure 2. Distribution of schools according to authority and expertise	47

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Social scientists have stressed that individuals cannot be viewed solely in unitary terms - separate and apart from the surrounding community. One's opinions, expectations and values are accumulated from past experiences, a reflection of his/her social group's norms. This belief that "no man is an island" also applies to the study of organizational structure. Organizations are even more complex and varied than are individuals, for they are composed of many diverse people holding differing experiences and thus differing expectations. Conflict between employees and employers may emerge over differences in organizational expectations, goals and objectives. A study of this clash has been the concern of many researchers and administrators who have attempted to identify and manage the conflict cycle.

Recently, efforts have been made to label various organizational structures, to identify teacher work values, and then to determine if conflict can result from their interplay. Perhaps with an understanding of this cycle, administrators may be able to vary and modify their organizational structure to accommodate the work values and attitudes of their staff members. Hiring procedures could be seen in a different light with the end goal of employing personnel with work values which are consistent with the school's organizational structure. More immediately, however, with the knowledge of teacher's work values and expectations, a concerted effort could be made to involve staff in revising the organizational structure in order to meet more effectively the needs of the teachers and

the administration.

It becomes a concern, therefore, to discover a more effective organizational structure to meet the demands and the needs of a changing faculty. For in education, as in industry, one discovers varying work values and expectations among the staff which necessitate differing educational strategies in order to promote professional growth and job satisfaction. When a mesh of values and organizational structure occurs, conflict can be managed and growth can emerge. When values and structure clash, conflict may destroy harmonious working relationships between the staff and the administration. It becomes obvious that when this happens all lose - teachers, administrators, and more sadly, the students.

The organizational structure of education was first modeled after the military and later the industrial design. The following aspects of bureaucracy are found in the educational structure: hierarchy, rules, procedures, impersonality, division of labor and technical competence. But recently, according to Bishop and George (1971), bureaucracy has increased due to an increased degree of specialization, more diversity in teaching functions and increased size of schools. This has resulted in more highly stratified levels of hierarchical control. This expansion is evidenced by the growing complexity of district organizational charts. Willower, as cited by Bishop and George (1971), reflected the bindings of other researchers when he stated that potential conflict between organizational demands and professional demands is growing.

Corwin (1965) observed that there is a consistent pattern of conflict between teachers and administrators over the control of work, and that

professionalism tends to be a militant process. Hoy and Miskel (1978) noted that when professionals are employed in a bureaucratic setting, a potential for conflict develops. Professionals are expected to act in the best interest of their clients, while bureaucrats (i.e., administrators) are expected to act in the best interest of the organization.

view the organization as open and healthy, others, as closed and devisive. Bidwell, as cited by Bishop and George (1971), has suggested that organizational structure may vary with the type of teacher recruited. An authoritarian, rule-oriented structure would attract professionals who want control, little involvement and strict guidelines. In contrast, an organizational structure which allows autonomy would attract professionals with collegial values.

Isherwood and Hoy (1973) analyzed the effect of various types of organizational structures upon the work values of the teachers. In their study, organizational structure was defined as one of the following types: authoritarian, bureaucratic, collegial bureaucratic. In addition, Isherwood and Hoy established procedures identifying teacher work values as falling into one of three classifications: professional, organizational and social. They found that for a conflict-free atmosphere, work values and organizational structure should complement each other. When there is a clash of expectations, conflict can emerge. To many teachers, conflict has apparently become synonymous with the issue of accountability. There are several ideas as to the source of this conflict. Elizabeth Koontz, NEA past president, stated that teachers were "being asked to be accountable for results without having any appreciable voice in governing their own profession - training, licensure, retention, and dismissal of teachers." House (1973, p. 62), in the same article, criticized accountability and stated: "The higher levels of authority formulate the goals, so that accountability becomes a strong hierarchical matter." House further charged that accountability schemes are ". . . ultimately immoral. They

will lead to suspicion, acrimony, inflexibility, cheating, and finally control - which I believe is their real purpose."

The perceived amount of control that administrators have over teachers is particularly important in the process of understanding educational conflict. According to Elizabeth Koontz (1969, p. 353), former NEA president, teachers have become militant because they are ". . . sufficiently frustrated and actively dedicated enough to do something about the . . . problems of working conditions, staff relationships and welfare of teachers."

Militancy (and perhaps the general social climate in the United States) has bred distrust among some of the teachers toward administrators. Collective bargaining is the one area in which teachers and administrators most directly face these problems. Hanson (1972, p. 11) observed that collective bargaining has propelled teachers ". . . squarely into the sphere of influence traditionally maintained by administrators." The protection of the "administrator's land" is no longer sacred. Teachers are demanding more voice in areas which were traditionally labeled as administrative prerogatives. Hanson maintained that traditional school bureaucracies are no longer adequate to cope with the demands of rising educational conflict. "Old time" organizational structures may be outdated.

Critical Questions

The focus of this study was to test the belief that the organizational structure perceived by teachers, combined with the collective work values of these teachers, can be predictors of conflict within the school. More specifically, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Is conflict a result of differing work values and expectations between the individual members of the staff and the organizational structure of the school?
2. Does the Teacher Preference Inventory actually measure teacher work values within the school?
3. Does the Conflict Assessment Questionnaire measure the intensity of conflict within a school building?
4. Does the School Organizational Inventory measure the level of bureaucracy within a school building?

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to replicate the use of the School Organizational Inventory (SOI), Teacher Preference Inventory (TOP) and the Conflict Assessment Questionnaire (CAQ) to determine if the correlations are indeed positive as indicated by the Spence (1977) study. In addition, the secondary variables of subject matter taught, number of years a professional has taught within the sampled building, sex and age were chosen to study. These were included in order to determine any interaction with them and relationships between teachers' work values and their perceptions of the level of conflict within the building.

The School Organization Inventory (SOI) had been used by Punch (1969), Udy (1959), and Isherwood (1971) to measure organizational structure. The instrument purported to identify two separate dimensions in the organization's structure: expertise of teachers and perceived administrative authority. Punch (1969) and Udy (1959) found that there was a negative correlation between the two dimensions. This was substantiated by Isherwood (1971) in his study. However, in 1977 Spence found that when the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed, a positive score of .91 was obtained. Because of this, Spence questioned the validity of the SOI. He speculated that the test no longer measured the dimensions of authority and expertise.

The TPI produces three scores in the work values dimensions: social, organizational and professional. In previous studies, Isherwood (1971), p. 131) found that these dimensions were mutually exclusive and that they measured the teachers' work values. The Spence study indicated that the social and organizational dimensions were not exclusive and thus he combined these values.

In addition to questioning the usefulness of these instruments, Spence raised questions as to whether organizational structure and work values influence the level of conflict within a building. In short, he speculated that schools today possess a unitary model of bureaucracy wherein administrative authority and the technical competence of teachers has become so well-defined that conflict and contradiction between the two dimensions no longer exists.

Possible reasons given for the change in correlation were that

schools have changed; thus, there may no longer be the perception of exclusiveness between administration and staff. Perhaps, in the teachers' eyes, the administration has become more open and more willing to acknowledge professional expertise. On the other hand, the organizations have become more unitary - more of a single dimension as Weber (translated 1947) originally posited.

The Teacher Preference Inventory was also used by Spence and, contrary to previous studies, was found to have a positive, not negative, association. Again, one can only surmise the reason for this change; perhaps differences among work values cannot be determined by using this questionnaire.

Hypotheses to Be Tested

The literature seems to support the idea that increased levels of bureaucracy and higher intensity of conflict among teachers are positively related. This study will first seek to identify types of bureaucratic structure in schools, as well as the work values of teachers in these schools. From that, the study will ascertain intensity of conflict (if any) among teachers having particular work value orientations, in relation to the type of organizational structure.

In a collegial school bureaucracy, it would seem logical that teachers having professional work values would experience less conflict since rules are less explicit, there is more freedom in decision-making, and they have a higher degree of influence with the administration. Those teachers having organizational and social work values, however, may be

uncomfortable in this nonauthoritarian atmosphere. There would be fewer expectations and less structure for these teachers. Consequently, the following operational hypothesis is suggested.

H_1 : In schools with authoritarian bureaucratic structures, teachers with professional work values will experience a greater intensity of conflict than teachers with organizational and social work values.

Isherwood and Hoy concluded from the study of college teachers that those teachers experiencing the greatest sense of powerlessness held professional or mixed work values in authoritarian schools.

Therefore, two more hypotheses are proposed:

H_2 : In schools with collegial bureaucratic structures, teachers with social work values will experience a greater intensity of conflict than teachers with professional and organizational work values.

H_3 : In schools with collegial bureaucratic structures, teachers with organizational work values will experience a greater intensity of conflict than teachers with professional and social work values.

In addition to the previously mentioned hypotheses, it would seem appropriate to develop yet another, which deals with all teachers. According to Isherwood and Hoy (1973), most teachers have mixed work values. Certainly it seems appropriate, then, to compare all teachers, regardless of work values, in authoritarian schools to all teachers in collegial schools. Therefore, a fourth hypothesis is posited.

H_4 : All teachers in authoritarian schools, regardless of work

values, will experience a greater intensity of conflict than their counterparts in collegial schools.

Subordinate Hypotheses

There were additional areas considered relevant for this study. On the TPI and CAQ, teachers were asked to identify their teaching level, sex, number of years of tenure in the building, age to the nearest year, and content area. This information was coded and used to determine differences, if any, relative to conflict and work values. Content area taught was omitted from the analysis due to a lack of standardized responses.

The following subordinate hypotheses were formulated concerning the TPI:

Hypothesis five: Work values orientations do not vary significantly by teaching level (elementary and secondary).

Hypothesis six: Work values orientations do not vary by sex of teachers.

Hypothesis seven: There is no relationship between a teacher's tenure in the building and the teacher's work values orientation.

Hypothesis eight: Work values orientations do not vary by age of teachers.

Similar subordinate hypotheses were formed concerning the Conflict Assessment Questionnaire. Specifically, the following hypotheses were formed:

Hypothesis nine: Conflict perceptions do not vary by teaching level (elementary and secondary).

Hypothesis ten: Conflict perceptions do not vary by sex of teachers.

Hypothesis eleven: There is no relationship between teacher tenure and the perceived level of conflict within the building.

Hypothesis twelve: Conflict perceptions do not vary by age of teachers.

Potential Value

Having identified organizational structure and the professional staff's work values, the administrator can begin to identify patterns of conflict which might emerge within the school and within the district. Conflict may be the result of a clash between work values and organizational structure. If this is the case, then modifications of the structure can be made in order to accommodate differing work values. Personnel practices can be modified as to hiring procedures, with the goal of blending new personnel with the existing organizational structure. In addition, staffs can be trained to identify the type of structure desired within the organization. Educational programs can then be devised in order to train personnel in the methods of that structure.

Delimitations

Inherent in any investigation are certain delimitations or boundaries. In this particular study, the sample is limited to those teachers teaching in Iowa during the school year 1977-78. Iowa is divided into service units designated as Area Education Agencies (AEAs). Three AEAs were chosen from which to take a random sample of buildings in this study. Area Two centered around Mason City and included the counties of Winnebago, Worth, Mitchell, Hancock, Cerro Gordo, Floyd, northeast Wright,

central and northern Franklin and northwest Butler. Cedar Falls and Waterloo were the largest cities in the AEA Seven locale. AEA Seven includes Black Hawk, Bremer, southeastern and central Butler, northeastern and central Tama, northwestern Benton and Buchanan counties. Area Nine encompasses the Davenport vicinity and includes Jackson, Clinton, Scott, Muscatine, northeast Louisa and southeast Cedar counties.

For a school to be included in the sample, it had to have a professional staff of 15 or more. Schools were stratified into elementary and secondary levels. A total of 60 schools were chosen out of 96 originally picked at random. Those 60 schools were picked on the basis of having returned 50 percent or more of the original questionnaires. Two weeks after the first questionnaires were sent, a follow-up letter was sent to those not responding in each of the 60 schools. An 80 percent return rate was a goal in each building so as to measure accurately each building's organizational structure, perceived level of conflict, and teachers' work values. It was decided that four of the five questionnaires out of each test should be returned in order for the building to be included in the sample.

Definitions

Organizational Structure: This term is used interchangeably with bureaucracy. It refers to the degree of complexity, hierarchy, number of rules, impersonality, division of labor and the degree of technical competence and the amount of control exerted by management within the organization. Specifically, organizational structure is divided into

three main types: authoritarian, bureaucratic and collegial.

Authoritarian Schools: Schools classified as having a high degree of authority tend to have decision-making and power centralized within the administration or hierarchy (Isherwood and Hoy, 1973).

Collegial Schools: Schools classified as collegial have less emphasis placed on authority and hierarchy and more placed upon teacher involvement. Authority is shared and staff input is determined by the expertise of the staff.

Bureaucratic or Weberian Schools: Schools classified as bureaucratic have both a high degree of authority on the part of administrators as well as a high degree of administrative recognition of teacher expertise. According to Max Weber (translated 1947) this is the ideal organization.

Work Values: Work values refer to the particular expectations and beliefs that a teacher may have concerning his role in the organization. Work values result from a combination of how people react to common roles, to shared community social norms and expectations, to differing expectations and one's evaluation of these, and finally, the shared experiences and communication networks within the social group.

Organizational Work Values: Those holding organizational work values are identified closely with the values and goals of the organization. They tend to conform more readily to the system's policies, rules and expectations.

Social Work Values: The teachers having social work values are more closely aligned to the values and goals of their work group, home,

family and religious orientation.

Professional Work Values: Teachers having professional work values identify more closely with the goals and ideas with a particular school or organization.

Militancy: Militancy is one indicator of teacher dissatisfaction.

Conflict: Getzels and Guba (1957) defined conflict as ". . . those behaviors, attitudes and feelings which keep the individual at odds with the institution" (p. 423). The needs, goals, and values of the individual and organization are incongruent, thus progress toward organizational goals is hindered.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An educational system is a complex structure comprised of differing groups each with its own perceptions and expectations of the organization. There are numerous ways of analyzing this system. One method is to depict the members of the organization in terms of their work values. Another is to classify the structure of an organization within a continuum which ranges from a relatively open and free system to one that is more closed and autocratic. A third method is to study the amount of conflict within the structure.

Work values differ among people. Some teachers seem threatened by the organization, whereas others within the same structure feel comfortable and relaxed. Presthus (1962) studied employee work values and stated: "The bureaucratic situation . . . is not 'seen' in the same way by all its members. While some individuals perceive the organization as a favorable place in which to assert their career claims, others view its systems of authority and status as threatening" (1962, p. 100). This perceived threat often results in anxiety, frustration, tension and usually conflict between the employee, the administration, and occasionally, other employees. Work values may reflect one's personality, role perceptions and physical/psychological needs and thus influence his perception of conflict within the organizational structure.

The basic structure for American schools was modeled after the industrial design which emerged during the latter half of the century (Katz, 1971). This structure was characterized by an extensive bureaucracy.

Max Weber explored the nature of bureaucracy in 1947. He saw bureaucracy as desirable; it was an efficient and orderly method of achieving goals and objectives. The traditional view of bureaucracy involved the following components: division of labor, hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, impersonal orientation, career orientation and quest for efficiency. The extensive use of rules and regulations gave the organization and its members guidelines for conducting the rights and duties of employees and clients. It created an orderly process resulting in stability and continuity. Bureaucracy was also characterized by impersonality and uniformity. This method, of consistent application of uniform rules and regulations, ensured equal treatment of employees and protection from administrative capriciousness and arbitrariness (Weber, 1947). In all, a thorough bureaucracy would create an efficient organization for producing goods resulting in a climate that was satisfying to the growth of its employees. There would, therefore, be a minimum of tension and conflict. But conflict continued to surface regardless of the level of bureaucracy within the organization.

Research has indicated that some level of conflict is to be expected in educational organizations. Parsons (1947) states that natural conflict exists between authority in position and authority based in technical competence, in other words, administrators versus teachers. Hoy and Miskel (1978) assert that bureaucracies have a high potential for conflict. Individuals within the same organization have differing orientations and thus their interests and values are not the same. Administrators tend to concentrate upon the interests of the organization whereas

teachers focus upon client or student needs, resulting in a dichotomy (Hoy and Miskel, 1978). This difference is not purely random; it is often determined by the type of organizational structure. Bidwell, as cited by Bishop and George (1971), states that the type of teacher hired varies by the type of school organizational structure. Highly bureaucratic structures tend to alienate professional teachers who desire more autonomy and collegial forms of control. Instead, they draw those desiring guidance, rules and regulations, and more strict administrative control.

Coughlin (1971) hypothesized that teachers' work values would affect job satisfaction. He divided teachers into three groups within the organizational structure: those having professional work values, organizational work values, or social work values. He hypothesized that work values among group members and the group's social structure are significantly related. In addition, he expected that teachers would respond differently to pressure and demands of disparate types or organizational systems in accordance to their needs and this, in turn, would be reflected in their work attitudes. His findings supported these hypotheses.

Bishop and George (1973) conducted another study centering upon employee perception of organizational climate. They found that a teacher's perception of climate may be viewed as a function of the interplay between the teacher's personality and specific structural characteristics of the organization.

The interplay between personality and structure is crucial to the study of conflict within all organizations, education, in particular. Conflict may be a positive or negative force depending upon the type of

resolution process employed. This process of conflict resolution should be a cognitive, rational process and not one of "hit and miss" politics. It is important, therefore, that research be directed toward and continued emphasis placed upon the impact of organizational structure on work values and the resulting issue or conflict.

Bureaucracy: Scope and Development

Organizational structure refers to an established pattern of operations and the relationship that this pattern has between different roles within the bureaucracy (Bishop and George, 1973). The purpose of a bureaucratic structure is to present a degree of rationality and discipline to an organization, enabling it to function smoothly and effectively. Bureaucracies are characterized by precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination and reduction of friction (Weber, 1947).

Max Weber, the sociologist of the organizational revolution called "bureaucracy," outlines several qualities of an effective organization. According to Weber, organizations should be run ". . . without hatred or passion . . . without affection or enthusiasm" (Weber, 1947, p. 341). Impersonality pervades, leading to higher levels of rationality and factual inputs. Thus, sentiment and its resulting inconsistencies are reduced and better decisions are made. Weber asserts that decision-making is a rational process. He illustrates this with the following two examples: hiring and upward mobility. In a bureaucracy, hiring is based upon expertise and competence, thus the organization experiences

rationality, security and stability. Upward mobility, in addition, evolves from above-average performance. In this process, people are satisfied, rationality pervades and no conflict surfaces.

Hierarchical authority and professional expertise tend to be paired in Weber's model. In addition, Weber states that bureaucratic principles are raised to the optimum in a monolithic structure as compared to other forms of bureaucracy. A monolithic structure is one that recognizes only one dimension in an organization's structure. In Weber's model, the dimension is bureaucracy. In this unitary model, all parts of the bureaucracy are functionally related; all are aiming at the most efficient means of attaining the goals of the organization. One's authority is based upon the rational legal position of his office within the organization. In addition, there is an extensive hierarchy of control within the organization.

Weber's monolithic theory of organizational structure served as a launching point for revision and criticism for many researchers. Gouldner (1954) criticized Weber's theory, stating that Weber had actually combined authority based in position with authority based in expertise. In other words, Weber assumed that people in leadership positions had not only the power delegated to them by their positions, but also were the most knowledgeable and skillful people for that job. This combination, Gouldner asserted, was unwarranted.

In 1965, Hage developed a four-factor concept of organizational structure. This revolved around an organization's degree of centralization, complexity, formalization and stratification. Centralization

involved such items as formalization, degree of standardization and the amount of regulations. The degree of complexity within a structure centered around the level of training necessary for jobs and tasks. The fourth dimension, the degree of stratification, centered upon the company's division of labor, upward mobility patterns, reward and incentive structures.

Pugh, Hinnings, MacDonald, Turner and Luptzon (1963) developed a six-dimensional version of organizational structure. In this model, the dimensions were specialization, standardization, formalization, centralization, configuration and flexibility. This theory emphasized a systems approach to bureaucracy and a belief that the organization must be examined in terms of its total environment.

Educational Bureaucracy

Punch (1969) made one of the first efforts at studying educational organizations as bureaucracies. He defined educational bureaucracies as ". . . the organization designed to accomplish large scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals. It is here that bureaucracy becomes synonymous with large organizations or formal organizations" (p. 43). Punch states that although schools are bureaucracies, it is the extent of bureaucracy within the organization that becomes important. In 1960, he studied teacher perception of bureaucracy. A six-dimensional model was developed to explain the structure revolving around hierarchy, rules and procedures, impersonality, technical competence, and a division of labor. Punch stated that

bureaucratic structure is a two-factor and not a unitary concept, which is contrary to Weber's theory. One factor involves hierarchy, rules, procedures and impersonality whereas the second revolves around the division of labor and technical competence (Punch, 1969).

How are schools like industrial bureaucracies? Hoy and Miskel (1978) stated that both have similar concepts of division of labor by specialization (such as in subject matter or grade orientation), and both have a system of hierarchy of labor which has evolved in order to manage and monitor the organization. This management is most often seen through school administration flow charts, organizational charts, district policies and rules and regulations.

In 1973, Isherwood and Hoy developed a four-fold typology of organizational structure based upon this dualistic theory of bureaucracy.

(See Figure 1.) A Type I or Weberian structure was characterized as one

		Expertise	
		High	Low
Authority	High	Type I Authority and Expertise	Type II Authoritarian
	Low	Type III Collegial	Type IV Chaotic

Figure 1. Four-fold typology of organizational structure

with a high degree of authority and expertise. The Type I classification is close to Weber's original definition of bureaucracy and this is often referred to as a Weberian organization. In Isherwood and Hoy's study,

a Type I school occurs only if the hierarchy and decision-making are centralized. This school is high in authority and low in expertise. Type II schools are mainly punishment-oriented and are identified as highly authoritarian. Type III schools or collegial structures are low in authority and high in expertise. There is a great amount of shared decision-making, staff input is encouraged and a large amount of freedom and latitude is allowed because of a recognition of a high level of individual expertise. Finally, a Type IV or chaotic structure never occurred in their study.

In summary, researchers have long pondered the questions concerning organizational structure and its relationship to employee productivity and job satisfaction. There have yet to be decisive answers to questions such as: What are the particular effects of an organization's structure? How might the structure of an organization be modified to reduce or eliminate sources of undesirable or dysfunctional behavior? In other words, what structures minimize conflict and at the same time maximize worker satisfaction and productivity? (Bishop and George, 1973).

Work Values: A Cumulation and Complication

Many investigators have attempted to identify the types of roles, work values and expectations within an organization, hoping that a review of these may reveal sources of conflict. In organizations as complex and varied as schools, there are varying expectations arising from differing work values within the staff. Studies indicate that one's perception of his role within the organization is often a reflection of his experiences

and work values (Reissman, 1949). These roles are not isolated but reflect a person's whole experiences. An employee's expectations mirror his interests, his upbringing and cultural and social group affiliation. Social roles, for instance, cannot be structured ". . . exclusively in terms of the situation and ideal behavior patterns . . . with little or no concern . . ." for environmental circumstances. In other words, one's role expectations and job satisfaction involve the entire realm of an individual's life (Reissman, 1949, p. 306).

Blau and Scott (1962) listed four factors which attempt to describe the way people relate to roles. First of all, people hold common values which govern their goals. Secondly, there are social norms and common expectations concerning behavior which people share. Thirdly, roles contain differentiated expectations from which people must evaluate and then act accordingly. Finally, social relations form networks of communication and shared values and experiences within the group. These networks serve as a reference group which establishes, defines and reinforces work values and role orientations (Merton, 1957).

One's role can be complicated by the bureaucratic structure. Reissman (1949) stated that within an organization, one can find, not one, but four types of bureaucrats: functional, service, job and specialist. A functional bureaucrat is oriented toward recognition from specific professional groups residing outside the organization. The specialist bureaucrat has a professional orientation similar to the functional bureaucrat but with a greater sense of identification with the organization. The service bureaucrat allies himself more closely to

bureaucratic structure and seeks limited recognition from outside the organization. The job bureaucrat seeks recognition almost exclusively from within the organization, maintaining few outside ties professionally (Reissman, 1949). In Reissman's continuum, bureaucrats range from people who are influenced from outside sources to bureaucrats who center all energies and concerns within their own organization.

Gouldner (1957) studied organizational structure among professors in a small liberal arts college and discovered two main types of individuals within a bureaucracy: locals and cosmopolitans. He defined locals as the "true believers" in the organization. Among the types of locals usually found in organizations were the true bureaucrats, the homeguard workers (who were place-bound in their occupation) and the elders (or the older people, the established employees in the organization). The cosmopolitans were of two types, the outsiders and the empire builders. The outsiders did not integrate into the formal structure, were not close to students or faculty, participated little, and had a high commitment to refining specific skills. The empire builders within the organization were somewhat economically independent and tended to look for upward mobility outside the organization. Gouldner discovered that cosmopolitans exhibited a low degree of loyalty to the organization and a high commitment to developing specialized role skills. They, as did the functional bureaucrat, relied upon outer reference groups for role definitions and reinforcement. In contrast, locals tended to have organizational values with a high loyalty to the employing organization and a low commitment to specialized role skills. This group relied upon a reference

group within the organization. Thus, within a single organization, Gouldner identified two distinctively different employees having nearly opposite values.

In a similar study, Carlsen (1962) studied superintendent mobility patterns, contrasting place-bound superintendents with career-bound superintendents. He found that place-bound superintendents sought to maintain their positions within their local districts whereas career-bound superintendents sought upward mobility or status by moving from job to job. One group sought stability, the other, advancement and challenge.

Coughlin (1971) attempted to account for these differences by listing three work values typically held by teachers: professional, organizational, and social work values. In his study he found that teachers with organizational work values identified more closely with the values and goals of the organization, such as conformity to system policy, rules and promotions into supervisory positions. A teacher with professional work values would identify more closely with the goals and ideals of the profession as a whole than with the particular organization or school in which they were employed. These professionals rated specialization as an important element in the occupation. Finally, those who held social work values identified with the values and goals of their immediate work group, home, family and religious orientation.

Structure and work values

The organization can either hinder or facilitate the accomplishment and satisfaction of employee needs. In Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, an individual must first satisfy the "lower" needs in order to achieve self-actualization. Physical, safety and belonging needs must be met first in order for a person to experience more advanced levels. Barnes (1960) modified Maslow's hierarchy-of-needs theory by stating that self-esteem, esteem of others and belonging needs were the most important in the hierarchy. These needs were all related to each other and basic to the physiological and safety needs and thus basic to the success of the system. The organization, through its structure, and role definitions can aid in the acquisition of these needs which can produce a more stable atmosphere within the bureaucracy. An organization accomplishes this by the promotion of self-esteem needs, by allowing a high degree of autonomy and freedom. Other esteem needs are influenced by the way relationships are structured. The organization helps to satisfy or to frustrate the employee's belonging needs according to the opportunities for interaction provided beyond those required in the job. In contrast, organizations can also block these needs and thus become pervaded with disharmony and conflict. The attainment or blockage of needs occurs with the matching of bureaucratic structures with work values of its employees.

Coughlin (1971) noted that people having different work values also have differing needs: professionals need self-esteem; organizationals strive for other esteem; socials concentrate on acquiring belonging

needs. Similar themes emerged in all four previously mentioned studies; there are different role expectations for employees as well as differing work values among the staff. Coughlin hypothesized that teachers' work values can affect job satisfaction depending on whether values coincide or conflict with organizational values. Coughlin administered the Teacher Preference Audit (TPA) to 192 teachers to determine if work values and job satisfaction were related to the type of organizational values. He discovered, however, that teachers in relatively open systems, regardless of their work values, seemed to be more satisfied with administrative policies. In closed systems, individual attempts to gratify belonging and self-esteem needs seemed to be blocked. There were fewer opportunities for "widespread interactions, job autonomy and upward influence." In closed, as opposed to open systems, differences in feelings and thoughts concerning colleague relationships tended to be more restrictive. Teachers felt a lack of freedom, candor and openness within this type of organization.

Coughlin (1971) depicted three overlapping and sometimes competing structures within which teachers must operate: bureaucratic principles of the school, principles of the profession and the social structure of their particular work group. Within these structures, work values of teachers vary from those having professional values or organizational or social values. Differences in expectations may arise from incompatible work values and organizational structure.

Isherwood and Hoy (1973) found that there was a significant difference in powerlessness scores (a measure of one aspect of conflict) among

teachers having different work values in authoritarian (or closed) and collegial (open) schools. Teachers responded to the type of organizational structure perceived within the organization. This response, according to the authors, was, at least partly, according to their work value orientations.

Isherwood and Hoy hypothesized that teachers with professional values would experience a higher sense of powerlessness in authoritarian structures than teachers with organizational or social work values. Results of their study indicated that professional teachers did indeed exhibit a greater sense of powerlessness than socially oriented teachers in authoritarian schools. There was no significant difference between professional and organizational powerlessness scores in authoritarian schools. In collegial schools, organizational teachers expressed the greatest sense of powerlessness and had a significantly greater sense of powerlessness than teachers with professional work values. Professional teachers had the greatest sense of powerlessness in authoritarian schools and the least in collegial (Isherwood and Hoy, 1973). Organizations had the greatest sense of powerlessness in collegial but did not possess the lowest sense of powerlessness in authoritarian schools. Teachers with social values held a low sense of powerlessness in authoritarian schools and a high sense of powerlessness in collegial schools. The latter two findings were contrary to their original hypothesis. In summary, Isherwood and Hoy wrote: ". . . a vast majority (89% of the entire sample) experienced a greater sense of powerlessness in authoritarian schools than they did in collegial schools" (Isherwood and Hoy, 1973, p. 136).

Conflict

Definition of conflict

Through the years conflict has connoted many things to people; images of trouble, disaster and upheaval seem to pervade. There are numerous definitions of conflict. Boulding (1964) writes that conflict is ". . . competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility to potential future positions in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other" (Boulding, 1964, p. 46). Conflict involves competition, incompatibility of future desired positions between people, groups or even elements within one's personality.

Mack and Snyder (1957) support this view of conflict. They assert that conflict results when the interaction between two or more individuals or alternatives are mutually opposed and when one alternative is chosen at the expense of another. Conflict also arises, they assert, from choices involving a scarcity of position or resources.

Pondy (1967) explained that contrary to prevailing opinions, the effects of conflict can range from negative to positive depending on the resolution achieved. Simmel (1955) described the resulting action as achieving ". . . a kind of unity. . . ." (Simmel, 1955, p. 87). Pois (1969) describes conflict as a negative force - something to be controlled and eliminated if possible. In reality, however, conflict is neither totally good nor totally evil. If properly managed, conflict can even enhance the effectiveness of an organization.

The process of conflict resolution

The process of conflict resolution is important in administrative effectiveness. As is usually the case, some people process conflict effectively whereas other mismanage the process and dysfunctional behavior occurs, producing blockage of goals and inefficiency.

Conflict exists within organizations which consist of people performing various roles or holding various offices within the structure (Katz and Kahn, 1966). These offices are interrelated and have patterns of activities associated with their roles. One's role definition is derived from the duties that individuals perform. Communication becomes important in the process of role definitions. Role messages are communicated between the offices with individuals responding according to their perceptions of the information. The response affects the behavior of the sender. This cyclical activity is constantly repeated. As long as interactions remain simple, involving a single activity, misinterpretation is minimal. But usually, multiple activities are combined within a single role. With this added complexity, people often must cope with role messages and demands which sometimes seem contradictory, resulting in conflict (Katz and Kahn, 1966).

Types of conflict

Katz and Kahn (1966) delineate four types of conflict: intrasender, intersender, interrole and role overload. Intrasender is where there are two conflicting role expectations imposed upon a person from one sender. The second type of conflict results when differing expectations from other organizational offices occur, forcing choices.

Interrole conflict surfaces when two or more senders impose conflicting role expectations upon a person. One finds his individual values, needs and capacities violated by the role requirement. Finally, in role overload, a worker experiences too many legitimate expectations within a single position.

The potential for conflict depends upon "the extent to which required resources are shared among organizational units, the degree of their interdependence and the perceived incompatibility of their goals" (Schmidt and Kochan, 1976, p. 364). Schmidt and Kochan outline three types of conflict within the organizations. Type I conflict is any interference at the point of resource attainment. A study by Trist and Bamforth in 1951 illustrated this type of conflict. Teams competed in filling tubs with coal but since tubs were scarce, teams stole them from one another. Because the tubs were at the crucial point of task accomplishment, conflict emerged.

Type II conflict exists when separate goals are established but independent activities are instituted. Trist and Bamforth used specialized task groups of gummers and fillers to demonstrate this type of conflict. The gummers and fillers performed different tasks; each group had different goals but the work was interdependent so that one group could not finish its task until the other group completed theirs. Conflict resulted from this process.

When groups must share resources but have different goals and activities, a third type of conflict emerges. Dutton and Walton (1966) studied two departments in production and sales. The production department

focused on cost control and efficiency whereas sales concentrated upon increasing volume and service. As each worked toward its mutually independent goals, conflict surfaced. Production claimed that it did not have the necessary materials to produce an order while sales would withhold needed information from the production department in order to make cost estimates more difficult.

In summary, research seems to indicate that when differing goals and objectives are formed, when there is a scarcity of resources, or when there is interference at the point of a task being completed, conflict may result. Miskel and Gerhardt (1973) stated that conflict results from an interaction "between two or more interdependent individuals or units as a result of a scarcity of organization incentives" (Miskel and Gerhardt, 1973, p. 2).

Conflict in education

Conflict exists in educational as well as industrial structures. Blau and Scott (1962) attribute the rise of educational conflict to increasing expertise and advancing technology resulting in clashes over organizational and professional goals. Rizzon, House, and Lirtzman (1970) stated that professional organizations tend to violate the hierarchy of authority principle thus resulting in three sources of conflict. The professional organization may create a dual authority structure which may result in diminishing a teacher's loyalty to the organization. Secondly, teachers with professional values tend to be more critical of the school organization and tend to ignore administrative details. Finally, because of divided loyalties between professional organizations

and school organizations, teachers may experience stress. Commenting on this dichotomy, Corwin (1965) stated ". . . on the one hand, the expert (or teacher) is expected to be loyal to the organization and on the other hand, his primary identification is often with groups on the outside" (Corwin, 1965, p. 10). Etzioni (1964) stated that many teachers resent the authority imposed upon them through organizational rules. This, in turn, causes conflict over professional autonomy and administrative control.

Teachers and administrators may differ in role perceptions. This dichotomy may produce conflict. These role perceptions grow out of values which emanate from one's experiences and reference group. Miskel and Gerhardt (1973) found that central life interest or work values was a variable which occurred between conflict and job satisfaction. In addition to value orientations relating to conflict, research has indicated that the type of organizational structure in combination with particular work values produces conflict.

Miskel and Gerhardt (1973) found a significant positive relationship between the school district's bureaucratic level and the teachers' sense of power. He stated that ". . . the more bureaucratic the school district, the greater the teachers' sense of power" (p. 124). Bureaucratic, briefly, refers to the degree of formalization, specialization, centralization and standardization that exists within an organization. In Moeller's study, teachers felt more comfortable with specified rules and regulations, and a limited involvement in decision-making. In contrast, Barakat (Miskel and Gerhardt, 1973) found the opposite: The more

controlling the school organization, the greater the sense of teacher alienation.

In a study of Canadian teachers, Isherwood and Hoy (1973) found that a strong relationship existed between school bureaucratic structure and the teachers' sense of powerlessness. According to their study, teachers in authoritarian schools experienced a significantly greater ($p. < .001$) sense of powerlessness than teachers in collegial or more open schools. In particular, teachers with professional and mixed work values had a greater sense of powerlessness in authoritarian schools when compared to their counterparts (those having social work values and organizational work values in collegial schools). Simply put, the vast majority of teachers experienced a greater sense of powerlessness in authoritarian schools than those in collegial organizations (Isherwood and Hoy, 1973).

As research has indicated, conflict may surface for numerous reasons. The most prevalent conflict issue (and perhaps the most important) revolves around individual work values which may clash with organizational role definitions, objectives and goals. In addition, the type of organizational structure may have a relationship to the degree of conflict perceived by the teachers. Thus, the interplay between organizational structure and employee work values may be crucial to the management of conflict.

Summary

The American educational system has reflected many of the movements and theories experienced by the private sector. Bureaucracy, for example, was once viewed in fairly simple terms by both the private and public sectors. Max Weber's (1947) perception of organizational structure reflected many of these early beliefs. He believed that organizational structure revolved around business' efficient attainment of goals; or simply stated - profit. Hierarchy of personnel, rules and regulations were all functionally interrelated in order to attain this goal. Employees were hired to facilitate this function. Their perceptions, experiences or beliefs were not integral in the company's achievement of goals. In Weber's view of bureaucracy, technical competence and management were the same. He believed that the most technically competent employees would, naturally, be the most capable and efficient managers.

But the orderly accomplishment of an organization's goals was not as simple as Weber had philosophized. In Weber's model, there was little or no consideration given to the effect of conflict upon personnel and ultimately upon the efficiency of the organization. Since then social scientists have studied the process of conflict and modified Weber's unitary model of bureaucracy. Multidimensional schemes of bureaucracy were developed recognizing employee values and role perceptions as well as the separate dimension of authority and management.

In 1969, Punch began to study educational systems in terms of bureaucratic structures. Isherwood and Hoy (1973) continued this theme and developed a classification system whereby schools were "typed" according

to their level of bureaucracy: authoritarian, collegial, Weberian, or chaotic. Isherwood and Hoy also found that teachers experienced differing degrees of "powerlessness" or conflict depending upon the organizational structure of their school. They concluded that teachers in authoritarian schools experienced a greater degree of conflict than teachers in collegial or open organizations. It was assumed, therefore, that authoritarian schools bred conflict. Spence (1977), however, found a non-significant relationship between conflict, work values and structure, thus creating an aura of doubt around the Isherwood and Hoy findings.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the procedures used to conduct this study. This study examines the notion that teacher work values and organizational structure influence the degree of conflict within a building. Isherwood and Hoy (1973) studied this with an additional variable of effectiveness and discovered that there was a significant correlation between work values, bureaucracy and conflict. Spence (1977) investigated the same variables but found no significant differences. Results of this study will help clarify previous studies and may also indicate the appropriateness of the instruments used to measure conflict, work values and organizational structure.

Instrumentation

School Organizational Inventory (SOI)

The SOI was employed to determine the perceived organizational structures of schools picked for the sample. The SOI was developed by Hall (1963) and originally measured the degree of bureaucracy in business organizations. Expert judges correlated their subjective observations with reports of instrument measures for each subscale to achieve validation. Hall applied the Spearman-Brown formula for split-half reliability to each of the original subscales. The reliability coefficients were: .83, .24, .59, .64, .56, and .71. The SOI was revised by McKay (1964) and Robinson (1966) for use in schools. The SOI consists of 48 Likert-type items which measure the six dimensions of bureaucracy. Punch (1969)

reduced these six dimensions to two, authority and expertise. The dimension of authority includes hierarchy, rules, procedures, and impersonality, whereas the expertise dimension includes division of labor and technical competence.

Teacher Preference Inventory (TPI)

Work values were measured by the TPI. The measure emerged from the conceptual work of Barnes (1960) and the empirical work of Coughlan (1971). Coughlan conducted a pilot study which reduced the 75 items to 48. From these, 22 accounted for approximately 35 percent of the common variance of five bipolar factors. These factors are shown in Figure 2 (Chapter IV).

Five judges classified responses into one of the three work value constructs for validity. All items in the TPI received unanimous support from the judges. Reliability was determined by applying the Kuder-Richardson formula 20. Internal consistency reliability estimates ranged from .51 to .74, with a median of .60. Isherwood (1971) selected 14 of the 22 with the highest factor loading to develop the final instrument.

Conflict Assessment Questionnaire (CAQ)

The CAQ was developed by Gerhardt (1971) based upon the works of Barnard (1958), Mack and Snyder (1957), and Corwin (1963). It is intended to measure the intensity of conflict in organizations. Gerhardt used expert opinion to validate the instrument and to reduce Corwin's original 125 items to 74 items covering eight factors. These factors are desirable physical work conditions, material inducements, personal

nonmaterial opportunities, school priorities and standards, decision-sharing, student relationships, administrative relationships and staff relationships. Later pilot studies reduced the number of items to 53. The reliability estimate of the instrument is .94 and was determined by calculating Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients. Appendix C lists the items for each dimension of the CAQ.

Sample

The number of schools included in each portion of the sample varied slightly. The Mason City area consisted of 60 elementary and 45 secondary schools. The area around Waterloo and Cedar Falls had 51 elementary and 40 secondary schools. The Davenport region had 63 elementary and 32 secondary schools. An attempt was made so that schools were similar in size and staffing patterns at each level.

In order to be included in the sample, schools needed a certified teaching staff of at least fifteen teachers. This criterion was established so as to give a more adequate reflection of the building's work values, organizational structure and level of conflict. Fifteen teachers were randomly selected within each building. Of those selected, five teachers responded to the TPI, five to the SOI, and five others to the CAQ.

Collection of Data

Permission to distribute the questionnaires was obtained by sending the building principal a letter outlining the purpose of the study. If the principal agreed to allow his building to participate in the study,

he distributed an envelope containing an introductory letter to each teacher with the designated questionnaire. The questionnaires were numerically and color coded in order to facilitate follow-up letters and to insure return of the questionnaires. Five hundred seventy-five teacher's questionnaires were used in this study. Information regarding sex, age, teaching level, total years of experience in the building and content area was gathered from those teachers answering the Conflict Assessment Questionnaire and the Teacher Preference Inventory. Two mailings were employed two weeks apart. The return rate for each building ranged from three to five per questionnaire. Appendices D and E contain copies of all correspondence and Appendices F, G, H show the questionnaires used.

Treatment

The School Organization Inventory (SOI) was used to identify the type of organizational structure within the school. After scoring the SOI, a mean and median were computed for each school. Secondly, a mean score and median were computed for each of the factors of authority and expertise. With this information a graph was constructed representing the four quadrants: Weberian, collegial, chaotic and authoritarian. The scoring was arrived at in the following manner: Schools above the mean in expertise but below it in authority were assigned to the "collegial" quadrant. Those schools which were above the mean in both expertise and authority were placed in the "Weberian" quadrant. Schools falling below both means were determined to be "chaotic." Those schools scoring

above the mean in authority but below the mean in expertise fell into the "authoritarian" quadrant. Each question was classified as either measuring a component of authority or expertise. Missing responses on the questionnaires were classified in a separate category in order to determine if certain questions were unclear to the teachers.

The Pearson product-moment correlation was applied to the factors of authority and expertise. In previous studies the relationship between authority and expertise had negative correlations. Udy (1959) and Isherwood (1971) found this to exist. Isherwood discovered that the coefficient was $-.77$ at the $.005$ level of significance. Spence (1977), however, found that there was a positive relationship, $+.98$ at the $.001$ level of significance. This, of course, is not only contradictory to other studies but also served as a focal point of interest in this study.

The Teacher Preference Inventory (TPI) was used to ascertain the work values orientations of teachers for each building sampled. Personal information concerning the number of years a teacher had taught in the building, the grade level taught, sex, age and teaching area was included on each questionnaire. One hundred ninety-eight questionnaires were used to measure the building's work value orientation.

The scoring for the TPI was accomplished by determining a median for each dimension (social, organizational, and professional) for the entire sample. After the median was computed, a work values profile was constructed. Those schools above the median on the professional scale and below it on the other two scales were classified as having professional work values. This procedure was repeated for the other two dimensions

(social and organization). If a building met none of these criteria, it was classified as having mixed work values. In addition, those questions which had either no response or more than one response were coded separately. This was done in an attempt to determine possible problems teachers may have had in perceiving differences between the dimensions.

A correlation between the three dimensions was calculated. Isherwood (1971, p. 81) found that all three dimensions were significantly and negatively correlated and of similar magnitude. He felt that work values tended to be "mutually exclusive." In contrast, the Spence study revealed that social and organizational work values were positively related whereas there was a negative relationship between social and professional work values. There was also a negative relationship between organizational and professional work values (Spence, 1977).

The Conflict Assessment Questionnaire was used to determine the amount of perceived conflict within the building. One hundred eighty-eight teachers were used for this portion of the study, 95 elementary teachers and 93 secondary teachers. As in the TPI, personal information was contained on each questionnaire: age, sex, number of years teaching in the building, and content area.

The Conflict Assessment Questionnaire consisted of a five-point Likert-type scale for each statement. Five points were scored for a response of "serious conflict" and one point for a response of "no conflict." A mean was calculated for each building. Building means were summed and then a mean for the entire sample was determined.

Conflict scores were further analyzed by classifying each question

into one of the following areas: desirable physical work conditions, material inducements, personal, nonmaterial opportunities, school priorities and standards, decision-sharing, student relationships, administration relationships, staff relationships, and total conflict. An analysis was calculated in these areas to determine a possible conflict pattern within the school.

The assumptions about the parent population for the analysis contained in this study were: the sample was randomly drawn from normal populations with equal variances σ^2 and they are independent. Further, it is assumed that the score X_{ij} can be thought of in terms of the following linear model: $X_{ij} = \mu_j + e_{ij}$, where μ_j is the mean of the j th group, μ_j is the average of the j population,

μ_j is the difference between the mean of the j th population,

μ_j , and μ_j , and

e_{ij} is the difference between X_{ij} and μ_j , the mean of the j th population (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973).

The statistical procedure selected for the evaluation dependent variable mean differences was analysis of variance. This technique utilized as the basis for its comparison the following:

$$SS_y = SS_{\text{between}} + SS_{\text{within}}$$

$$\text{where } SS_y = \sum_j \sum_i (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y})^2$$

$$SS_{\text{between}} = \sum_j j (\bar{Y}_j - \bar{Y})^2$$

$$SS_{\text{within}} = \sum_j \sum_i (\bar{Y}_{ji} - Y_j)^2$$

Mean differences determined through the analysis of variance procedure were evaluated for statistical significance by an "F" test. This

test utilized as its mathematical basis the following (Nie et al., 1973, pp. 400-401).

$$F = \frac{SS_A / (K-1)}{SS \text{ error } (N-k)} = \frac{MS_A}{MS \text{ error}}$$

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

The primary focus of this study was to determine if the level of conflict within a school was related to the teachers' work values and the school's organizational structure. In determining this, three instruments were used: The Teacher Preference Inventory, to measure work values; the School Organizational Survey, to measure the type of organizational structure; and the Conflict Assessment Questionnaire, to measure conflict.

Bureaucratic structure and work values were the independent variables and conflict was the dependent variable. Teachers within the buildings were randomly picked to participate in the study. They were given one of the three questionnaires. Upon tabulation, buildings were determined as having high or low conflict and a work values profile was constructed indicating if the building was predominately oriented toward social, organizational, professional or mixed work values. Finally, a determination was made as to whether the building's organizational structure was primarily bureaucratic, collegial, authoritarian or chaotic.

In order to test the hypotheses, several steps were necessary. A comparison of the levels of conflict was conducted with schools having similar bureaucratic structures but differing work values. A second step compared schools with different organizational structures irrespective of work values. One-way analysis of variance procedures were used to test the hypotheses and examine the variables for significant differences. In addition, Pearson Product-Moment correlations were employed to