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

8021776

JONES, N. FREEMAN, JR.

THE EFFECTS OF RACE ON THE PRINCIPAL'S SOURCES OF POWER: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro ED.D. 1980

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs _____
2. Colored illustrations _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓ throughout _____
7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
9. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author _____
10. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows _____
11. Poor carbon copy _____
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type _____
13. Appendix pages are poor copy _____
14. Original copy with light type _____
15. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
16. Other _____

University Microfilms International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

THE EFFECTS OF RACE ON THE PRINCIPAL'S SOURCES OF POWER: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

by

N. Freeman Jones, Jr.

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1980

Approved by

Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser _____

Oral Examination
Committee Members _____

_____

_____

_____

3-17-80
Date of Examination

JONES, N. FREEMAN, JR. The Effects of Race on the Principal's Sources of Power: A Comparative Study. (1980) Directed by: Dr. Roland H. Nelson, Jr. Pp. 136.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in the case of Brown vs. Board of Education that the doctrine of separate but equal schools for black and white students was unconstitutional. The Court also mandated that the states practicing this doctrine would have to formulate and execute plans to desegregate their schools with "all deliberate speed."

The decision of the Court had divergent effects on the white and black citizens in southern and border states. In most white communities in the South, the decision was perceived as an infringement on state's rights. Many white citizens vowed to maintain separate facilities for black and white students at any cost.

Conversely, the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court was perceived by black Americans as the second Emancipation Proclamation. The level of expectations of black citizens throughout the United States was elevated by the Court's decision. To black Americans, declaring segregation in public schools unconstitutional was a step in the direction of full participation in the mainstream of the American way of life.

Just as the 1954 decision had divergent effects on black and white citizens, the decision also precipitated unintended

as well as intended consequences. The major intent of Brown vs. Board of Education was to terminate de jure segregation in the South. To some extent, this intent of the decision was accomplished. The state laws requiring separate educational facilities for black and white students were declared unconstitutional. Moreover, the subsequent passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Elementary-Secondary Education Act served as a catalyst to the process of school desegregation in the South.

However, the unintended consequences of the Court's decision included the adverse effects that the process of school desegregation had on black principals who served in the system of black education during the era of "separate but equal" educational facilities for black and white citizens. Following the Supreme Court decision of 1954, many black principals in southern states lost their jobs. One of the reasons given for the dismissal of black principals was that white teachers would not respect the sources of power of black administrators. This assertion was an assumption that needed to be subjected to empirical study. Being cognizant of the fact that the paucity of research in this area was a cause of the plight of black principals in school systems that decided to initiate desegregation programs, the writer decided to undertake this study.

The literature suggested that the principal draws his sources of power from positional authority, expertise, and

charisma. In order to determine how black and white teachers perceived the sources of power of black principals, a sample was taken of 107 public school teachers, who responded to a questionnaire that was designed to determine which source of power had the greatest influence on the teachers' behavior.

The major findings of the study indicated that white and black teachers have similar as well as dissimilar perceptions of the black principal's sources of power. According to the findings, the following similarities prevailed between the perceptions of black and white teachers:

1. Both black and white teachers were influenced more by the positional authority of the black principal than by his charisma.

2. Both black and white teachers were influenced more by the black principal's expertise than by his charisma.

The findings also showed the following dissimilarity in the perceptions of black and white teachers:

> White teachers were influenced more by the black principal's positional authority than by his expertise, whereas black teachers were influenced more by the black principal's expertise than by his positional authority.

This study was limited to the seven schools in the selected administrative units that had black principals and racially mixed faculties. The schools selected for the study were located in four administrative units in the Piedmont section of North Carolina.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer acknowledges with great appreciation the suggestions, encouragement, and assitance given to him by his committee chairman, Dr. Roland H. Nelson, Jr., and the other members of the committee: Dr. Dale L. Brubaker, Dr. Dwight Clark, Dr. William Noland, and Dr. Joseph C. Himes from whom invaluable guidance was received in the preparation of this manuscript.

The writer expresses his appreciation to his wife Connie for her encouragement and patience. The writer is also indebted to his daughter, Carol, who was a faithful typist and a major source of inspiration.

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to each person who contributed to and assisted in the preparation of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
Structure and Characteristics of Organization	27
Influence	38
Authority	42
Power	51
Sources of Power	53
Sources of Power Available to Leaders	57
Summary	62
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	63
Statement of the Problem	64
Statement of Hypotheses	64
Hypotheses	65
Place and Time of Study	65
Sample	67
Collection of Data	73
The Instrument	74
Treatment of Data	77
IV. FINDINGS	84
Influence of Positional Authority in the Formal Organization	85
Summary	92
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	95
Summary	95
Conclusions	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

CHAPTER V (continued)

Implications. 107
Recommendations for Further Research. . . 110

BIBLIOGRAPHY 112

APPENDIX A INSTRUMENT 121

APPENDIX B REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT 131

APPENDIX C PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT 133

APPENDIX D t-TEST SCORES. 135

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Perceptions of Bases of Authority in an Elementary School.	59
2	Number of Schools and Teachers by Race	68
3	Number and Percentage of Questionnaires Returned by Race.	69
4	Number and Percentage of Respondents by Age. . . .	71
5	Respondents by Years of Teaching Experience. . . .	71
6	Respondents Grouped by Years of Teaching at Present School	72
7	Number and Percentage of Teachers' Responses to Main Sources of the Principal's Authority . . .	85
8	Number and Percentage of Teachers' Responses by Race to the Main Sources of the Principal's Authority	87
9	Number and Percentage of Teachers' Responses by Age to the Sources of Power	91
10	Percentage of Minority Students and Teachers in Selected States.	109

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historically, more black college graduates in the South have entered the field of education than any other profession. Their preference for working in education was based on the fact that "Negro Education" offered the largest job market for black college graduates. Moreover, the "Negro Education" provided blacks an opportunity for advancement within the system of education. Blacks could become principals and supervisors of black teachers in the local district. In North Carolina, black educators could advance to the staff of the State Department of Education. At this level in the educational hierarchy, they had state and regional supervision over black personnel and programs in the black schools.[1]

In the system of "Negro Education," the black principal was a very important individual to the white community as well as the black community. Frequently, the black principal represented the main source of leadership in the black community, and usually served as the primary channel of communication between black and white communities.

Perhaps the greatest impact of the black principal was upon the students he or she served. The black principal was one of the outstanding role models for young black Americans.

---

[1] J. C. James, "The Black Principal: Another Vanishing American," The New Republic, September 26, 1970, p. 18.

As a role model, the black principal exemplified to black youth that through education, success could be achieved. Owen Kiernan, in his opening statement before the Select Committee on Educational Opportunity noted that black educational leaders provided a much needed image for black children and youth who were in desperate need of appropriate inspiration and example.[2]

Today, many black educational leaders are no longer in positions to set examples or participate in the decision-making process involving education. The desegregation of public education has resulted in many black educational administrators being dismissed, transferred, or reassigned to positions of lesser importance.[3] According to James, "as fast as schools are desegregated, black principals are eliminated."[4]

The trend in public education in the South has been to eliminate black principals while the process of desegregation is implemented. In a survey conducted by J. W. Mask and presented to the Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, it was reported that in 1963-64, the total number of black principals and supervisors in North Carolina was 904. In 1970-71, the total number of black principals and

---

[2]U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. Part 10--Displacement and Present Status of Black School Principals in Desegregated School Districts, Hearings Before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Senate, 92nd Congress 1st Session, 1971, p. 4905.

[3]Ibid.

[4]James, "The Black Principal," p. 10.

supervisors was 159.[5]

To illustrate the plight of black principals created by school desegregation, correspondents for Southern Education Report surveyed the 17 southern and border states in order to obtain data regarding the number of black principals administering desegregated schools in 1967. Although statistics and specific examples were difficult to obtain, the following conclusions were drawn:

(a) The number of black principals in most states surveyed was declining steadily.

(b) New opportunities for blacks to advance to principalships were scarce.

(c) The trend that was being established in 1967 suggested that complete desegregation of all schools in the South would make the black principal as rare as the one-room school.[6]

Despite the apparent trend to eliminate black principals during the process of desegregation, black leadership is still needed in public schools.

Roye supported this contention in the following statement:

> At no time in history have principals been more important nor have good ones been in such short supply. Never has it been more important to have qualififed representation strongly present in this key rank in the education hierarchy.[7]

---

[5]U.S., Congress, Senate, Select Committ on Equal Educational Opportunity, Displacement and Present Status of Black School Principals in Desegregated School Districts, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 1971, p. 5298.

[6]John Egerton, "When Desegregation Comes, the Negro Principals Go," Southern Education Report 3 (December 1967):9.

[7]Wendell J. Roye, "Black Principals: Vanishing Americans or Out-Flanked Agents?" The National Center for Research and Information on Equal Opportunity, Tipsheet No. 7, February, 1972, p. 1.

Ethridge supported the need for black leadership in education in a letter to Senator Mondale, Chairman of the Select Committee on Educational Opportunity. Ethridge noted that the white child's need for role models in desegregated schools was not nearly as acute as the black child's need for role models. Ethridge further noted that the white child has many models whereas the role models for the black child are limited.[8]

Although the desegregation of public education has increased, the black leader is threatened with extinction. The implications of this extinction are startlingly grave for black leadership capability in future years. Indeed, the future of black leadership in desegregated schools seems to be in a precarious state. The continued decline in the number of black principals in school districts that have desegregated their schools to comply with federal mandates is a significant development that merits attention.

This trend may be illustrated in the experiences of the black administrators who survived the desegregation process in four school districts in the Piedmont section of North Carolina. The school districts constitute a cross section of city and rural areas in the state.

Prior to 1969, there were nine blacks serving in administrative or supervisory positions in the four school districts included in the study. An analysis of the positions

---

[8]U.S. Congress, Displacement and Present Status of Black Principals, p. 4945.

held by those blacks is as follows:

1. Unit A had one high school principal and three elementary principals.

2. Unit B had one union school principal, grades 1-12.

3. Unit C had one union school principal, grades 1-12.

4. Unit D had three elementary school principals.

In addition to the above principalships by blacks in the four school districts, one black supervisor served all four districts.

The desegregation of the schools in the four districts resulted in the following changes of black administrative and supervisory personnel:

1. All formerly black high schools were changed to either junior high or elementary schools;

2. One elementary school was closed and the principal of the school was "promoted" to supervisor of audio-visual materials for the district;

3. One elementary principal was replaced by a white principal and appointed to the position of science teacher in the middle school; and

4. The black supervisory position was phased out when the black supervisor retired.

The seven black principals who survived the desegregation process were the foci of the study.[9] The investigator's interest was in the attitudes of teachers in schools in which the black principals were leaders.

In order to assess the impact of this trend upon educational leadership in a southern community, a study of black

---

[9] The investigator, although a principal in the county, excluded himself from this study in order not to bias the findings.

principals in the four school districts mentioned above was undertaken. The purposes of the study were to determine the following:

(1) What effect, if any, did the race of the principal have on the attitudes of black and white teachers in the desegregated schools; and,

(2) Do black and white teachers have different perceptions of the sources of power available to black principals in public schools.

Personal observations and a review of the relevant literature suggested that there were three salient characteristics of power. These factors are positional authority, charisma, and expertise. The focus of the study was to test the significance of the principal's race on the sources of power.

Significance of the Study

Since the 1954 decision by the Supreme Court, the Nation's schools have been delegated responsibility for racial desegregation. The proceedings of the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth presented further testimony of this commitment, During the conference, attention was focused on the problem of human relations, and ways for removing racial barriers from education, employment, religion, housing, suffrage, and community activities. Further testimony on the school's responsibility for racial desegregation is supported by Thompson's contention that "the crisis in American society and culture" stems from the 1954 United States

Supreme Court decision.[10]

The Supreme Court decision of 1954 should have increased the need for black leaders in public schools instead of initiating the trend to decrease the number of blacks when the desegregation of schools became inevitable. A position paper prepared by the Recruitment and Leadership Training Institute concluded that:

> If the conditions of minorities are to change in this country, many more minority educational administrators must be included in the decision-making process regarding matters that relate to minority students.[11]

The assumption of superintendents and boards of education that white teachers and students would not respect blacks who occupied positions of authority in public schools needed to be subjected to empirical research.

As cited in Chapter 2 of this study, sociologists and educational administrators have conducted studies on the relationship of expertise, charisma, and positional authority in formal organizations. However, the underlying assumption of these works has been that the incumbent of the authority position would be white. Consequently, there is a need for research which placed in juxtaposition the sources of power and the black incumbent.

---

[10] Daniel A. Thompson, The Role of Leadership in School Desegregation, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED064432 (November, 1971), p. 2.

[11] Recruitment and Leadership Training Institute, "Minorities in Policy-Making Positions in Public Education," (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1974), p. 41.

The public schools of the United States are confronting tremendous challenges. They must find means by which they can become instruments of change in racial attitudes. This study, which investigates the relationship between the principal's race and the attitudes of teachers, finds its justification within the more general commitment that the schools must undertake in helping to improve race relations in society.

Definition of Terms

Race. For the purpose of this study, race will have only two designations: black and white. Although this dichotomy is not ethnologically pure, it has real sociological meaning in the United States.

Formal Organization. This term will include any organization which possesses the following: (1) specialization, (2) a well defined hierarchy, (3) a system of rules covering the rights and duties of positional incumbents, (4) a system of procedures for dealing with work situations, (5) impersonality of interpersonal relations, and (6) promotion and selection for employment based on technical competence.[12]

Power. This term is defined as control over others. It reflects the degree to which an individual or group affects the action of others.[13]

---

[12] Richard Hall, "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment," American Journal of Sociology (July, 1963): 33.

[13] Dale L. Brubaker and Roland H. Nelson, Introduction to Educational Decision-Making, (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1972), p. 21.

Authority. For the purpose of this study, authority is the legal right of an individual to influence the actions of others.[14]

Positional Authority. This term is defined as the legitimate right of an individual to control the actions of others because of the formal position that he or she holds in a formal organization.

Charisma. In this study, this term is defined as a source of power based on the ability of an individual to control the actions of another or others because the individual is perceived by others to be a desirable model for their own actions and is one whose company they enjoy.

Expertise. This term is defined as a source of power based on the ability of an individual to control the actions of another or others because the individual is perceived to possess high levels of knowledge or skill in particular areas of subject matter or performance.

---

[14]Ibid.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The plight of the black principal in the South began when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in the case of Brown vs. Board of Education that the "separate but equal" doctrine established in the case of Plessy vs. Ferguson was unconstitutional.[1] The Court concluded that in the field of education the doctrine of "separate but equal" had no place; and that separate educational facilities for blacks were inherently unequal.[2] In addition to declaring de jure segregation in education unconstitutional, the Courts enjoined states operating dual school systems to establish unitary systems to serve all races.

Initially, the Brown decision had little if any effect on the desegregation of the schools in the South. During the three-year interim following May 17, 1954, no black children were admitted to any traditional white schools in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, or North Carolina.[3]

---

[1]George Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 419.

[2]Harry A. Ploski and Roscoe C. Brown, eds., The Negro Almanac (New York: Bellwether, 1967), p. 22.

[3]W. D. Workman, "The Deep South," in With All Deliberate Speed, ed. Don Shoemaker (New York: Harper and Bros., 1957), p. 88.

The slow pace of desegregation in the South was primarily caused by the Supreme Court's standard for implementation of the desegregation process. The Court required a "good faith" start in the transformation from a dual to a unitary system. The key words involved in making the transition from segregation to desegregation were "with all deliberate speed." The Court also permitted limited delays in achieving complete desegregation if a school board could "establish that such time is necessary in the public interest."[4]

Southern states took advantage of the mechanism for the delay of desegregation provided by the doctrine of "with all deliberate speed." Throughout most of the South, a fierce and concerted resistance to desegregation was sustained. The efforts to delay desegregation included open defiance of the law, passage of numerous state antidesegregation laws, adoption of complicated pupil assignment and freedom-of-choice policies, and the closing of public schools.

These tactics proved effective in delaying the process of desegregation in public schools in the South. In 1964-65 only 1.2 percent of the black students in the eleven Southern states attended schools with whites.[5]

Instead of complying with the mandate of the Court to end segregated school systems "with all deliberate speed," some southern school officials expended energy and money to

---

[4]U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, Twenty Years after Brown, 1974, p. 31.

[5]Ibid., p. 33.

circumvent the Court's mandate. In some states, programs to construct new facilities for blacks were begun in an effort to bring black schools into substantial physical equality with schools for whites. Roy Reed reported that "at the time of the Supreme Court decision, and even before, school districts across the Deep South had begun to spend millions of dollars building new Negro schools. The building boom was a frank admission that Negro schools were separate but not equal."[6]

Ostensibly, the major priority of white leaders in the South during the period immediately following May 17, 1954 was the avoidance of desegregation. Sarrate noted this priority in the following illustration:

> When Luther H. Foster, president of Tuskegee Institute, appeared before the Alabama Legislature to make his appropriation request, John H. Pinson, a former senator, supported Foster. Pinson advised the House Ways and Means Committee, "If you don't want integration at the University, then you had better continue this appropriation."[7]

Although the illustration just cited referred to higher education, it was applicable to public schools and indicated the extent to which many white leaders were willing to go to preclude the process of desegregation.

Initially, the reaction to the Brown decision enhanced the status of the black system of education. In many school

---

[6]Roy Reed, "Rights Act Forces School Equality," in The Great Contemporary Issues: Education, U.S.A. ed. James Cass (New York: New York Times, 1977), p. 233.

[7]Reed Sarrate, The Ordeal of Desegregation (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 136-137.

systems, white school officials provided black teachers and principals with equipment and supplies that had been previously denied them. This trend continued for approximately a decade after the 1954 Court decision. However, the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 had a significant effect on the tactics that white school officials had been utilizing to delay desegregation. When it became apparent that the desegregation of schools in the South was inevitable, the preferential treatment that blacks had been receiving to appease them was terminated.

The Civil Rights Act was subdivided into eleven titles, which were the following:

Title I--Voting

Title II--Public Accommodations

Title III--Public Facilities

Title IV--Public Schools

Title V--Civil Rights Commission

Title VI--Federal Aid

Title VII--Employment

Title VIII--Statistics

Title IX--Courts

Title X--Conciliatory Services

Title XI--Miscellaneous[8]

---

[8]Ploski and Brown, eds., The Negro Almanac, p. 112.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided impetus to the desegregation process through Titles IV and VI. Title IV authorized the federal government to provide technical and financial aid to all school districts engaged in the process of desegregation, provided private citizens were not in a position to do so.[9]

Title VI guaranteed that no person shall be subject to any form of racial discrimination in any program which is receiving federal financial aid. It also empowered federal agencies to take appropriate steps to counteract any such discrimination, particularly by denying federal funds to any state or local agencies which practiced discrimination.[10]

The enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) served notice to southern and border states of the intention of the federal government to assume direct responsibility for providing all children, particularly the disadvantaged, with quality education. The five key provisions of the Act can be summarized as follows:

Title I--Opportunity for the Disadvantaged

Title II--School Library and Institutional Resources

Title III--Supplementary Education Centers

Title IV--Educational Research

Title V--Strengthening State Educational Agencies

Title I of ESEA provided for the promotion of racial integration in the public schools of the United States. Title I

---

[9]Ibid., p. 113. [10]Ibid.

also made funds available to school districts under state plans approved by the U.S. Office of Education. To illustrate the effectiveness of ESEA, during the first year of the program, Congress appropriated 775 million dollars to individual states.[11]

After the passage of the Civil Rights Act with its Title VI provision for administrative enforcement, the rate of desegregation in the schools increased because school officials wanted to avoid the termination of federal funds provided by the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) and ESEA. Following the enactment of the Civil Rights Act, the plan used by most southern states to desegregate schools and remain in compliance with regulations was freedom-of-choice. Under the guidance of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), freedom-of-choice provided a student the opportunity to select and attend any school in his attendance district.

In order to accelerate the desegregation process, the HEW guidelines required that school districts desegregate at least four grades by September, 1965. In 1966, the guidelines were amended to include specific percentages of desegregation for measuring plan effectiveness.[12] The Title VI guidelines of the Civil Rights Act were changed in 1968. This change stated that if the freedom-of-choice plan did not eliminate

---

[11]Ibid., p. 510.

[12]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, General Statement of Policies under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. "Racial Desegregation of Elementary and Secondary Schools," 1968.

the vestiges of a dual school system, additional steps would be necessary to complete the desegregation of its schools, including the use of geographic attendance zones, reorganization of grade structures, school closings, consolidations, and construction.[13]

Despite the guidelines developed at the federal level, resistance to desegregation remained a problem. However, in an April, 1968 memorandum to chief state school officers, HEW directed that, where freedom-of-choice plans had not effectively eliminated dual school systems, the system should adopt plans that would accomplish this task. This memorandum supported the March, 1968 guidelines in stating that complete desegregation should not be delayed beyond the 1969-70 school year.[14]

Although freedom-of-choice plans remained in effect after the 1969-70 school year, it is evident that with the use of guidelines and threatened or actual cut-off of federal funds, desegregation in the South increased for five years after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.[15]

The desegregation of public schools in the South created both intended and unintended results. The intention of the Supreme Court decision in the case of Brown vs. Board of

---

[13]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Policies On Elementary and Secondary School Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964," 1968.

[14]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Twenty Years After Brown, 1974, p. 36.

[15]Ibid.

Education was to eliminate a dual school system. The intended consequence of the Court's decision was partially accomplished by the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 since the desegregation of public schools in the South did increase appreciably. However, the transition from a dual school system to a unitary school system has produced a number of spin-offs that have been detrimental to black teachers and principals.

Prior to 1969, a general trend that had begun in the border states was followed by southern states in order to comply with the 1954 Supreme Court decision and subsequent legal decisions. According to Palmer, the following trends developed:

1. Former black schools were phased out.
2. Black students were transferred to traditionally white schools.
3. Black teachers and administrators were either fired, demoted or "promoted" to ineffective positions in the school district.[16]

The termination of de jure segregation in the public schools in the South was, in essence, the beginning of the demise of black teachers and principals who had served in the system of black education. But further desegregation of public education resulted in many black principals being dismissed, transferred, or reassigned to positions of lesser importance.

---

[16]E. B. Palmer, "Outergration," North Carolina Teachers Record 38 (January, 1968): 9.

noted that "as fast as schools are desegregated, black principals are eliminated."[17]

Desegregation and the consolidation of schools within school districts increased the decline and disappearance of black principals in almost every southern and border state. As previously cited, correspondents for Southern Education Report surveyed the 17 southern and border states in order to obtain data regarding the number of black principals administering desegregated schools in 1967. Although statistics and specific examples were difficult to obtain, the following conclusions were drawn:

(a) The number of black principals in most of the states surveyed was declining steadily.

(b) New opportunities for blacks to advance to principalships were scarce.

(c) The trend that was being established in 1967 suggested that complete desegregation of all schools in the South would make the black principal as rare as the one-room school.[18]

The trend of displacing black principals was established in the border states which began the process of desegregation shortly after the Supreme Court decision of 1954. In 1965, when a National Education Association task force examined the 17 southern and border states, it discovered that the closing

---

[17]J. C. James, "The Black Principal: Another Vanishing American," The New Republic, September 26, 1970 , p. 19.

[18]John Egerton, "When Desegregation Comes, The Negro Principals Go," Southern Education Report 3 (December 1967):9.

of formerly all-black schools and the firing of black principals, a pattern that had characterized parts of Kentucky, Missouri, and Oklahoma in the mid-1950's was evident in counties of Arkansas, Texas, Tennessee, and North Carolina.[19] Later in the decade of the 1960's, the trend of displacing black black principals because of desegregation was accelerated.

The greatest impact on the status of black principals in the South occurred in 1969. In that year, southern and border states were required to show vast improvement in the desegregation of schools or suffer the consequence of losing large sums of federal money. In order to comply with the 1969 federal guidelines, school systems initiated plans to increase the amount of desegregation in the schools.

This requirement forced southern and border states to produce the results intended by the federal government; however, the increase in desegregation precipitated a decrease in the number of black principals in the states affected by the guidelines.

In his testimony before the Select Committee, Banks noted that the following trends developed when school districts desegregated schools on a large scale:

---

[19] U.S., Congress, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Displacement and Present Status of Black Principals in Desegregated School Districts, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 1971, p. 5346.

1. Black high school principals were transferred to elementary or junior high school principalships.

2. Black principals were removed entirely from policy-making positions.

3. Many black principals were reassigned to the classroom.

4. Some black principals were given pseudo-promotions to the central office.[20]

The following data illustrate the deleterious effects of large-scale desegregation on the status of black principals in some southern states:

(a)	Maryland:	In 1954 there were 211 high school principals, 44 of whom were black. By 1968, the number of white principals increased from 167 to 280, but the number of black principals decreased from 44 to 31.
(b)	Kentucky:	In 1954, Kentucky had approximately 350 black principals. As of the school year 1969-70, the number had decreased to 36.
(c)	Arkansas:	The number of black secondary principals was reduced from 134 to 14 between 1964 and 1971.
(d)	Florida:	A report of HEW stated that 49 school districts in Florida had eliminated 57 black principals while adding 56 white principals.
(e)	Louisiana:	A report of HEW stated that between 1968 and 1970, Louisiana eliminated 68 black principals.
(f)	South Carolina:	The number of black high school principals was reduced from 144 to 33 between 1965 and 1970.
(g)	Tennessee:	The number of black high school principals was reduced from 72 to 17.

---

[20] Ibid.

(h) Texas: A study in East Texas stated that: "Resistance to the prospect of black principals superivising white teachers remains firmly entrenched in southern white communities. As a result, black educators are being dismissed, removed, or phased out."

(i) Virginia: In 1965, 29 percent of all secondary principals were black. However, in 1970, only 6.5 percent of Virginia's secondary principals were black.

(j) Alabama: In 1967, there were approximately 250 principals in Alabama. In 1970, the number had been reduced to 50, a decrease of 80 percent.[21]

The situation in North Carolina, the general focus of this study, was as follows: In 1963, there were 227 black high school principals. In 1970, there were only eight black principals serving in high schools. This decrease of over 95 percent represents the most dramatic reduction of black administrators in all southern and border states.[22]

According to E. B. Palmer, of the North Carolina Association of Educators, during the five-year period from 1966-67 to 1970-71, the total number of black principals in North Carolina schools was reduced from 620 to fewer than 170.[23]

---

[21] John Smith and Betty Smith, "For Black Educators: Integration Brings the Axe," The Urban Review, May, 1973, p. 7.

[22] Robert Hooker, Displacement of Black Teachers in Eleven Southern States (Nashville, Tenn.: Race Relations Information Center, 1970), p. 4.

[23] Ibid.

Samuel B. Ethridge, Director of National Education Association's Teachers' Rights Program noted that "prejudiced school boards have been mainly responsible for the sharp decline in black principalships in the 17 southern and border states."[24]

He reported that the total number of black principals in the 17 southern and border states had decreased from an estimated total of more than 5,000 in 1954 to about 3,000 in 1972.

Ethridge further noted that Arkansas, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Texas had displaced 55 to 65 percent of their black principals.

A projected loss of 40 to 45 percent of black principals was attributed to Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Delaware, Florida, and Tennessee.

The factors that caused the decline in the number of black principals when schools were desegregated were varied. However, the consensus among most superintendents and boards of education was that white students, teachers, and citizens would not accept and respect black leadership. White school officials anticipated resistance to the prospect of black principals supervising white teachers and black teachers instructing white students.

Another factor that aided in the displacement of black educational leaders was the assumption that expertise of black

---

[24]"Decline in Principalships Laid to Prejudiced Boards," Richmond Afro-American, August 1975, p. 14.

leaders was not commensurate with the expertise of white educational leaders. A. Craig Phillips allegedly supported this contention during his tenure as superintendent of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school district. In an article in Nation's Schools, the following statement is attributed to Phillips by Cohodes:

> We've got to admit the quality of instruction is going to be different with Negro teachers in the South even when the same dollars are spent for textbooks and for facilities. The average Negro teacher is not as well qualified as the average white teacher.[25]

Similar statements regarding the disparity between the qualifications of black and white teachers were also the contention of many white school officials regarding the qualifications of black and white principals. However, Phillips and other school officials failed to consider the fact that the competition in the system of black education was so intense that most black teachers had baccalaureate degrees and standard teaching certificates. It was not uncommon to find black teachers in the public school system with master's degrees and advanced certificates. Because of the lack of job opportunities for black college graduates, they could not resort to the maxim that was vogue among white college graduates: "When all else fails, try teaching." Teaching was a first resort for most black college graduates.

In order to obtain a principal's certificate, most states required that an individual earn a master's degree from

---

[25]Aaron Cohodes, "How School Districts are Desegregating," Nation's Schools, 72 (February, 1964):43.

an accredited college or university. Since de jure segregation precluded the enrollment of blacks in historically white colleges with graduate programs and since most predominantly black schools did not have graduate programs in educational administration and supervision, many blacks who desired to earn advanced degrees enrolled in predominantly white institutions of higher education located in northern cities. So in many instances, the qualifications of black principals were comparable to and, in some cases, surpassed the qualifications of white principals.

In the school districts in which this study was conducted in 1972, all the black teachers had at least a baccalaureate degree, some had master's degrees, and all had North Carolina "A" Certificates. However, there were a number of white teachers who had substandard certificates and some did not have baccalaureate degrees. All the black principals in the districts had advanced degrees and held North Carolina principal's certificates; but some of the white principals did not have advanced degrees or North Carolina principal's certificates.

The decline in the number of black principals has had a serious impact on the desegregation of our public schools. According to Dr. Owen Kiernan, the Executive Secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals:

> There are substantial grounds for concluding that the desegregation of public schools accompanied by the parallel process of school consolidation has brought

> about and continues to result in a marked decrease in the number of black principals in almost every Southern state. The problem of elimination, displacement, and demotion of Negro public school principals, supervisors, and administrators as a result of ongoing desegregation of schools has reached such serious proportions that it requires the intervention of the Federal Government using its full force and power to bring it to an end.[26]

According to Dr. Benjamin Epstein who also testified before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity:

> When a school is desegregated and must serve black and white students alike, the powers-that-be who make decisive determinations as to the staffing of such schools, apparently try to make sure that white students will not have to be under the authority of a black principal.[27]

Despite the apparent decision of superintendents and boards of education to eliminate black principals because of desegregation, the need for principals was as vital in desegregated schools as it was in segregated schools. In the following statement, Roye supported this contention:

> At no time in history have principals have been more important, nor have good ones been in such short supply. Never has it been more important to have qualified minority representation strongly present in this key rank in the education hierarchy.[28]

Ethridge noted that the white child's need for role models in desegregated schools was not nearly as acute as the

---

[26]U.S. Congress, Displacement and Present Status of Black School Principals, p. 4904.

[27]Ibid., p. 4906.

[28]Wendell J. Roye, "Black Principals: Vanishing Amercans or Out-Flanked Agents?" The National Center for Research and Information Equal Opportunity, Tipsheet No. 7, February, 1972, p. 1.

black child's needs for role models.[29] Ethridge further declared that: "unless something is done to reshape the attitudes of superintendents and boards of education toward Negro administrators, we are going to lose a lot of the talent and leadership that we already have."[30]

Dr. Herbert Wey perceived the detriment of dismissing black principals during the process of desegregation from a different vantage point. Dr. Wey warned that:

> Negro professionals are becoming alarmed to see their chances for promotion and advancement vanish as desegregation moves ahead. We must have programs to recruit topnotch Negro prospects, train them, and place them in our schools. If we don't, there is going to be more and more resistance to desegregation from Negro educators.[31]

Schools are basically formal organizations. Since formal organizations are designed to provide leaders in the organizations with sources of power necessary to achieve the goals of the organization, a review of the literature related to the components of formal organizations is a significant aspect of the study.

The purpose of the following discussion is to present literature and research relevant to the following areas: (a) the structure and characteristics of organizations: (b) influence systems in formal organizations, and (c) sources

---

[29]U.S. Congress, Displacement and Present Status of Black School Principals, p. 4945.

[30]John Egerton, "When Desegregation Comes, The Negro Principals Go," Southern Education Report 3 (December 1967): 12.

[31]Ibid.

of power available to leaders in organizations.

Structure and Characteristics of Organizations

Most organizations have some type of structure that coordinates the work of people for the purpose of achieving the goals of the organization. According to Swingle, the organization represents both a set of goals and the resources to achieve those goals.[32] Since people are one of the major resources of an organization, organizational structure and the people therein are the basic elements of the organization.

Knezevich noted that all organizations are characterized by the following factors: (a) goals, (b) structure, (c) a social system of people, (d) a communications network, (e) cultural and environmental contraints, (f) service functions, (g) and a dynamic life cycle.[33]

Kast and Rosenweig concluded that organizations are: (a) goal-oriented, people with a purpose; (b) psycho-social systems, people working in groups; (c) technological systems, people using knowledge and techniques; and (d) an integration of structured activities, people working together.[34]

---

[32]Paul G. Swingle, The Management of Power (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erbaum Associates, 1976), p. 138.

[33]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 54-55.

[34]Fremont E. Kast and James E. Rosenzweig, Organization and Management: A Systems Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p. 60.

In addition to the aforementioned components of organizations, Kast and Rosenzweig posited that an organization can be thought of as a merger of two components: (1) the group as a set of persons, and (2) the structure as a set of positions.[35] Naturally, when numbers are added or deleted, the group will change. However, regardless of the changes in the group, the structure remains the same because the positions do not change when the personnel are adjusted.

The structure of an organization establishes the framework for the relationships that will or should exist between the various components of the organization. Hower and Lorsch defined the structure of an organization as: (1) the pattern of formal relationships and duties the organization charts plus job descriptions or position guides and (2) formal rules, operating policies, work procedures, control procedures, compensation arrangements, and similar devices adopted by management to guide employee behavior in certain ways within the structure of formal relationships.[36]

The structure of an organization is defined by Kast and Rosenzweig as the established pattern of relationships among the components or parts of the organization.[37] Albeit

---

[35]Ibid., p. 278.

[36]Ralph M. Hower and Jay W. Lorsch, "Organizational Inputs" in Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior, ed. John Seiler (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1967), p. 157.

[37]Kast and Rosenzweig, Organization and Management, p. 170.

the structure of an organization represents the substance that holds the elements of the organization together, the substance is an abstraction that cannot be qualified. In actuality, the structure of an organization can only be inferred from the operation and behavior of the organization.

Every organization has a structure that must be kept in balance and adapted to goals. The structural pattern defines relations among persons and groups within the organization. The structure is demonstrated as a bureaucracy or hierarchy of positions.[38]

From a traditional point of view, the organization's structure was designed to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. The authority and responsibility of accomplishing the goals of the organization were incumbent in the positions in the structure, not the individuals who occupied those positions. The traditionalists considered the structure to be the vital aspect of the organization.

Organizational structure continues to be a vital component of formal organizations. In order to understand the value of structure to formal organizations, it is imperative to determine the difference between formal organizations and social organizations.

Formal organizations contain characteristics that distinguish them from social organizations in several ways.

---

[38]Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, p. 55.

According to Blau and Scott, social organizations refer to the ways in which human conduct becomes socially organized, that is, to the observed regularities in the behavior of people that are due to the social conditions in which they find themselves rather than their physiological or psychological characteristics as individuals.[39]

The major focus of social organizations is to orchestrate human behavior from a social vantage point. Blau and Scott also noted that the two important facets of social organizations are: (1) the structure of social relation in a group of a large collectivity of people, and (2) the shared beliefs and orientations that unite the members of the collectivity.[40]

Social organization is a generic concept referring to the fact of order and control in the conduct of human affairs. Formal organization is a specialized type of social organization that is designed to achieve specific or limited goals. Traditionally, formal organization is perceived as being characterized by the following principles:

(a) Task Specialization--assumes that a limitation of work duties will promote the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization.

(b) Chain of Command--coordinates the activities of the components of the

---

[39] Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962), p. 2.

[40] Ibid.

organization by providing leaders. The principle assumes that a hierarchy of authority will enable individuals at the top of the hierarchy to control the behavior of individuals at bottom of the hierarchy. In order for the individuals at the top of the hierarchy to control the behavior of those at the bottom effectively, they are assigned formal power to hire, discharge, reward, and penalize the individuals in order to mold their behavior in the pattern of organizational objectives.

(c) Unity of Direction--assumes that organizational efficiency is improved when each facet of the organization works to achieve a common goal that is planned and directed by the leader or leaders.

(d) Span of Control--assumes that leadership efficiency is increased by controlling the number of subordinates that the leader has to supervise.[41]

A perusal of the principles of formal organizations reveals their merit. When used prudently, the principles are useful in giving the organization direction during the initial stages of development; they help

---

[41]Chris Argyris, "The Individual and Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment," in Educational Administration: Selected Readings, ed. Walter G. Hock et al., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), pp. 166-170.

to coordinate the relationships between the systems within the organization; and they help to establish lines of authority within the organization.

According to Briner and Iannaccone, the formal organization in schools or school systems, unlike friendship groups which exist to provide psychological satisfaction to members, is the most effective known way of coordinating the behavior of many individuals to achieve the societal goal of educating children. The authors further stated that the formal organization influences the behaviors of its members putatively, at least according to criteria of efficiency and effectiveness in task accomplishment.[42]

The literature related to organizational structure suggests that the formal organization has some of the basic characteristics of Max Weber's bureaucracy.

To many individuals, bureaucracy has a negative connotation. However, the model as developed by Weber did not include the deleterious traits that are attributed to it.

According to Presthus, the following characteristics accurately depict a bureaucracy:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictional areas, regularly ordered by rules, policies, regulations, and by-laws.

---

[42]Conrad Briner and Lawrence Iannaccone, "Selected Social Power Relationships in Education," in Educational Administration: Selected Reading, ed. Walter B. Hack et al., p. 144.

2. Principles of hierarchy and levels of graded authority that ensure a firmly ordered system of super- and subordination in which higher offices supervise lower ones.
3. Administration based upon written documents.
4. Administration by full-time, trained officials.
5. Administration by stable and comprehensive general policies.[43]

The aforementioned characteristics of bureaucracy tend to dispute the allegations that the bureaucratic model represents a morass of red tape and a high degree of inefficiency. According to Max Weber, the bureaucratic model represents the most efficient approach to large-scale administration.[44]

When bureaucracy is perceived in the manner in which Weber intended, it represents an efficacious way to ensure the attainment of organizational goals.

Hall suggested that the degree of bureaucratization of an organization can be determined by measuring the following characteristics:

1. A division of labor based upon functional specialization.
2. A well-defined hierarchy of authority.

---

[43]Robert Presthus, The Organizational Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), p. 5.

[44]Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 337.

3. A system of rules covering the rights and duties of positional incumbents.
4. A system of procedures for dealing with work situations.
5. Impersonality of interpersonal relations.
6. Promotion and selection for employment based upon technical competence.[45]

The characteristics enumerated by Hall indicate that bureaucracy is coterminous with the general concept of the structure of formal organizations. Blau and Scott contend that if bureaucratization is defined as the amount of effort devoted to maintaining the organization rather than to directly achieving its objectives, all formal organizations have at least a minimum of bureaucracy.[46]

The discussion regarding organizational structure and its relation to formal organizations and bureaucracies is relevant to this review of the literature. The comments help to provide insights into the organizational structure of public schools in the United States.

Brubaker and Nelson noted that public schools are arranged bureaucratically because schools adhere to the following tenets of the bureaucratic organization:

---

[45] Richard H. Hall, "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment," American Journal of Sociology, July, 1963 , p. 33.

[46] Blau and Scott, Formal Organizations, p. 8.

1. Bureaucracies provide for disciplined compliances with rules, regulations, and directives from superiors.
2. The hierarchical organization of a bureaucracy provides clear lines of authority and responsibility so that individuals can readily be held accountable for their actions.
3. Bureaucracy seems best suited to organizations whose ends are discreet and measurable, whose objectives are clear and generally agreed on, and whose casual relationships between means and ends are readily demonstrable.[47]

When the characteristics of bureaucracies and formal organizations are juxtaposed with public schools, it becomes apparent that schools are inherently formal organizations with bureaucratic orientations. The hierarchical organization of public schools gives the board of education the right to formulate policies, the superintendent the authority to enforce policy within the individual school, and teachers the authority to enforce policy in the classroom.

Sergiovanni and Carver concluded that although the public school is similar to the bureaucratic model in many ways, it has its own unique characteristics:

(a) The school is a professionally oriented organization. That is, school members are concerned

---

[47]Dale L. Brubaker and Roland H. Nelson, Creative Survival in Educational Bureaucracies (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974), pp. 64-65.

with the achievement of manifest goals--the education of children and youth--and are, by and large, professionals as opposed to skilled, semi-skilled, or unskilled workers.

(b) The school's clients, the students, typically do not have a choice in determining the services they receive from school.

(c) The amount of financial support a school receives is generally more related to local wealth and number of students than to how well the school accomplishes its goals.

(d) Schools suffer from goal ambiguity. Although the stated goal of school is "to provide learning experience for children and youth," the means by which it is to be accomplished are not universally agreed upon.

(e) The dual system of students, client organizational members, places the school organization in an unusual, if not unique, situation. That is, if parents are perceived as the societal element to satisfy, the students are second-order clients. If on the other hand, students are perceived as the target groups for education, then they are first-order, and their parents are second-order citizens.[48]

---

[48]Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carter, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1974), pp. 135-136.

The work order of most writers in the field of educational administration supports the premise that the public school possesses both bureaucratic characteristics and a well defined organizational structure. Since schools and other organizations exist for the purpose of achieving goals, the way organizations arrange role relationships to achieve their goals determines, to a great extent, the structure of the organization.

The structure of the formal organization has a great impact on the authority system that moves the organization toward its goals. According to Kast and Rosenzweig, there is a direct relationship between organizational structure and the pattern of authority within an organization. Since organizational structure focuses on the establishment of positions and the relationships between positions, it provides the framework for authority relationships. The authors further noted that the structure and the positioning of participants in a hierarchical arrangement facilitate the exercise of authority.[49]

Since one of the major characteristics of formal organizations is a system of authority based on role or position rather than the individual who occupies the position, it is necessary to examine the literature that deals with the relationship of influence, authority, and power in formal organizations.

---

[49] Kast and Rosenzweig, Organization and Management, p. 175.

Influence is generally perceived as the ability of an individual to control or direct the behavior of other people. Influence is usually used in association with power and authority. Some authors consider all three terms to be synonymous, whereas some authors view the terms as separate entities. It is the conclusion of this writer that in order to understand the authority structure of formal organizations in general and public schools in particular, a distinction should be made between definitions of influence, authority, and power. Blau and Scott supported this position by noting that authority must be distinguished from other forms of social influence--from power, on the other hand, and from persuasion and other kinds of social influence on the other.[50]

Brubaker and Nelson also concur with the writer's conclusion that a distinction should be made between influence, authority, and power. Whereas power is defined as control over others, authority is viewed as the legitimate right--as determined by the formal organization--to control the actions of others, while influence is of a less legal or formal nature.[51]

Influence

In order to influence the behavior of another person, the "influencer" usually controls the "influencee" through

---

[50] Blau and Scott, Formal Organization, p. 27.

[51] Brubaker and Nelson, Creative Survival, p. 24.

an appeal to the influencee's hierarchy of needs. The statement implies that the process of influence places the onus on the influencer as well as on the influencee.

According to Hampton and his associates, people respond to influence for six fundamental reasons: (a) fear, (b) tradition, (c) blind faith, (d) rational faith, (e) rational agreement and (f) self-determination.[52]

Influence by fear is probably the most common way to control the behavior of individuals. When fear is employed, the influencer is not concerned about the influencee's understanding the reason for the directive or whether the influencee agrees with the directive. The paramount concern is that the influencee carries out the directive of the influencer.

Influence by tradition is also a common approach to controlling human behavior. Influence by tradition probably starts as influence by fear, and perhaps has the implicit recognition of the power of authority; however, the response becomes institutionalized and inculcated into the class structure and ideology of the society. An individual usually responds to another individual because of respect or because there is a custom to be followed.

---

[52]David R. Hampton, Charles E. Summer, and Ross A. Webber, Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management, (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973), p. 143.

Hampton, Summer, and Webber noted that in the traditional system the follower responds to the leader's position. In the army, the officer is identified by his uniform and his insignia. One obeys the order, regardless of the characteristics of the person giving the order, because the position is respected. Whether the officer is tall or short, fat or thin, black or white, is irrelevant; the follower responds to the position.[53]

Influence by blind faith involves followers responding to leaders who have charisma. The charismatic leader is an individual who has characteristics that followers admire. Followers are influenced by the charismatic leader because of strong emotional attachment, even love for the leader in whom they have blind faith. "The relationship is personal rather than general because charisma is not simply an attribute of the leader but the fit between his characteristics and the follower's needs."[54]

In the process of influence by rational faith, followers respond to the directives of the leader on the basis of evidence that the leader has knowledge and ability. The followers believe the leader knows what he is talking about.

---

[53]Ibid., p. 148.

[54]Ibid., p. 150.

Influence by rational agreement and influence by rational faith are parallel in concept. Influence by rational faith occurs when followers believe the leader is knowledgeable, and they have confidence in what he is doing. In influence by rational agreement, the leader involves the followers in the decision-making process. By persuading the followers to concur with his point of view, the leader pays the followers a compliment by implying that they have the intelligence to understand what is being decided and that their opinions are respected.

Hampton, Summer, and Webber noted that when the follower has participated in determining what is to be done, he should understand and agree that a certain course of action is necessary and proper. Influence by self-determination gives the follower an opportunity to exercise some power, to express his thoughts, and to exemplify his abilities. An opportunity to participate in the decision-making process usually produces voluntary implementation of decisions.[55]

As noted above, there are a variety of ways that a leader may influence the behavior of followers. A review of these influence methods reveals that there are advantages and disadvantages incorporated in each method. It is also interesting to note that one method of influence may not be more efficacious than another. This statement was supported by those authors who concluded that each influence system has

---

[55]Ibid., p. 153.

a drawback: (a) fear is offensive to many, and it can be expensive to maintain the necessary police mechanism; (b) tradition may be ineffective because of declining respect for positional authority; (c) faith suffers from the drawback that people who can generate this emotional response are rare.[56]

Authority

Max Weber wrote extensively on organizational structure, authority, and power. The work of Weber has greatly influenced the work of subsequent organizational theorists.

Weber defined authority as "the probability that certain specific commands or all commands from a given source will be obeyed by a given group of persons."[57] The essence of authority is that edicts issued by persons in certain positions in the formal organization are voluntarily obeyed. The willingness of the group to obey the directives of the position holder is based on the fact that the members of the group perceive it legitimate for the position holder to influence their actions.

Simon notes that in an authority relation the subordinate "holds in abeyance his own critical faculties for

---

[56]Ibid., p. 154.

[57]Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons; ed. Talcott Parsons (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1946), p. 324.

choosing between alternatives and uses the formal criterion of the receipt of a command or a signal as his basis for choice."[58]

From the work of authorities in the fields of sociology and educational administration, it can be concluded that basic criteria of authority are voluntary compliance with legitimate command, and suspension of personal judgment in advance of command.

It is often difficult to determine if the criteria are being met in an authority relation. When a situation develops in which one person forces another to carry out a directive, the question is often raised--does the first person have authority over the other person?

According to Blau and Scott, in order for social control to develop into authority, another social condition must prevail. This condition provides a final and basic criterion for authority. The condition in question is that a value orientation must develop that defines the exercise of social control as legitimate, and this orientation can only arise in a group context.[59]

---

[58]Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, 2nd ed. (New York: MacMillan, 1947), pp. 126-217.

[59]Blau and Scott, Formal Organization, pp. 28-29.

Authority is not based on the compliance of a single individual with the directives of another individual. Authority is based on the concept that members of the group will enforce compliance with orders of the superior as part of their enforcement of conformity to group norms.

The group's demand that orders of the superior be obeyed makes such obedience partly independent of his coercive power or persuasive influence over the individual subordinates and thus transforms these other kinds of social control into authority.[60]

Authority relations can develop only in a group or larger collectivity and not in isolated pairs, because only group values can legitimate the exercise of social control and only group norms can serve as an independent basis for enforcing the pattern of compliance.[61]

According to Weber, there are three types of authority: (a) traditional authority, (b) charismatic authority, and (c) legal authority.[62]

Traditionally, authority is legitimated by the sacred approach to adhering to the ways of the past. In traditional authority, the person controlling the behavior usually acquires this status by heredity. The followers are obligated to the leader by traditional feelings of loyalty.

---

[60]Ibid., p. 29. [61]Ibid.

[62]Max Weber, Theory, pp. 324-386.

Charismatic authority is legitimated in the belief that the leader is inspired by divine or supernatural powers. Charismatic authority usually serves as a source of change from traditional authority.

Legal authority is legitimated by a belief in the supremacy of the law. In legal authority, obedience is not owed to a person; obedience is owed to the position occupied by the person.

Of all types of authority identified by Weber, the writer perceived legal authority as the foundation of the formal organization. This contention is supported by Brubaker and Nelson who note that authority is the legitimate right, as determined by the formal organization, to control actions of others.[63]

Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson identify the following types of authority relations: (a) authority of confidence; (b) authority of sanctions; and (c) authority of legitimacy.[64] In relationships of authority of confidence, subordinates in the organization accept the proposal of the superior because the subordinates believe in the competence and reputation of the superior. The subordinates have confidence in the expertise of the superior and are willing to carry out his directions

---

[63]Brubaker and Nelson, Creative Survival, p. 24.

[64]Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson, "Authority: Its Nature and Motives," in Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management, eds. David R. Hampton, Charles E. Summer, and Ross A. Webber (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973), p. 172.

because they are confident that the superior knows what he is doing.

Authority of sanctions is generally the most recognized weapon of the superior in a formal organization. The authority of sanctions gives the superior the ability to impose unpleasant consequences on subordinates in order to control their behavior.

The most important authority relationship in formal organizations is authority of legitimacy. In this authority relationship, subordinates accept the proposals of the superior because they feel they ought to go along with the "rules of the game."[65]

When people enter organizations, they are apprised of the rules and regulations controlling the operation of the organization. These rules and regulations prescribe the working procedures of the organization by defining how the work will be done, how problems will be solved, who will make proposals, and who will accept and execute proposals. Acceptance of the working procedures of an organization by a member includes acceptance of the obligation to go along with the proposals of a hierarchical superior.[66]

Sergiovanni and Carter define authority as the potential capacity to effect movement toward goal achievement.[67]

---

[65]Ibid. [66]Ibid.

[67]Sergiovanni and Carter, The New School Executive, p. 154.

According to the authors, the most important function of an organization is the fulfillment of prescribed goals; further, the attainment of organizational goals is through the authority structure of the organization.

Sergiovanni and Carter classify the sources of authority as follows: (1) role and person-based authority; (2) formal and functional authority; and (3) bases of social power. The authors place special emphasis on the sources of authority in public schools. According to the authors, school administrators achieve role dimension by being placed in a school role which has ascribed or delegated authority. Since the public school has bureaucratic characteristics which include a hierarchy of authority, the degree of authority that a position holder has is dependent upon his place in the hierarchy. The authority is conferred independent of the individual. Therefore, school administrators are able to direct subordinates in their activities, in part, due to their position and attendant status. Subordinates comply with the edicts of the administrator because "he is boss."[68]

The person-based authority of an administrator is related to personality, training experience, and personal appearance.[69] According to person-based authority, the ability of an administrator to influence the behavior of a subordinate is somewhat related to the personal dimensions of the administrator.

---

[68]Ibid., p. 156. [69]Ibid.

According to Peabody, formal authority bases are comprised of legitimacy, positions, and the sanctions inherent in the office or position. Conversely, functional authority is comprised of professional competence, experience, and human relation skills which support or compete with formal authority.[70]

When the components of formal authority and functional authority are analyzed, four bases of authority are differentiated. According to Peabody, each of these has potential authority to effect movement toward goal achievement:

I. Formal Authority

A. Authority of legitimacy--accruing from acceptance by subordinates of legally constituted order.

B. Authority of position--accruing from position and its inherent sanctions and rewards.

II. Functional Authority

A. Authority of competence--accruing from knowledge and skill gained through training or experience.

B. Authority of person--accruing from personal

---

[70] Robert L. Peabody, "Perceptions of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly 6 (March, 1962):466-467.

characteristics of mystique.[71]

Barnard defines authority as the character of a communication (order) in a formal organization by virtue of which it is accepted by a contributor to 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 so far as the organization is concerned.[72]

According to Barnard, authority involves two aspects: first, the subjective, the personal, the accepting of a communication as authoritive; and second, the objective aspect, the character in the communication by virtue of which it is accepted.

Based on the definition and the two aspects of authority, Barnard concluded that a person can and will accept a communication as authoritative only when four conditions are simultaneously obtained:

(a) the person can and does understand the communication;

(b) at the time of his decision, the person believes that it is not inconsistent with the purpose of the organization;

(c) at the time of his decision, the person believes it to be compatible with his personal interest

---

[71]Ibid.

[72]Chester I. Barnard, "Theory of Authority," in Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management, ed. David R. Hampton, Charles E. Summer, and Ross A. Webber (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973), p. 486.

as a whole; and

(d) the person is able mentally and physically to comply with it.[73]

In order for a person to comply with an order or communication, he must understand what is intended. If the communication is incoherent, it stands to reason that it will have no authority.

If a communication is perceived by a recipient to violate the purpose of the organization, it will not be likely to be accepted. For example, the kindergarten teacher who is ordered to teach her students complicated math skills would be frustrated and would deny the authority because it contradicts the purpose of the kindergarten program as she understands it.

If a communication or order is perceived by a person in the organization as a burden that destroys the advantage of being associated with the organization, the authority of the communication would probably be ignored.

If a subordinate is ordered to do something that he is incapable of doing, obviously the order would not have authority because the subordinate would be unable to comply with the other. For example, to order a teacher who has no expertise in music to function as a director of instrumental music is an exercise in futility.

---

[73] Ibid., pp. 486-487.

Power

Power is seldom completely absent from social interaction; however, when it is used it ceases to be power but is transformed to other concepts. This transformation will be discussed subsequently. The first emphasis of this review will be to determine what power is.

Weber defines power as "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance."[74] Weber's definition emphasizes an important aspect of power and thus in a power relationship, subordinates do not react to the superior on a voluntary basis; power requires that subordinates adhere to the directives of the superior whether they desire to or not.

Brubaker and Nelson define power as "control over others."[75] This definition of power also denotes the absence of options for the followers. The definition implies that the superior is in complete control of followers' actions.

In order to give a lucid understanding of power, Bierstedt defines power in relation to force and authority. The author notes that power is neither force nor authority. However, he offers the following definitions: (1) power is

---

[74] Weber, Theory, p. 152.

[75] Dale L. Brubaker and Roland H. Nelson, Jr., Introduction to Educational Decision-Making (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1972), p. 21.

latent force; (2) force is manifest power; and (3) authority is institutionalized power.[76] The definition of power as latent force denotes that power itself is an abstraction. We never see power itself; we only see the results of power. When power is manifested, it becomes force. Power is not the actual application of force, it is the ability to employ force. Moreover, power is not authority; but behind all authority there is power.[77]

According to Bierstedt, only groups which have power can threaten to use force and the threat itself is power. Power is the ability to employ force, not its actual employment; the ability to apply sanctions, not their actual application. Power is the ability to introduce force into a social situation; it is the presentation of force. Unlike force, power is always successful; when it is not successful it is not, or ceases to be power. Power symbolizes the force which may be applied in any social situation and supports the authority which is applied.[78]

The term "power" is derived from the same word as "potential." Bierstadt notes that power is always potential;

---

[76]Robert Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power," American Sociological Review, 15 (December, 1950):733.

[77]Daniel E. Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956), p. 96.

[78]Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power," p. 733.

that is, when power is used it becomes something else, either force or authority.[79] Discussing power from the point of view of potential is an approach that writers other than Bierstedt have employed. Lippitt and associates stated that power can be differentiated into the following units: (a) the potentiality, (b) for inducing forces, (c) in other persons, (d) toward acting or changing in a given direction.[80]

The juxtaposition of power with potential is an effective approach to clarifying the concept of power. When power is discussed in terms of potential, one can envision that power cannot be seen in action, only the results or effects of power can be seen. Power itself is a potential; when it is activated it becomes force or authority.

Sources of Power

The literature relative to the sources of power is diverse. Bierstadt contends that power stems from three sources: (1) number of people, (2) social organization, and (3) resources.[81] Bierstedt predicates his conclusion on the premise that majorities have a residual source of social power; when majorities or minorities are organized and disciplined

---

[79] Ibid., p. 736.

[80] Ronald Lippitt, Norman Polansky, Fritz Rede, and Sidney Rosen, "The Dynamics of Power," in Group Dynamics, eds. Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson, 1953), p. 463.

[81] Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power," p. 737.

they form a formidable source of power. He refers to many kinds of resources--namely, money, property, prestige, knowledge, competence, deceit, fraud, secrecy, and all of the things usually included under the term "natural resources." Bierstedt notes that resources can serve to tip the balance when the other sources of power are relatively equal and comparable and concludes that resources are insignificant unless they are used by people who are in organized association with one another.[82]

French and Raven identify and define the following sources or bases of power: (1) reward power; (2) coercive power; (3) legitimate power; (4) referent power; and (5) expert power.[83] Reward power is based on the perception by the individual that the agent can mediate rewards for him; (2) coercive power is based on the individual's perception that the agent has the ability to mediate punishments for him; (3) legitimate power is based on the perception by the individual that the agent has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior for him; (4) referent power is based on the individual's identification with the agent; and (5) expert power is based on the individual's perception that the agent has some special knowledge or expertness.[84]

---

[82] Ibid., p. 737.

[83] John R. P. French and Bertram H. Raven, "Legitimate Power, Coercive Power, and Observability in Social Influence," Sociometry 21 (June 1958):83-97.

[84] Ibid.

The sources of power as enumerated by Brubaker and Nelson coincide with the work of French and Raven; however, Brubaker and Nelson condense the five sources of power identified by French and Raven into three sources. According to Brubaker and Nelson, the three sources of power are: (1) positional authority, (2) expertise, and (3) charisma.[85] They define positional authority as the legal right of an individual or group to control the actions of others because of the position held in an organization. The kind and degree of authority are actually assigned to the "position" and are controlled by the organization. The subordinates in the organization, by virtue of organization codification, owe their allegiance to the position primarily, and not to the incumbent of the position.

Expertise, the second source of power, accrues to an individual or group because of expert knowledge that the individual or group is perceived by other members of the organization to possess.

The third source of power is charisma, which becomes a source of power when an individual is able to exploit his charm and attract followers on the basis of camaraderie or esprit de corps.

Of the three sources of power cited by Brubaker and Nelson, positional authority is the source that encompasses the legal right of an individual to impose sanctions or rewards

---

[85]Brubaker and Nelson, Introduction to Educational Decision-Making, pp. 21-22.

on other members of the organization.

Although charisma and expertise are recognized as important variables in the hierarchical structure of formal organizations, positional authority is considered by many authorities to be the most significant source of power available to leaders in formal organizations. Weber perceived legal authority as a fundamental building block of the classical bureaucracy.[86]

The development of administrative positions in public schools tends to give insight into the sources of power available to educational administrators. The fact that authority resides in the school executive's position rather than the teacher's position is due in part to the circumstances under which public schools developed in American society.[87]

The first public schools in the United States were established by town legislatures. In these schools, the teacher was endowed with the authority to control the actions of the students; however, the major decision-making regarding the schools was the responsibility of the town selectmen.

As the number of schools increased and states began to devote more attention to the operation of schools, the authority of the town selectmen was transferred to a professional educator, the headmaster. Originally, the position of headmaster was a part-time undertaking that included

---

[86]Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, p. 337.

[87]Sergiovanni and Carter, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration, p. 154.

teaching. However, as more administrative responsibilities were added, teaching responsibilities decreased, and the principalship as we know it today evolved.

As noted in Chapter I, sociologists and educational administrators have conducted numerous empirical studies that deal with the sources of power in formal organizations. Some of the pertinent studies are included in the subsequent discussion.

Sources of Power Available to Leaders

When considering the sources of power available to leaders in organizations, Peabody's concept of authority bases and his empirical studies provide interesting and insightful data. According to Peabody, the sources of authority available to leaders are:

1. Authority of legitimacy--accruing from acceptance by subordinates of legally constituted order.
2. Authority of position--accruing from position and its inherent sanctions and rewards.
3. Authority of competence--accruing from knowledge and skill gained through training or experience.

4. Authority of person--accruing form personal characteristics or mystique.[88]

Peabody conducted an empirical study that focused on determining which authority base (i.e., legitimacy, position, competency, or person) operated to influence the behavior of workers in a county welfare department, a police department, and an elementary school.

The study was developed by conducting an exploratory interview of subjects from each organization. The questions asked the subjects were designed to discover what authority bases were exerting the greatest amount of influence.

The findings of the study support the authority bases developed by Peabody. For example, only four percent of the welfare workers and six percent of the policemen indicated a perceived base of authority different from bases of legitimacy, position, competence, and person. Moreover, no teacher in the study perceived an authority base other than one of the four identified by Peabody.

The responses of the teachers included in this study are very interesting. These responses are shown in Table 1. It is important to note that 60 percent of the teachers were influenced by position; 45 percent by competence; 35 percent by legitimacy and only 15 percent by person.

---

[88]Robert L. Peabody, "Perceptions of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6 (March 1962): 467.

TABLE 1

PERCEPTIONS OF BASES OF AUTHORITY

IN AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Bases of Authority	Percent of Teachers Reporting (N=20)
Authority of legitimacy	35
Authority of position	60
Authority of competence	45
Authority of person	15

Source: Adapted from Table 2, "Perceptions of the Bases of Authority in Three Public Service Organizations," in Robert L. Peabody, "Perceptions of Organization Authority: A Comparative Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly 6 (March, 1962):477.

It could be concluded from Peabody's study that certain of the personal traits that some authorities have considered to be vital to educational administration are perceived by teachers as competencies rather than personal attributes.

As previously noted, French and Raven identified five bases of power available to leaders. These bases of power are reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert.[89]

The bases of power identified by French and Raven have been used by several authorities as the variables for conducting empirical studies designed to determine the most important source of power in organizations.

Bachman, Bowers, and Marcus used the work of French and Raven to compare the responses of subordinates in 36 branch offices of a national sales firm; 12 liberal arts colleges; 40 life insurance agencies; 40 electrical appliance manufacturing firms; and 21 work groups in a utility company to determine why the subordinates concurred with the directives of their supervisors.

Respondents were requested to rank the importance of the following alternatives:

1. Legitimate power: "He has a legitimate right to expect his suggestions will be carried out."
2. Expert power: "I will respect his competence and

---

[89] John R. P. French, Jr., and Bertram H. Raven, "The Bases of Social Power," in Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, eds. Dorwin Carwright and Alvin Zander (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 259-269.

good judgment about things in which he is more experienced than I."

3. Referent power: "I admire him for his personal qualities and want to act in a way that merits his respect and admiration."
4. Reward power: "He can give special help and benefits to those who cooperate with him."
5. Coercive power: "He can apply pressure to penalize those who do not cooperate."[90]

The results of the investigation revealed that in every instance either legitimate or expert bases were the two most important reasons given by subordinates for complying with the request of their supervisors. It is also interesting to note that subordinates in four of the five organizations ranked coercive power as the least important.

Hornstein and others conducted a study that utilized the source of power developed by French and Raven and the statements designed by Bachman, Bowers, and Marcus.[91] The subjects used in Hornstein's study were public school teachers. The findings of Hornstein indicated that teachers prefer the use of expert power over the other types, and that the reliance

---

[90]Jerald G. Bachman, David G. Bowers, and Phillip M. Marcus, "Bases of Supervisory Power: A Comparative Study in Five Organization Settings," in Arnold Tannenbaum, Control in Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), pp. 229-238.

[91]Harvey A. Hornstein, D. M. Callahan, E. Fisch, and B. A. Benedict, "Influence and Satisfaction in Organizations: A Replication," Sociology of Education 41 (Fall, 1969): 380-389.

on expert power was associated with the following: (1) more favorable educations of the school system, (2) greater satisfaction with the principal, and (3) a tendency to perceive students to be more satisfied with their teachers.

Summary

It was shown that the racial desegregation of public schools not only reduced the number of black principals and other officials; it also fundamentally altered the administrative situation of the black principals who survived the change. They had to operate in administrative situations which were both formally structured and racially mixed. It was widely believed, especially in the South, that black principals were less competent than whites and that white teachers would not respond to the authority inherent in the office of principal when filled by blacks. This study undertook to ascertain whether such beliefs were correct or not.

A review of the pertinent literature indicated that, whether white or black, the principal's school authority emanated from three principal sources: his official position, his professional expertise, and his personal charisma. The literature indicated that of these three, the main source of the principal's power is from the legality and legitimacy of his official position. These findings provided a theoretical basis for the definition of the problem for research and the hypothetical judgements that are reported in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The desegregation of public schools in the South precipitated the trend of dismissing black principals on a large scale. The reason for the development of this trend was based on the assumption that white teachers would react adversely to the authority of black principals.

Because de jure segregation had mandated the separation of the races, and because blacks in the South had traditionally been relegated to subordinate roles in society, school officials surmised that blacks would be inefficacious leaders in racially mixed schools. The review of the literature indicated that in formal organizations, the authority of the leader is incumbent in the position and not in the person who occupies the position. The literature also indicated that the structure of the formal organization is designed to insure that the rights and responsibilities of position holders are respected by subordinates in the organization.

Although the findings reported above regarding leadership in formal organizations have been known and generally accepted by authorities in the fields of sociology and educational administration, apparently, these concepts were not considered applicable to black leaders. For these and other

reasons, the writer decided to investigate the following problem.

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated in this study can be stated in the following question:

> Do black and white teachers have different perceptions of the sources of power available to black principals in desegregated public schools? That is, will the three sources of power available to black principals (position, charisma, and expertise) affect black and white teachers similarly or differently?

Statement of Hypotheses

It is apparent from the review of the literature that most authorities agree that the structure of formal organizations is designed to give the leaders in the organization the legal right to influence the behavior of the subordinates in the organization. The literature also indicated that most authorities concur with the theory that the major sources of power available to leaders in formal organizations are positional authority, expertise, and charisma.

Since public schools are inherently formal organizations, the subsequent hypotheses were foci of the study. For purposes of data analysis, these hypotheses were stated in the null form, i.e., when the data demonstrate that the hypothesis is not confirmed, then the affirmative statement of the proposition has been supported. This was an operational device and did not affect the meaning of the data and analysis presented in the next chapter.

Hypotheses

1. The attitudes of white teachers will not be more significantly influenced by the black principal's charisma than by the principal's positional authority.

2. The attitudes of black teachers will not be more significantly influenced by the black principal's charisma than by the principal's positional authority.

3. The attitudes of white teachers will not be more significantly influenced by the black principal's expertise than by the principal's positional authority.

4. The attitudes of black teachers will not be more significantly influenced by the black principal's expertise than by the principal's positional authority.

5. The attitudes of white teachers will not be more significantly influenced by the black principal's charisma than by the principal's expertise.

6. The attitudes of black teachers will not be more significantly influenced by the black principal's expertise than by the principal's charisma.

Place and Time of Study

The study was conducted in four school districts in the Piedmont section of North Carolina. Although the four school districts were located in the same county, each district functioned independently of the others. That is, each district had its own board of education, superintendent, and central office personnel.

The study was conducted during the school year of 1973-74. The time of the study was three years after each school district had initiated full-scale desegregation plans for

teachers and students in 1969. Prior to 1969, only a token number of black students and teachers were located in traditionally white schools.

During school year 1967-68, the districts included in the study provided the following schools for black students:

District A

(a) One high school: grades nine to twelve.
(b) One elementary school: grades one to eight.
(c) One elementary school: grades one to six.

District B

(a) Three elementary schools: grades one to eight.

District B did not maintain a high school for black students. These high school students were bussed to the traditional high school for black students in District A.

District C

(a) One union school: grades one to twelve.

District D

(a) One union school: grades one to twelve.

Each of the schools listed above was administered by a black principal. In addition to these principals, one black supervisor was employed to serve all the traditionally black schools in the four districts.

In 1969, the four districts included in the study formulated and implemented full-scale desegregation plans in all schools. This brought about the following changes in the organization of the traditionally black schools and the employment of black administrative personnel.

District A

(a) The black high school was converted to a desegregated junior high school; and the black principal was appointed to the position of assistant principal of the desegregated senior high school which had been historically white.

(b) One elementary school was desegregated; and the black principal maintained his position in the school.

(c) One elementary school was closed; and the black principal was appointed to the position of supervisor of audio visual materials for the district.

District B

(a) Two of the traditionally black schools were desegregated; and the black principals maintained their positions in the schools.

(b) The parents of one elementary school voted to become affiliated with District A. After the school was desegregated, a white principal replaced the black principal who was appointed to a teaching position in the Middle School.

District C

(a) The union school was converted to a desegregated junior high; and the black principal was retained to administer the newly organized school.

District D

(a) The union school was changed to a desegregated elementary school and the black principal maintained his administrative position.

Sample

The sample for the study consisted of the educators from four school districts in the Piedmont section of North Carolina. The foci of the study were the seven black principals who survived the process of desegregation, and the 147 black and white teachers who comprised the faculties of the seven schools.

The types of schools included in the study were one senior high school, two junior high schools, and four elementary schools. Questionnaires were sent to all the teachers in these seven schools. Table 2 indicates the number of black and white teachers in each type of school to whom questionnaires were sent.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS BY RACE

Type of School	No. of Schools	No. of Black Teachers	No. of White Teachers	Total
Elementary	4	13	38	51
Junior High	2	14	25	39
Senior High	1	16	41	57
Total	7	43	104	147

The table show that although there were four elementary schools (57 percent) included in the study, the number of teachers in the four schools was only 51 (35 percent). Although the junior and senior high schools represented 43 percent of the schools, the number of junior and senior high teachers was 96 (65 percent). It should be noted that when the study was conducted there were a number of unused classrooms in the elementary schools. It was generally argued

that this condition was created by the reluctance of school officials to equalize the students and teachers assigned to schools administered by black and white principals.

Of the 147 persons to whom questionnaires were sent, 104 were white and 43 were black. It will be seen that the black teachers were almost equally distributed in the three categories of schools. About equal numbers of white teachers were found in senior high schools and elementary schools. However, fewer white teachers were engaged in junior high schools than in either of the other type.

Not all the teachers who received questionnaires returned them completed. Table 3 shows that 107, or 73 percent of the 147 teachers returned useable questionnaire forms. These 107 teachers, then, actually constituted the sample for this study. Of the 43 black teachers, 32 or 74 percent completed and returned the questionnaires. Among the white teachers, 75 or 72 percent of those receiving questionnaires filled them out and returned them. It was judged that this rate of return was satisfactory.

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF QUESTIONNAIRES

RETURNED BY RACE

Race	Number Issued	Number Returned	Percentage Returned
Black	43	32	74
White	104	75	72
Total	147	107	73

Failure to return useable questionnaires resulted from several circumstances. Fearing the possibility of reprisal, criticism, or the like, several persons refused to participate in the survey. Some other individuals simply failed to complete and return the questionnaires. The investigator received some questionnaires that were incompletely or incorrectly filled out. These had to be discarded. On the whole, the school officials and teaching personnel were supprotive and cooperated satisfactorily with the investigation.

Most of the teachers in this sample, 61.6 percent, were in the middle years, between 26 and 45. These data are revealed in Table 4 which describes the sample by age in relation to color. This table showed that one teacher was under 21 years of age. On the other hand, 21 teachers, or 19.6 percent of the sample were over 45 years of age. Only one individual in this category was over 60 years old. With a sample like this, in the prime of life, it would seem reasonable to expect thoughtful judgments and evaluations regarding the authority of black principals in racially desegregated school situations.

Two tables examined the teaching experiences of the persons in this sample. Table 5 indicated that the range of experience extended from less than a full year to 35 years. The mean number of years of teaching experience was 10.5 years. From an inspection of Table 5 it was seen that 46, or 43.0 percent of the teachers had 0 to 6 years of teaching experience. This was the largest single category and indicated that these

TABLE 4

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Ages	Number	Percentage
Below 21	1	.9
21-25	19	17.8
26-35	33	30.8
36-45	33	30.8
46 and above	21	19.6
TOTAL	107	100.0

TABLE 5

RESPONDENTS BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	Number of Teachers	Percentage
0-6	46	43.0
7-14	26	24.3
15-21	24	22.4
22-35	11	10.3
TOTAL	107	100.0

teachers were relatively new in this profession. When related to Table 4, it was evident that although the sample was not especially young, the respondents had come into teaching rather recently. The table also showed that 50of the respondents had teaching experience ranging from 7 to 21 years. This group was only a little larger than those with limited experience. Only 11 individuals had more than 21 years of school experience.

Another view of teaching experiences was shown in the figures in Table 6. It was seen that over three quarters 76.6 percent of the teachers had been at their present schools 5 years or fewer. Slightly less than a fourth of them had been teaching at their present school for more than 5 years. No teacher had been at his present school location longer than 20 years. The mean number of years at present school was 4.8 years.

TABLE 6

RESPONDENTS GROUPED BY YEARS OF TEACHING AT PRESENT SCHOOL

Years at Present School	No. of Teachers	Percentage
0-5	82	76.6
6-11	16	14.9
12-20	9	8.4
TOTAL	107	100.0

Collection of Data

Although serious desegregation of the school districts included in the study was initiated in 1969, school officials of the districts were still very concerned about the possibility of racial conflicts in schools in 1973. The possibility of racial confrontation between blacks and whites touched the anxieties of the four superintendents when the researcher requested permission to use personnel from their districts as sources for collecting data for the study. As a consequence, the researcher met separately with each superintendent of the four school districts. During these meetings, the nature of the study was discussed and each superintendent was presented a copy of the questionnaire that would be used to collect the data. The researcher was granted permission to visit the schools and solicit the cooperation of the teachers and the principal. After several weeks of traveling to the selected schools and talking to the principals and teachers, the researcher was able to convince both administrators and teachers that the focus of the study was on the teachers' perception of the principal's sources of power. In May, 1973, the researcher was granted permission by the superintendents and principals to submit questionnaires to the teachers in the selected schools.

Each principal consented for the researcher to meet with his teachers during a scheduled faculty meeting. On the dates specified by the principals of the selected schools, the instruments were delivered. Although the cover letter

attached to the questionnaires gave specific directions regarding the forced-choice procedure to be used, the researcher reminded the teachers about the importance of responding to each pair of statements on the questionnaire. The teachers were also assured that no effort would be made to identify anyone who participated in the study. A teacher from each faculty included in the study was delegated the responsibility of collecting the questionnaires after the teachers had made their responses. The researcher collected the completed instruments one week after the date of delivery.

The Instrument

A search of the literature revealed that instruments designed to measure the perceptions of followers of the leader's sources of power are limited. The instrument selected for this study was developed by Whale and Brack.[1] This instrument was selected because it was designed to indicate the reasons subordinates in an organization respond affirmatively to their superiors. According to this instrument, subordinates respond affirmatively to superiors because superiors are perceived in the following ways:

(a) the superior is perceived to have the legal right to impose rewards and/or sanctions;

(b) the superior is perceived to have the legal right to make requests;

(c) the superior is perceived to possess expertise; or

(d) the superior is perceived to possess charisma.

---

[1] W. B. Whale and R. E. Brack, The Development of an Instrument to Differentiate Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Bases of Power, Educational Resources Information Center, April, 1972, p. 28.

This instrument utilizes the sources of power identified by French and Raven. According to French and Raven, the five types of power available to leaders in organizations are:

1. Reward Power--a person is perceived by others to have, and be able to give material, social, or pyschological benefit that they need or find desirable.
2. Coercive Power--a person is perceived by others to have sanctions and resources to cause them anguish or to restrict or deny highly desired privileges.
3. Legitimate Power--a person is perceived by others to exercise control of their behavior by virtue of his ascribed or achieved position.
4. Referent Power--a person is perceived by others to be a desirable model for their own behavior or is one whose company they enjoy.
5. Expert Power--a person is perceived by others to have high levels of knowledge or skill in particular areas of subject matter or performance.[2]

The questionnaire uses the sources of power listed above to provide a basis for differentiating the relationships between the person in the power position and the person subjected to the power. Power is defined as the capacity of

---

[2]John P. French, Jr., and Bertram Raven, "The Bases of Social Power," in Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, eds. Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 259.

one person to modify or control the behavior of another or others.[3]

The instrument (see Appendix A) contains sixty pairs of statements that are attributable to the different sources of power.[4] Each source of power is represented by six different statements that appear four times in the instrument, each time in a different pairing with a different source of power.

Statements for the instrument were developed to answer the question: "Why do I allow the leader in the particular situation I am experiencing influence how I do things or how I feel?" Statements were prepared that could be attributable to one or more of the five sources of power as defined above. The pairing of statements was constructed by randomly pairing each statement with each of the other sources of power.

The questionnaire was designed to differentiate the subordinate's perceptions of the superior's bases of power. To meet the objective of the instrument, Whale and Brack used a forced-choice technique. By forcing respondents to make choices between statements that were attributable to different sources of power, the instrument permitted the collection of data to determine which source of power was exercising the greatest force on respondents. It also provided data to determine the strength of each source of power in relation to each other source within any superior- subordinate relationship

---

[3]Ibid.

[4]See Appendix A.

being studied.

In addition to the sixty pairs of statements, the researcher developed an addendum to the instrument which provided the researcher with personal and professional information regarding the respondents.

The researcher procured permission from Whale and Brack to use the instrument to collect data for the study. Whale and Brack were also asked to send the researcher available data regarding the reliability and validity of the instrument.[5] Whale and Brack granted the researcher permission to use the instrument; however, as reported in Chapter 3, data regarding the reliability of the instrument were not available.[6]

Treatment of Data

The data were subjected to the computer program of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences--version 5.01. This computer program permitted the researcher to stress race as a major variable to be considered in the study. Sex was eliminated as an analytical control because only 12 (11 percent) of the subjects were male. Years of experience was revealed to be virtually irrelevant as a control because it was not significantly associated with answers about the principal's sources of power.

---

[5]See Appendix B.

[6]See Appendix C.

The instrument selected to collect the data for this study used the variables reward, coercion, legitimacy, referent, and expertise. However, the sources of power stressed in the study were positional authority, expertise, and charisma. The variable referent did not represent a problem for the researcher because this variable was a synonym for charisma. Expertise was itself. However, the variables reward, coercion, and legitimacy had to be converted to the variable positional authority. Reward, coercion, and legitimacy are components of positional authority because these variables represent the power that a leader in a formal organization possesses. That is, a leader in a formal organization has the legal right to impose the use of coercion and rewards in order to get followers to work to accomplish the goals of the organization.

As shown above, the variable positional authority includes the components reward, coercion, and legitimacy. Since the questionnaire used in the study asked the informants to respond to these components rather than to the inclusive variable, positional authority, it was necessary that the answers to these three components of positional authority be converted into a single value. The formula for making this conversion is:

$$\text{Positional Authority} = \frac{\text{Reward} + \text{Coercion} + \text{Legitimacy}}{3}$$

Mean scores for the other two variables, expertise and charisma, were computed by dividing the total number times each

of these alternatives was chosen by 107, the total number of informants.

Crude differences between teachers' preferences for the three sources of power--positional authority, expertise, and charisma--are shown in frequency tables. These differences conformed with predictions set out in the hypotheses. However, in order to ascertain whether or not these differences are statistically significant, they were subjected to the t-test.

Computation of the t-test involved several steps. First, Mean "D" Scores were produced by subtracting the mean scores of expertise and charisma from the mean score of positional authority; and by subtracting the mean score of a negative Mean Difference Score. Second, the values of the "D" variables (difference between the three main variables) and the mean scores of the three main variables were used to compute the Standard Deviations. Third, the Mean Difference Scores and the standard deviation were utilized in computing the t-test scores. It was determined that the t-test scores were significant at the .05 level when the score for whites was 1.167 and for blacks 1.70.

As stated above, one of the operations involved in testing hypotheses is the creation of a new variable which involves computing the difference between two means. According to Dowie and Heath, the testing of hypotheses involves computing the difference between two means and determining if

the difference is significant.[7]

Essentially, the procedure necessary to test a hypothesis is to create a new variable that consists of the difference between two variables of interest (e.g., Positional Authority--Expertise) and testing to determine if the difference is significant in the specified direction.

The difference variables created to test the hypotheses of this study are the following:

D1 = Positional Authority--Charisma

D2 = Positional Authority--Expertise

D3 = Charisma--Expertise

In this study, all hypotheses were tested at the alpha level of .05.

Because the size of the sample of the study was relatively small, the t-ratio was used to interpret the data. It should be noted that the place of entry on the t-ratio table is determined by the degrees of freedom (df). The degrees of freedom (df) are computed by using the statement (N-1).

In this study, (N = 75 - 1) or 74 degreees of freedom was used for the sample of white teachers. For black teachers, (N = 32 - 1) or 31 degrees of freedom was used. In order to obtain the value of t needed to reject the null hypotheses tested in the study, the t table was entered at the appropriate number of degrees of freedom for white and

---

[7]N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970), p. 167.

black teachers, 74 and 31 respectively. At the .05 level of significance, a t score greater than 1.67 was needed to reject null hypotheses 1 and 3. These hypotheses focused on the perceptions of white teachers. However, a t score greater than 1.70 was needed to reject null hypothese 2 and 4, which focused on the perceptions of black teachers included in the study.

Null hypothesis 5 focused on the responses of white teachers. Unlike null hypotheses 1 and 3, null hypothesis 5 needed a t score less that -1.67 to be rejected. Null hypothesis 6 pertained to the response of black teachers included in the study. The t score needed to reject null hypothesis 6 differed from the score needed to reject null hypothesis 2 and 4. Null hypotheses 2 and 4 needed a t-score greater than 1.67 to be rejected. However, null hypothesis 6 needed a t score greater than -1.70 to be rejected.

The study was limited to seven schools located in one geographical section of North Carolina. The reason only seven schools were included in the study was determined by the fact that only seven black principals, excluding the writer, were employed in the selected school districts.

A total of 147 questionnaires were distributed to the teachers in the seven schools. However, only 107 completed questionnaires were returned. It should be pointed out that many questionnaires were determined unusable because the repondents failed to react to all items or wrote comments such

as "not applicable" in lieu of adhering to the forced-item technique of the instrument.

The researcher requested data from Whale and Brack regarding the reliability of the instrument; however, the researcher was informed that the development of a reliability coefficient was incomplete. Although information regarding the reliability of the instrument was not made avaible to the researcher there are certain basic conclusions that are relative to reliability.

The reliability of a scale refers to how well the scale measures what it is designed to measure. Therefore, a high reliability means a low ratio of error variance to true score variance. Essentially, a researcher would like to have as low a level of error variance as possible. To some extent, the standard error of a scale will reflect the error variance, hence the reliability of the scale.

If two scales were extremely unreliable, their standard errors would be high, and the likelihood of finding a difference between them would be low. In the case of the scales used in this study, the standard or errors were low; therefore, a difference between the two scales was obtained. (The researcher concluded that since there were some significant differences between the scales, the scales used in the study were reliable.)

Since the foci of the study were the effect of the principal's race on the attitudes of black and white teachers, and

the perceptions that black and white teachers have of the black principal's sources of power, the study does not purport to determine how the subjects included in the study would have acted or reacted in actuality.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

As indicated in Chapter III, the main issue of this study concerns the sources of power of black principals in racially desegregated schools. In this chapter, we will report and interpret the major findings of the research. The data contained in the findings were obtained by administering questionnaires to teachers who worked in schools that were administered by black principals in four school districts in the Piedmont section of North Carolina.

The questionnaire used in the study was comprised of items designed to determine which source of power has the greatest influence on the behavior of teachers. From the review of the literature, it was concluded that the major sources of power available to leaders in formal organizations are positional authority, expertise, and charisma. The questionnaire that the writer used focused on these sources of power.

In this study, it was hypothesized that the sources of power available to a black principal vary in their degree of influence. That is, the principal derives more authority from his position than from expertise; and more from expertise than from charisma.

Influence of Positional Authority in the Formal Organization

The literature regarding leadership in formal organizations indicates that more authority is derived from the individual's position in the organization than from other characteristics. The focus of this study was to test this proposition in the case of black principals in racially desegregated schools.

It was argued, hypothetically, that the black principal derives more authority from his formal position than from either his expertise or charisma. Table 7 presents the reactions of all teachers included in the study to the principal's sources of authority when the race of the teachers was not a consideration. These data illustrate the collective responses of black and white teachers.

TABLE 7

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO MAIN SOURCES OF THE PRINCIPAL'S AUTHORITY

Sources of Power	No. Responses	Percentage of Responses
Positional Authority	1760	41%
Expertise	1666	39%
Charisma	873	20%
TOTAL	4299	100%

Table 7 shows that the major predilection of the teachers was positional authority. This source of power received 41 percent of the responses. Expertise received 39 percent of the responses and was a close second choice of the teachers. Charisma received only 20 percent of the responses, and of the three sources of power was the least influential.

As illustrated in Table 7, the major choice of the combined responses of black and white teachers was positional authority. However, it is interesting to compare the small difference between the percentage of responses between positional authority and expertise. Conversely, it is also interesting to note the relatively large gap between expertise and charisma

The findings depicted in Table 7 are consistent with the writings of most authorities regarding the significance of position, expertise, and charisma in formal organizations. However, the factors that make the findings in Table 7 unique are the race of the principal and the race of the respondents.

As a rule, the literature pertaining to formal organizations does not consider the race of the leader or the followers to be an important characteristic. Ostensibly, the omission of race as a significant variable is due to the fact that most authorities on leadership in formal organizations have focused their attention on the hierarchical structure of major corporations.

Generally, the chain of command of major corporations is dominated by whites in important positions of leadership. Conversely, blacks in these organizations are usually relegated to subordinate roles. Since this superordinate-subordinate relationship between whites and blacks adhers to the typical pattern found in most organizations, race has not been an important issue. However, since the enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, race has become a vital consideration in formal organizations such as public schools.

Table 8 depicts the responses of the teachers included in the study when controlled by race. It is important to note that when the responses of black and white teachers are perused separately, the differences and similarities of these responses are significant.

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES BY RACE TO THE MAIN SOURCES OF THE PRINCIPAL'S AUTHORITY

Sources of Power	WHITE TEACHERS		BLACK TEACHERS	
	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Percent o Responses
Positional Authority	1300	43.8%	460	34.6%
Expertise	1065	35.8%	601	45.3%
Charisma	606	20.4%	267	20.1%
TOTAL	2971	100.0%	1328	100.0%

Table 8 shows that the responses of white teachers to sources of power of the black principal correspond to the collective responses of all the teachers as shown in Table 7. However, the white teachers stressed position slightly more, and expertise somewhat less, than all teachers as main sources of the principal's authority.

Table 8 notes that black teachers were influenced more by the black principal's expertise than by positional authority. The difference in the preference of black teachers and the collective responses of all the teachers to position and expertise is about equal, though in opposite directions.

Table 8 notes a significant difference in the responses of white and black teachers to the principal's sources of power. White teachers were influenced the most by the black principal's positional authority. The percentage of white responses to this source was 43.8. Expertise was the second preference of white teachers. The percentage of responses of expertise by white teachers was 35.8. The black principal's expertise influenced black teachers the most. The percentage of responses for expertise by black teachers was 45.3.

Although white teachers responded the most to position, and black teachers responded the most to expertise, it is interesting to note the similarity of the level of preferences. The percentage of responses of white teachers to position was 43.8, whereas the percentage of responses of black teachers to expertise was 45.3.

The similarities of the responses of black and white teachers are revealed in their perceptions of charisma when applied to black principals. Both black and white teachers were influenced by the black principal's charisma. As noted in Table 8, the percentage of responses to charisma by white teachers was 20.4. Concomitantly, the percentage of responses to charisma by black teachers was 20.1.

Table 8 reveals that, in the case of whites, the data supported null hypotheses 1, 3, and 5. This finding was in line with predictions and was confirmed by the t test scores (see Appendix D). For hypotheses 1 and 3, on the relations between positional authority and both charisma and expertise, the t scores of 8.33 and 2.84 were greater than 1.67. For hypothesis 5, relating to the difference between expertise and charisma, the t test score of -6.12 was less than -1.67.

In the case of black teachers, two of the hypotheses were found to be rejected. Findings for the black teachers showed that hypothesis 2 (positional authority vs. expertise) and hypothesis 6 (expertise vs. charisma) were rejected (See Appendix D). The t test score of 1.70 shows that the relationship was significant at the .05 percent level. Rejection of hypotheses 2 and 6 was confirmed by the statistics since the t test scores failed to produce the necessary values. For black subjects, hypothesis 4 was supported and indicated as significant at the .05 level by a t score of -1.70 or less.[1]

---

[1]See Appendix D.

As previously noted, when the race of the teachers included in the study became a consideration, there were significant differences and similarities in the responses of the subjects to the black principal's sources of power.

In addition to determining the impact of race on the responses of the teachers, the researcher decided to determine if age would also be a significant factor in influencing the responses of black and white teachers to the principal's sources of power.

As noted in Table 9 the age groups of the teachers included in the study were 21-25; 26-35; 36-45; and 46 and above.

Table 9 shows white teachers in each age bracket had similar perceptions of the three sources of power. Each ranked positional authority first, expertise second, and charisma third.

Table 9 also shows that black teachers in each age group followed the general reaction of black teachers to the black principal's sources of power. In each age group, black teachers ranked expertise first, positional authority second, and charisma third.

It is interesting to note that the pattern of position, expertise, and charisma for white teachers and the pattern of expertise, position, and charisma for black teachers were maintained from the 21-25 age group through the 46-and-above age group.

TABLE 9

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' RESPONSES

BY AGE TO THE SOURCES OF POWER

	Positional Authority		Expertise		Charisma	
Race and Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White						
21-25	283	22	195	18	99	16
26-35	431	33	308	29	168	28
36-45	323	25	317	30	176	29
46 and above	260	20	245	23	163	27
TOTAL	1297	100	1065	100	606	100
Black						
21-25	52	11	85	14	31	11
26-35	142	31	191	32	95	36
36-45	212	46	228	38	96	36
46 and above	57	12	97	16	45	17
TOTAL	463	100	601	100	267	100

The data suggested that age did not have a significant impact on the responses of either black or white teachers.

Summary

The findings of this study were analyzed in terms of: (a) the influence of positional authority in the formal organization, and (b) the authority sources of expertise and charisma.

To determine the influence of positional authority in the formal organization, data regarding the responses of both black and white teachers to positional authority, expertise, and charisma were compared and contrasted. When the collective responses of black and white teachers were analyzed, the findings of this study concurred with the literature relative to formal organizations. That is, of the three sources of power, positional authority is the most influential; expertise is ranked second;and charisma is the least influential. However, when the responses of black and white teachers were examined separately, white teachers were influenced by the black principal's sources of power in the following order: positional authority was the most influential; expertise was the second most influential; and charisma was the least influential.

The reactions of black teachers to the sources of power available to black principals were as follows: the greatest influence on black teachers was expertise; positional authority was perceived as the second greatest influence; and charisma

had the least influence on the behavior of black teachers.

The findings show that black and white teachers differ in their reactions to the positional authority and expertise of the black principal. However, the reactions of these two racial groups are similar regarding charisma. Both black and white teachers were influenced the least by charisma.

It is interesting to speculate about the reasons for the preference differences expressed by white and black teachers. The white teachers' answers conform generally with conclusions reported in the literature and predictions contained in the hypotheses. However, the black teachers deviated strikingly from these predications. Why? At this time, it can only be guessed. School desegregation had only recently been installed in the school districts studied. The black teachers were anxious for the black principals to succeed. Black principals constituted symbols for the black community and laboratory subjects in the experiment of school desegregation. It seemed likely that the black teachers may have judged that expertise was their major resource for success. This guess was confirmed by the fact that whites widely alleged that blacks lacked training and technical expertise for many positions. It would be interesting and informative to explore this issue further at some later time.

Descriptive analysis of the findings of this study were presented in this chapter. The analyses were made on the bases of the characteristics of the sample and the hypotheses stated

in the study. The summary and conclusions of the study will be presented in the subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court ruled in the case of Brown vs. Board of Education that "separate but equal" schools for black and white students were unconstitutional. The Court also mandated that states practicing this doctrine would have to formulate and execute plans to desegregate their schools with "all deliberate speed."

In most white communities in the South, the decision of the Supreme Court was viewed as an infringement on states' rights. Many white southerners vowed to maintain the separation of the races at any cost. During the subsequent years following the landmark decision of the Supreme Court, only a token degree of desegregation took place in the South. White school officials in particular and white citizens in general exerted every vestige of energy to maintain the status quo in the public schools throughout the South.

Conversely, the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court was perceived by black Americans as the second Emancipation Proclamation. The Court's decision decision elevated the levels of expectations of black citizens throughout the United States. To black Americans, declaring segregation in public schools unconstitutional was a step in the direction of full

participation in the mainstream of the American way of life.

Just as the Court decision had divergent effects on black and white citizens, the case of Brown vs. Board of Education precipitated unintended as well as intended consequences. The major intent of the decision was to terminate de jure segregation in the South. To some extent, this intent was accomplished. Separate educational facilities for black and white students were declared unconstitutional. Moreover, the subsequent passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Elementary-Secondary Educational Act served as a catalyst to the process of school desegregation in the South.

However, the unintended consequence of the Court's decision included the adverse effects that the process of school desegregation had on black principals who had served in the system of black education during the era of "separate but equal" educational facilities for black and white citizens. When the process of school desegregation increased, the number of black principals decreased. Many white school officials concluded that desegregation militated against the need for black principals; therefore, as a result of the desegregation of public schools in the South, many black principals were dismissed, demoted, or forced to resort to early retirement.

The reasons that white school officials usually gave for the dismissal or demotion of black principals were the following: (a) black principals were not as qualified

as white principals; (b) desegregation of the schools reduced the need for black principals; and (c) white teachers would not respect the sources of power of a black principal.

The contention that black principals were not as qualified as white principals was repudiated during the Hearing on the Status of Black Principals. During the hearings, a large contingent of witnesses testified that black principals who had lost their jobs because of desegregation had advanced degrees from predominantly white colleges and universities in the North. It was also noted that the dismissed principals also possessed principal's certificates for their respective states. Moreover, many noted authorities have taken the position that the inception of school desegregation increased the need for black principals in public schools.

The assertion that white teachers would not respect the sources of power of black principals was an assumption that needed to be subjected to empirical study. Being cognizant of the fact that a paucity of research existed relative to the way white followers perceive the sources of power of black leaders, the writer decided to undertake this study.

The study was limited to the seven schools in the selected area that were administered by black principals; however, the faculties of the schools included in the study were comprised of both black and white teachers. The schools selected for the study were located in four administrative units in the Piedmont section of North Carolina.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the data regarding the null hypotheses tested in the study, it was apparent that white and black teachers had similar as well as dissimilar perceptions of the black principal's sources of power.

According to the analysis of the data, the following similarities prevail between the perceptions of black and white teachers. Both black and white teachers were influenced more by the positional authority of the black principal than by his charisma.

It was interesting to note that both white and black teachers were influenced more by statements on the questionnaire that referred to the legal rights and the ability or knowledge of the principal than by statements that related to the principal's personal charm.

Some of the statements on the questionnaire that referred to the legal rights of the principal are: (1) the principal has been placed in charge of the group; (2) the principal has been selected to carry out this job; (3) the principal has been given the responsibility in this situation; (4) the principal is the person they sent; (5) the principal has been assigned the job; (6) the principal has been appointed to the position.

The statements on the questionnaire that refer to the ability or knowledge of the principal are: (1) the principal knows why things are the way they are; (2) the principal is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems;

(3) the principal is capable of highly competent performance; (4) the principal has up-to-date knowledge; (5) the principal is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue; and (6) the principal knows how to apply what he knows.

The questionnaire items that refer to the principal's charisma are: (1) the principal has a personality I admire; (2) the principal provides an example I'd like to follow; (3) the principal is the kind of person I'd like to be; (4) the principal is a person I like being with; (5) the principal does things the way I would like to be able to do them; and (6) the principal has the kind of reputation I would like to have.

Because of the similarities that black and white teachers have regarding their perceptions of the principal's influence, the data indicated that both groups of teachers were influenced more by the inherent authority that accompanies the position and the expertise that a principal was assumed to possess, than by charismatic qualities.

The findings relative to the dissimilar perceptions of black and white teachers regarding the black principal's sources of power are as significant as the similarities between the two groups of teachers.

Basically, the major differences between the perceptions of black and white teachers were the following: white teachers were influenced more by the black principal's positional authority than by his expertise, whereas black teachers were influenced more by the black principal's

expertise than by his positional authority. However, in order to gain some insight into the reactions of black and white teachers, it was imperative that the circumstances affecting both groups of teachers during the time the study was conducted be perused.

The writer concluded from experience that in order to understand why white teachers responded more to the items in the instrument that related to positional authority, it must be remembered that during the initial stages of school desegregation in the South, it was rather difficult for school officials to get white teachers to consent to being transferred to historically black schools. However, in order for southern school systems to comply with federal desegregation guidelines, it was imperative that some white teachers be assigned to historically black schools that survived the "phase out" process. The result of the mandate to desegregate school staffs created situations in which white teachers worked with a black principal.

Most of the white teachers who were assigned to schools administered by black principals were apprehensive about or resentful of their new assignments and viewed them as denigrating placements. The stigma that some white teachers associated with being assigned to traditionally black schools was that such schools were inferior because they had inadequate resources, black students, black faculties, and were usually located in black communities. Moreover, a large number of white teachers perceived the assignment to teach in a

traditionally black school as a demotion. Consequently, many white teachers refused to serve in these schools. Instead of accepting positions in traditionally black schools, they sought transfers to other school systems or other fields or endeavor.

Although many white teachers refused assignments to historically black schools, there were some white teachers who accepted their new assignments. Those white teachers who were instrumental in desegregating the faculties of historically black schools that retained black principals were the subjects of the study.

In order to justify or rationalize their acceptance of assignments to work with black principals in previously all-black schools, some white teachers concluded that their assignment to the traditionally black school and the appointment of the black principal to administer the school were initiated by white school officials.

The background data cited above served as a point of reference regarding the value system of those white teachers who consented to adhere to the requests of school officals to accept their assignments. The acceptance by these teachers of their new assignments indicated that they were inclined to be influenced by the legal constraints that control organizations. Because of this belief in legal foundations of formal organizations, white teachers were influenced by those items on the questionnaire that referred to the legal rights of the principal that are inherent in the position.

Apparently, white teachers reacted more to the positional authority of the black principal because they were more concerned with the legal authority that is inherent in the position than they were with the person who occupied the position. The reactions of white teachers to the importance of positional authority corresponded with the general concept of respect that individuals who work in bureaucracies have for persons who hold positions of leadership.

Since schools have bureaucratic principles, the authority structure of these organizations was generally viewed in the context that education is a responsibility and function of each state, and that local boards of education serve as agents of the state. The state uses its power to control the field of education by creating local boards of education to which is delegated the authority to hire and fire superintendents, supervisors, principals, teachers, and other staff personnel.

The local school board is a policy-making agency that delegates the responsibility to implement its policies to the superintendent of the local district. The authority of the superintendent descends through the hierarchy of the organization to the principal.

The above frame of reference is frequently the prevailing factor that controls the actions of followers in educational organizations, and ostensibly, was used by white teachers who responded to the questionnaire. From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that

white teachers perceived the black principal as possessing authority based on rational grounds. According to Dubin, authority based on rational grounds is predicated on the administrative theory that the position is the center of authority in formal organizations and that the sanction for this authority rests in duly constituted law and order.[2]

Individuals who adhere to the principles of traditional authority are usually influenced more by the position of the principal than by the individual who occupies the position.

Traditional authority embodies such concepts as line-staff, chart of organization, leader-follower relationship, and an acceptance of the belief that leadership consists of closely held power for decision making.

According to Delmo Della-Dora, the acceptance of traditional authority enjoys a resurgence of popularity whenever a local unit is undergoing a period of uncertainty and anxiety. The author notes that when doubt and fear abound, it is sometimes comforting to hear an authoritative voice speaking out with certainty.[3]

During the initial stages of desegregation there was a multiplicity of uncertainties and anxieties among white

---

[2]Robert Dubin, ed. Human Relations in Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956), p. 196.

[3]Delmo Della-Dora, "Changing Styles of Leadership," Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977): 6-8.

teachers who were assigned to work with black principals in desegregated schools; having doubt and fear about their new assignments, these teachers were comforted by their perceptions of the black principal's major source of power.

Since white teachers were influenced more by the traditional authority of the black principal, it can be concluded that white teachers were more concerned with the position of leadership than with the incumbent of the position. The fact that white teachers supported the concept that allegiance is owed to the leadership position in the organization, in lieu of the position holder, indicates that the major problem confronting blacks in the field of education is not skin color but the acquisition of a position. Once the position is obtained, white teachers tend to be influenced more by the position than by the race of its incumbent

The reactions of black teachers to the influence of the black principal's sources of power differed from the reactions of white teachers. The black teachers were influenced more by the black principal's expertise than by his positional authority or charisma.

In order to understand the reaction of black teachers to the black principal's sources of power, it is important to review the circumstances that prevailed in the field of education, and the status of black educators during the early years of desegregation.

In 1972, the year this study was initiated, the trend of firing and demoting black principals was a tactic used constantly by school officials who were required to desegregate their school systems. This trend was so prevalent that black teachers realized that black principals who maintained their positions were, to use the vernacular, "superblacks." This small number of blacks who remained as principals in desegregated school districts were perceived by black teachers as possessing a high degree of expertise. Black teachers were cognizant of the fact that black principals were becoming an endangered species and that those remaining in positions of authority represented the elite. Because of this realization, black teachers were more responsive to the black principal's expertise than to the principal's positional authority or charisma.

The plight of black principals during the late 1960's and the 1970's can be recounted by instances whereby competent and certified black principals lost their jobs to white individuals who were not certified to serve as principals. An example of this type of discrimination involved a case in which a black principal in one of the school districts included in the study was demoted to a teaching position and replaced by a white person when the school in which the black principal had served successfully for many years was desegregated.

The demoted black principal had a master's degree from a university in Pennsylvania and one from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. However, the individual who replaced him had neither a graduate degree nor a principal's certificate.

Cases similar to the one cited above were frequent occurrences during the initial stages of public school desegregation. Therefore, black teachers were cognizant of the fact that black principals were an endangered species and that only a few black principals would survive the efforts of white school officials to remove blacks from positions of authority.

Realizing that the primary way for black principals to remain in leadership positions would be through the exemplification of effective leadership ability, black teachers included in the study were influenced more by the black principal's expertise than by his positional authority or charisma.

The fact that black teachers were influenced more by the expertise of the black principal seems to concur with the Weberian model of bureaucracy. According to Miller, the Weberian model suggests that persons with superior expertise will usually be elevated into positions in the official hierarchy of control; they will be vested with the right to issue commands and can expect to be obeyed as long as their commands and their own competence are legitimated

by other members of the organization.[4]

The reactions of black teachers to the black principal's sources of power indicated that blacks tend to adhere to the concept that authority is associated with the organizational position which demands expertise for incumbents.

Ideally, control in a bureaucracy such as a public school is exercised by experts; therefore, persons with expertise would be able to exercise authority because their influence and importance are inherent in a formal system of positions which possess authority. Generally, the members of the bureacracy who occupy positions of authority will be recognized as competent individuals and will be perceived as having the right to exercise control over others.

Implications

The findings of this study should be helpful to public school officials who have the responsibility of hiring, promoting, and dismissing school personnel. The study revealed significant similarities in white and black teachers' perceptions of the sources of power of the black principal. The study also showed that interesting and significant differences prevailed.

---

[4]John P. Miller, "Social-Psychological Implication of Weber's Model of Bureaucracy: Relations Among Expertise, Control, Authority, and Legitimacy," Social Forces 49 (September 1970):93.

The data indicated that white teachers ranked the sources of power available to the black principal in the following order: (1) positional authority; (2) expertise; and (3) charisma, whereas black teachers ranked the sources of power available to the black principal in this order: (1) expertise; (2) positional authority; (3) charisma.

Because of the data provided by the teachers who responded to this study, school officals who have staffing responsibilities should review their hiring and promotion practices regarding black educators. The data indicated that teachers are influenced more by the principal's position andexpertise than by his charisma. The findings of the study should help to allay the fear and doubts that school board members and superintendents may have about appointing black educators to responsible positions.

According to Grant,[5] the general lack of minority teachers and administrators in public schools serves to maintain racism. Grant contends that the pattern of employment of minorities is indicative of how schools are used as instruments for racism.

A recent report by HEW shows that a significant disparity continues to exist between the number of minority teachers and the number of minority students. The report show that in 40 states (Hawaii excluded) the total percentage of minority teachers is 11.2 percent, while minority students comprise 21.7 percent. Table 10 gives some specific illustrations

[5]Carl A. Grant, "Racism in School and Society," Educational Leadership 33 (December 1975):185.

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED STATES[6]

State	Percentage of School Population	
	Minority Students	Minority Teachers
North Carolina	30.9	23.5
South Carolina	41.7	31.1
Virginia	25.3	19.0
Georgia	34.5	27.0
New York	26.6	5.6
New Jersey	21.3	8.4

[6]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report on the Condition of American Education 1975 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 71.

The findings of this study may help to minimize, or indeed to discontinue the practice of dismissing black principals and teachers. The declining number of black principals and teachers during the last decade has been a source of poor race relations in our schools and our society.

A position paper prepared by the Recruitment and Leadership Training Institute at Temple University contends that "If the conditions of minorities are to change in this country, many more minority educational administrators must be included in the decision-making process regarding matters that relate to minority students."[7]

Recommendations for Further Research

The purposes of this study were to determine the effect, if any, the race of the principal has on the attitudes of black and white teachers in desegregated schools, and to investigate if black and white teachers have different perceptions of the sources of power available to black principals in public schools. In addition to providing findings which give some insight into the problem regarding the effects of race on sources of power, the study also raises some questions that merit research.

Since school desegregation continues to be a problem for school districts in the United States that are not in

---

[7] Recruitment and Leadership Training Institute, Minorities in Policy-Making Positions in Public Education (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1974), p. 41.

compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the issue of race and its effects on the sources of power of school personnel other than the principal are in need of research. The writer recommends the following questions as worthy areas of research:

1. What effect does race have on the teacher's sources of power?
2. How do racially mixed faculties perceive the white principal's source of power?
3. How do black and white parents perceive the sources of power of principals and teachers?
4. What effect does sex have on the sources of power of principals?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adoff, Arnold, ed. Black on Black: Commentaries by Black Americans. Toronto, Ontario: The Macmillan Company, 1968.

Allen, B. J. "The Racial Attitudes of White Pre-Service Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 43 (January 1972): 326-327.

Anderson, James G. "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organization Authority." Educational Administrative Quarterly 11 (Winter 1966): 7-34.

Ashmore, Harry S. The Negro and the Schools. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Bachman, Jerald G.; Bowers, David G.; and Marcus, Phillip M. "Bases of Supervisory Power: A Comparative Study in Five Organizational Settings." In Control in Organizations. Edited by Arnold S. Tannenbaum. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Bales, Robert F. "A Theoretical Framework for Interaction Process Analysis." In Group Dynamics. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1953.

Ballard, Allen B. The Education of Black Folk. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Banks, James A., and Grambs, Jean D. Black Self-Concept. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Barbour, Floyd B., ed. The Black Seventies. Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers, 1970.

Barnard, Chester I. The Function of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Baughman, E. Earl. Black Americans: A Psychological Analysis. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1971.

Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Bierstedt, Robert. "An Analysis of Social Power." American Sociological Review 15 (December 1950):733.

"Black Principals Decrease." Reidsville [North Carolina] Review, March 12, 1974.

Blau, Peter. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Blau, Peter M. "The Hierarchy of Authority in Organizations." American Journal of Sociology 73 (January 1968):453-467.

Blau, Peter M., and Scott, W. Richard. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Bontemps, Arna. Story of the Negro. Toronto: Random House of Canada, 1955.

Broderick, Francis L., and Meier, August, eds. Negro Protest Thought in the Twentieth Century. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.

Brown, Hugh Victor. A History of the Education of Negroes in North Carolina. Raleigh, N.C.: Irving Swain Press, 1961.

Brubaker, Dale L., and Nelson, Roland H. Creative Survival in Educational Bureaucracies. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1974.

Brubaker, Dale L., and Nelson, Roland H. Introduction to Educational Decision-Making. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1972.

Button, H. Warren. "Doctrines of Administration: A Brief History." In Educational Administration: Selected Readings. Edited by Walter G. Hack et al. Boston: Allyn Bacon, 1971.

Campbell, Donald T., and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zauder, Alvin, eds. Group Dynamics. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1953.

Cohodes, Aaron. "How School Districts are Desegregating." Nation's Schools 73 (February 1964):41-43, 66-68.

Cruise, Harold. The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual. New York: Morrow, 1967.

"Decline in Principalships Laid to Prejudiced Boards." Richmond Afro-American, August 19, 1975, p. 14.

Della-Dora, Delmo. "Changing Styles of Leadership." Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977):6-8.

Dennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Dubin, Robert, ed. Human Relations in Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.

Ebony Pictorial History of Black America. Vol. III: Civil Rights Movement to Black Revolution. Nashville, Tenn.: The Southwestern Company, 1971.

Egerton, John. "When Desegregation Comes, The Negro Principals Go." Southern Education Report 3 (December 1967):12.

"Elusive Black Educator: How to Find, Hire, and Keep Him." School Management, March 1969, pp. 1-22.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly 4 (June 1959):43-67.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Fenelon, James R., and Raven, Bertram. "The Bases of Social Power." In Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zauder. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

French, John R. P., and Raven, Bertram H. "Legitimate Power, Coercive Power, and Observability in Social Influence." Sociometry 21 (June 1958):83-97.

Goldhamer, Herbert, and Shils, Edward A. "Types of Power and Status." The American Journal of Sociology 45 (September 1939):171-177.

Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: Free Press, 1954.

Grant, Carl A. "Racism in School and Society." Educational Leadership 33 (December 1975):185.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.

Hack, Walter G.; Gephart, William J.; Heck, James B.; and Ramseyer, John A., eds. Educational Administration: Selected Readings. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Hall, Richard. "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment." American Journal of Sociology, July 1963, p. 33.

Hampton, David R.; Summer, Charles T.; and Webber, Ross A. Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Educational Leadership for the Seventies." Phi Delta Kappan 53 (March 1972):403-406.

Henning, Dale. "Authority: Concepts, Conflicts and Synthesis." In Human Elements of Administration. Edited by Harry R. Knudson. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.

Hill, Winston, W., and French, Wendell L. "Perceptions of the Power of Department Chairmen by Professors." Administrative Science Quarterly 11 (March 1967):548-574.

Himes, Joseph S. "The Recruitment of Black Conflict Leaders: A Hypothetical Model." The Journal of Afro-American Issues 1 (Summer 1972):55-59.

Hooker, Robert. Displacement of Black Teachers in Eleven Southern States. Nashville, Tenn.: Race Relations Information Center, 1970.

Hornstein, Harvey A.; Callahan, D. M.; Fisch, E.; and Benedict. "Influence and Satisfaction in Organizations: A Replication." Sociology of Education 41 (Fall 1969):380-389.

Houston, Alice V. "Leadership for Multicultural Experiences." Educational Leadership 33 (December 1975):199-202.

Howard, James M. "A Study of the Relative Significance of Positional Authority and Expertise in an Experimental School." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1974.

Hower, Ralph M., and Lorsch, Jay W. "Organizational Input." In Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior. Edited by John A. Seiler. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1967.

Isherwood, Geoffrey,B. "The Principal and His Authority: An Empirical Study." High School Journal 56 (June 1973): 291-303.

James, J. C. "The Black Principal: Another Vanishing American." The New Republic 163 (September 1970):17-20.

Kast, Fremont E., and Rosenzweig, James E. Organization and Management: A Systems Approach. New York: McGraw Hill, 1970.

Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Keeley, Benjamin J. "Reactions of a Group of White Parishioners Toward the Acceptance of Negro Pastor." Sociology and Social Research 55 (January 1971):216-228.

Knezvich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

McCloskey, Gordon. Education and Public Understanding. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970.

Miller, John P. "Social-Psychological Implication of Weber's Model of Bureaucracy: Relations Among Expertise, Control, Authority, and Legitimacy." Social Forces 49 (September 1970):93.

North Carolina Dept. of Public Instruction. Eliminating Sex Discrimination in Schools: A Source Book. Raleigh, N.C.: State Department of Public Instruction, 1975.

Palmer, E. B. "Outergration." North Carolina Teachers Record 38 (January 1968):9.

Peabody, Robert L. "Perceptions of Organization Authority: A Comparative Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly 6 (March 1962):463-482.

Ploski, Harry A., and Brown, Roscoe E. The Negro Almanac. New York: Bellwether Publishing Company, Inc., 1967.

Powell, Reed M. Race, Religion, and the Promotion of the American Executive. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1969.

Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962.

Recruitment and Leadership Training Institute. Minorities in Policy-Making Positions in Public Education. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1974.

Reed, Roy. "Rights Act Forces School Equality." In The Great Contemporary Issues: Education, U.S.A. Edited by James Cass. New York: New York Times, 1977.

Richards, Steven Arthur. "The Effects of the Supervisor's Race upon His Performance Ratings and the Group Interaction in a Simulated Organization." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1970.

Roye, Wendell J. "Black Principals: Vanishing Americans or Out-Flanked Agents?" The National Center for Research and Information on Equal Opportunity, Tipsheet No. 7, February, 1972, p. 1.

Sarrate, Reed. The Ordeal of Desegregation. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Sax, Gilbert. Empirical Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Carter, Fred D. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1974.

Shartle, Carroll L. "Studies of Leadership by Interdisciplinary Methods." In Leadership in American Education. Edited by Alonzo G. Grace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Shoemaker, Don, ed. With All Deliberate Speed: Segregation-Desegregation in Southern Schools. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in Black and White. New York: Random House, 1964.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947.

Simpson, George, and Yinger, J. Milton. Racial and Culture Minorities. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Smith, Edward Boland. "Chester Barnard's Concept of Leadership." Educational Administration Quarterly 11 (Autumn 1975).

Smith, John, and Smith, Betty. "For Black Educators: Integration Brings the Axe." The Urban Review, May, 1973, p. 7.

Sowell, Thomas. Black Education: Myths and Tragedies. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972.

Spain, James S.; Dunnaville, Clarence M.; Pickens, William; and Nash, Kendall. "Black Executives: The Darkies at the Bottom of the Stairs." The Master in Business Administration, April-May, 1969, pp. 35-36.

Starnes, Thomas A., and Watson, J. Allen. "Southern Negro and White Educators: A Comparison of Pertinent Characteristics. Journal of Negro Education 40 (Spring 1971):159-161.

Taylor, Stuart. "The Black Executive and the Corporation: A Difficult Fit." The Master in Business Administration, January 1972, p. 9.

Thompson, Daniel A. The Role of Leadership in School Desegregation. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document, ED064432, 1971.

Tucker, Sterling. For Blacks Only. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Erdmans Publishing Company, 1971.

Ubben, Gerald C., and Hughes, Larry W. "Preparation Programs for Top Level Negro Public School Administrators: A New Perspective." Journal of Negro Education 38 (Spring 1969):169-172.

U.S., Commission on Civil Rights. Twenty Years after Brown, 1974.

U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity. Part 10--Displacement and Present Status of Black School Principals in Desegregated Schools. Hearings before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunities. 92nd Congress, 1st Sess., 1971. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Civil Rights. Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts: Enrollment and Staff by Racial/Ethnic Group. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Civil Rights. Policies on Elementary and Secondary School Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Civil Rights. General Statement of Policies under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Racial Desegregation of Elementary and Secondary Schools. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Civil Rights. Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts: Enrollment and Staff by Racial/Ethnic Group. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Civil Rights. Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts: Enrollment and Staff by Racial/Ethnic Group. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Civil Rights. A Statistical Report on the Condition American Education 1975. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1946.

Whale, W. B., and Brack, R. E. The Development of an Instrument to Differentiate Students' Perceptions of Teachers Bases of Power. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document, ED062633, 1972.

Wiley, Bennie L. "A Different Breed of Administrator." Phi Delta Kappan 42 (May 1971):550.

Winston, Michael R. "Through the Back Door: Academic Racism and the Negro Scholar in Historical Perspective." Daedalus 100 (Summer 1971):678-719.

Workman, W. D. "The Deep South." In With All Deliberate Speed. Edited by Don Shoemaker. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.

Yinger, J. Milton. "Recent Developments in Minority and Race Relations." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 378 (July 1968):135.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX A--INSTRUMENT

Dear Educator,

The superintendent of your school district and the principal of your school have granted me permission to solicit your help in a research study that I am conducting.

The study focuses on the sources of authority available to public school principals and is designed to determine why teachers allow principals to influence their behavior at school.

Although the major focus of this study is on the authority of the principal, it is anticipated that the study will also have significance for teachers. Since students perceive teachers as authority figures, the results of the study should be applicable to the improvement of student-teacher relations as well as the improvement of teacher-principal relations.

In order to obtain additional information about why teachers allow principals to influence their behavios, you are requested to respond to the items on the enclosed questionnaire.

Please do not sign your name on the questionnaire. Your identity is to remain anonymous, and no attempt will be made to identify those who aid in this undertaking.

Thank you for your cooperation.

N. Freeman Jones, Jr.
320 Branch Street
Reidsville, NC

PERCEPTIONS DIFFERENTIATIONS

In the following series of paired statements, you are requested to choose one statement from each of the pairs, that describes best why you allow your principal, in the particular education you are now experiencing, to influence how you do things of how you feel. Please mark an X beside the statement of your choice. SELECT ONLY ONE OF EACH PAIR.

I allow the principal to influence me because:

1. _____ the principal has a personality I admire

   _____ the principal knows why things are the way they are

2. _____ the principal has been placed in charge of the group

   _____ the principal knows why things are the way they are

3. _____ the principal can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know

   _____ the principal was assigned to the job

4. _____ the principal can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile

   _____ the principal can cause others to ridicule me

5. _____ the principal can take disciplinary action

   _____ the principal provides an example I'd like to follow

6. _____ the principal was selected to carry out this job

   _____ the principal is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems

7. _____ the principal has been placed in charge of the group

   _____ the principal is the kind of person I'd like to be

8. _____ the principal can make me feel inadequate

_____ the principal is capable of highly competent performance

9. _____ the principal can make me feel that I have something to contribute

_____ the principal can make fun of me

10. _____ the principal can cause others to ridicule me

_____ the principal does things the way I would like to be able to do them

11. _____ the principal has a personality I admire

_____ the principal can make me feel inadequate

12. _____ the principal has up-to-date knowledge

_____ the principal has been given the responsibility in this situation

13. _____ the principal is a person I like being with

_____ the principal is capable of highly competent performance

14. _____ the principal is the person they sent

_____ the principal can cause me considerable anguish

15. _____ the principal was assigned the job

_____ the principal knows how to apply what he knows

16. _____ the principal can give me a feeling of personal achievement

_____ the principal can keep me from obtaining higher recognition

17. _____ the principal was appointed to the position

_____ the principal does things the way I would like to be able to do them

18. _____ the principal is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue

_____ the principal can give me a feeling of personal achievement

19. _____ the principal is the kind of person I'd like to be

_____ the principal knows how to apply what he knows

20. _____ the principal can make me feel that I have something to contribute

_____ the principals is skilled at identifying althernate approaches to problems

21. _____ the principal provides an example I'd like to follow

_____ the principal has been given the responsibility in this situation

22. _____ the principal can help me achieve social status

_____ the principal does things the way I would like to be able to do them

23. _____ the principal has up-to-date information

_____ the principal can make fun of me

24. _____ the principal is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue

_____ the principal has the kind of reputation I would like to have

25. _____ the principal is the person they sent

_____ the principal is capable of highly competent performance

26. _____ the principal can keep me from obtaining higher recognition

_____ the principal know how to apply what he knows

27. _____ the principal can help me achieve social status

_____ the principal can cause me considerable anguish

28. _____ the principal was appointed to the position

_____ the principal can make me feel good about my progress

29. _____ the principal has a personlity I admire

_____ the principal can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile

30. _____ the principal is the person they sent

_____ the principal can make me feel that I have something to contribute

31. _____ the principal was selected to carry out this job

_____ the principal can give me a feeling of personal achievement

32. _____ the principal is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems

_____ the principal does things the way I would like to be able to do them

33. _____ the principal can cause others to ridicule me

_____ the principal has been placed in charge of the group

34. _____ the principal is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue

_____ the principal was appointed to the position

35. _____ the principal is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems

_____ the principal can take disciplinary action

36. _____ the principal can give me a feeling of personal achievement

_____ the principal is a person I like being with

37. _____ the principal can make me feel inadequate

_____ the principal was appointed to the position

38. _____ the principal has the kind of reputation I would like to have

_____ the principal can cause me considerable anguish

39. _____ the principal has been given the responsibility in this situation

_____ the principal can make fun of me

40. _____ the principal has a personality I admire

_____ the principal was selected to carry out this job

41. _____ the principal is a person I like being with

_____ the principal was assigned to the job

42. _____ the principal can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile

_____ the principal has been given the responsibility in this situation

43. _____ the principal can make me feel good about my progress

_____ the principal can make me feel inadequate

44. _____ the principal can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know

_____ the principal can take disciplinary action

45. _____ the principal has been placed in charge of the group

_____ the principal can help me achieve social status

46. _____ the principal knows why things are the way they are

_____ the principal can cause others to ridicule me

47. _____ the principal provides me an example I'd like to follow

_____ the principal has up-to-date information

48. _____ the principal is the kind of person I'd like to be

_____ the principal can make me feel that I have something to contribute

49. _____ the principal can make fun of me

_____ the principal is a person I like being with

50. _____ the principal can help me achieve social status

_____ the principal knows why things are the way they are

51. _____ the principal has the kind of reputation I would like to have

_____ the principal is the person they sent

52. _____ the principal has the kind of reputation I would like to have

_____ the principal can make me feel good about my progress

53 _____ the principal was selected to carry out this job

_____ the principal can take disciplinary action

54. _____ the principal knows how to apply what he knows

_____ the principal can make me feel good about my progress

55. _____ the principal is the kind of person I'd like to be

_____ the principal can keep me from obtaining higher recognition

56. _____ the principal can keep me from obtaining higher recognition

_____ the principal was assigned to the job

57. _____ the principal has up-to-date information

_____ the principal can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile

58. _____ the principal provides an example I'd like to follow

_____ the principal can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know

59. _____ the principal is capable of highly competent performance

_____ the principal can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know

60. _____ the principal can cause me considerable anguish

_____ the principal is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue

General Information

The following information is vital to the completion of this project. This information will be kept in very strict confidence and will not be seen by anyone other than the researcher. The information will not be used in anyway to jeopardize the welfare of the respondent or to determine the identity of the respondent.

Total years of teaching experience _____

Years of teaching at present school _____

Age: 21-25 _____

26-35 _____

36-45 _____

46 and above _____

Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Race: Black _____ White _____

APPENDIX B

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT

Appendix B

Request for Permission to Use Instrument

320 Branch Street
Reidsville, NC
July 14, 1973

Dr. W. B. Whale and Dr. R. E. Brack
Associate Professors of Conintuing Education
University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon,
Saskatchewan, Canada

Gentlemen:

At the present time, I am working on a doctoral dissertation in educational administration at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The study focuses on the sources of power available to a position holder in a formal organization; and the subordinate's perceptions of that power.

During my review of the related literature, I encountered the work that you have done on developing an instrument to differentiate perceptions of sources of power, and I am requesting your permission to use the instrument as a major means of gathering data for the study.

In addition to securing permission to use your instrument, I would also appreciate any additional information that you have regarding the reliability and validity of the instrument.

Thank you kindly for any consideration extended to me.

Yours truly,

N. Freeman Jones, Jr.

APPENDIX C

PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN SASKATOON, CANADA
S7N 0W0

August 9, 1973

Mr. N. Freeman Jones, Jr.
320 Branch Street
Reidsville, N.C.
U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Jones:

Thank you very much for your letter concerning the study that focuses on sources of power.

I am assuming the information you have concerning our work in this area was the material presented at the Adult Education Research Conference in Chicago in 1972. I should warn you that we have done no further work on the instrument since that time. We have some feelings about the reliability and validity of the instrument, however, we have not established this objectively. We have budgeted time to pursue this further this fall and winter.

You are certainly free to use the instrument if you wish, recognizing that we have not resolved the reliability and validity questions to our satisfaction. If you decide to proceed we would appreciate being kept informed of your findings. We in turn will pass along any information we obtain as we reactivate our study.

Sincerely,

W. B. Whale
Director

WBW:ra

cc B. Brack

EXTENSION
DIVISION

DIRECTOR'S
OFFICE
343-3791

APPENDIX D

t-Test Scores

t-test

Difference Variable	White Teachers (N = 75)				Black Teachers (N = 32)			
	N	Mean Difference	SD	t*	N	Mean Difference	SD	t*
D1 =(Positional Authority Minus Charisma)	75	9.21	9.51	8.33	32	6.13	8.26	4.13
D2 = (Positional Authority Minus Expertise)	75	3.09	9.36	2.84	32	-4.31	8.11	-431
D3 =(Charisma Minus Expertise)	75	-6.12	5.48	-9.60	32	-10.44	5.06	-11.50

*t =1,67 needed to reject H_o1 and H_o3

*t = -1,67 needed to reject H_o5

*t= 1,70 needed to reject H_o2 and H_o4

*t= -1.70 needed to reject H_o6