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CHAPTER I

A CONFLICT CASE STUDY: BACKGROUND AND DESIGN

INTRODUCTION

Those who profess to favor freedom yet deprecate agitation are men who want crops without plowing the ground; they want rain without thunder and lightning; they want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters.

—Frederick Douglass

These phrases suggest a crucial point. Simply stated, the conduct of human affairs is seldom free of conflict. When conflict does occur, pointed attempts are customarily made to suppress it. Bailey has provided one explanation for this response.

Because conflict is painful and unnerving, we tend to look upon it as evil.¹

¹Stephen K. Bailey, from a speech at the Christopher Inn, Columbus, Ohio, January 10, 1972.
The relationships which exist between members of the board of education and the superintendent of schools are a key factor in the governance of public education. The nature of the relationships is conducive to conflict and to several inherent dichotomous relationships, including those of superior-subordinate, lay-professional and policy making-policy administration. The quality of board-superintendent relationships is determined in part, therefore, by the ability of the participants to deal with conflict.

The position of central influence occupied by the board and the superintendent has been illustrated by Minar.

Given the nature of school functions and legal institutions, the key point in school government would seem to be the relations and the distribution of power between superintendent and board. Their respective positions are based on different types of authority, one deriving from technical expertise, the other from formal rank.¹

Since board member-superintendent relationships are of central importance to educational governance it is desirable to understand phenomena which affect those

relationships. Conflict is imperfectly understood, potentially disruptive, and inherently threatening. It is, therefore, especially deserving of study.

According to Pondy:

Few students of social and organizational behavior have treated conflict as a natural phenomenon to be studied primarily because of scientific curiosity about its nature and form, its causes, and its effects. Most frequently, the study of conflict has been motivated by a desire to resolve it and to minimize its deleterious effects on the psychological health of organizational participants and the efficiency of organizational performance.¹

This statement helps to explain some of the fear and mismanagement which commonly accompany conflict. Pondy's statement suggests that a problem analysis and definition are essential to conflict resolution.

**Statement of the problem.** The problem addressed in this study was that of determining whether board member-superintendent belief systems, role perceptions, and perceptions of community inputs mediated by and through the board of education operated interactively or independently as they affected board member-superintendent conflict, and if these factors were sufficient to explain board member-superintendent conflict.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Conflict. Pois believes that too much or too little conflict may contribute to dysfunction as the board and superintendent attempt to transact business and set policy for the school system. Individual actors or sub-groups who consistently find themselves on the losing side in conflict situations tire of losing. As a result they may withdraw physically or psychologically, or they may assume a fighting posture. These responses all pose severe threats to group productivity. "Inflexibility and undue deference are both qualities that make the relationship devoid of true usefulness."¹

According to Pondy,² there has been a tendency on the part of organizational theorists to treat conflict as an organizational impediment, or, in an economic context, to treat conflict as an organizational cost. Pondy suggests that conflict as a phenomenon, however, is valueless until it is placed in a context within which it may be evaluated as to its organizational functions or dysfunctions.³

² Pondy, op. cit. p. 309.
³ Ibid. p. 319.
Boulding believes that a theoretical model of conflict can assist in understanding why some conflict processes seem to be creative and to have built-in processes of resolution. Such a model can also help to explain why other conflict processes "become clearly destructive and pathological."¹

The foregoing discussion suggests that conflict as a phenomenon may have effects on an organization which range along a continuum from extremely negative to extremely positive.

Campbell² has pointed out the potential for role conflict in his elaboration of the Getzels-Guba Social Interaction Model. He has pointed out three broad categories of administrative behavior which suggest possible sources of conflict. The administrator may behave in a way which emphasizes the needs of individuals as they function within an organization, he may emphasize the achievement of organizational goals, or he may attempt to integrate individual needs and organizational goals. In terms of this particular model, the administrator may


experience role conflict, role-personality conflict, or personality conflict.

Conflict is a ubiquitous phenomenon. Its existence between aspects of an individual's personality, between and within individuals, groups and organizations is axiomatic. Having said this, and in view of the fact that the potential for conflict exists in the relationships between and among board members and superintendents, certain kinds of research directions seem appropriate. Gross has suggested one potentially productive research endeavor.

In his investigation, Gross discovered a number of relationships between board member-superintendent characteristics and beliefs and the tendency for board members and superintendents to view each other positively. He was led to conclude that the superintendent's role deserved additional investigation. He specified the need to objectively examine the "dilemmas, pressures and conflicts which attend the job of the superintendent."¹

McCoy's research serves as one response to Gross¹ plea for investigations related to the effects of conflict on the superintendent. McCoy applied the Coleman Model

in his assessment of six conflict episodes. Conflict components were identified which were described as being "most generalizable." McCoy found that system-internal conflict issue sources, focus on power and authority, perceived management errors, change in opinion climate, the tendency for the legally constituted authority to become the defendant, and the emergence of previously suppressed issues were common to the six conflict episodes examined. He also discovered that new and different issues emerged, that outside powers intervened, that the school system was unable to solve internal problems, and that the mass media appeared to significantly affect the course of the conflict in all cases.

The Case Study Approach. In view of these findings it has seemed appropriate to initiate a micro-analytic study, or an investigation in-depth of one set of overtly conflictive board member-superintendent relationships. The appropriateness of a micro-analytic or case study approach to the investigation was supported by its extensive use in the literature of business organizations;

---


e.g., the case studies of the Harvard Graduate School of Business, Guest's Organizational Change: The Effects of Successful Leadership, and other extant examples of a similar generic type.

According to van Dalen,

A case study makes an intensive investigation on the complex factors that contribute to the individuality of a social unit—a person, family, group, social institution, or community. Through the use of a number of research tools, pertinent data about the unit's present status, past experiences, and relationships with the environment are studied. After probing deeply into the factors and forces that condition its behavior and analyzing the sequences and interrelationships of these factors, one can construct a comprehensive, integrated picture of the unit as it functions in society.¹

Additionally:

Through word descriptions...[the case study] reveals a wealth of enlightening information that a quantitative study might not be able to produce.²

According to Cunningham, "Research into what is begs careful examination and observation of the phenomena; its focus must be on the situation, the event, or the

²Ibid. p. 199.
Further support for the case method is given by the following.

Case study method emphasizes the total situation or combination of factors, the description of the process or sequence of events in which the behavior occurs, the study of individual behavior in its total setting, and the analysis and comparison of cases leading to the formulation of hypotheses.2

Objectives of the study. The major objectives of this study were:

1. To provide an extensive expository account of a two year period of conflictive interaction between and among a superintendent and board of education as the interactions were reported by board members and superintendent, evidenced in policy votes of the board, and reported by selected non-participant observers and in local newspaper accounts.

2. To determine whether board member-superintendent belief systems, role perceptions and perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education operated interactively or independently as they affected board member-superintendent conflict, and to determine whether these factors were sufficient to explain board member-superintendent conflict.


RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The major question of the study was this: Does the conflict evidenced by one board of education and superintendent have its roots in differences in belief systems, differences in role perceptions, and in perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education? Furthermore, do these three variables operate independently or interactively to engender conflict, and are they sufficient to explain existing conflict?

Specific major and subsidiary questions relating to these issues were:

1. Do belief systems, role perceptions and perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education operate independently or interactively in the arousal and maintenance of board member-superintendent conflict?

   a. Will verbatim reports of board members, superintendent, and selected community observers be consistent or discrepant as they relate to the origins, development, and maintenance of board member-superintendent conflict over a two-year period?

   b. To what extent will these reports suggest that these three variables operated independently or interactively in the arousal and maintenance of conflict?
c. To what extent will an examination of board policy decisions suggest that the content of policy may arouse conflict, and to what extent may policy content be related to and subsumed under the three variables of interest?

d. To what extent will newspaper accounts of board member-superintendent interactions be consistent with participant and selected observer reports?

2. Are the factors described by the terms belief systems, role perceptions and perceived mediated community inputs sufficient to explain conflict which existed between and among board members and superintendent during the two year period examined?

a. Will an examination of the civic beliefs of board members and superintendent reveal substantial differences between and among individuals?

b. Will an examination of role perceptions held by board members and superintendent reveal substantial differences between and among individuals with regard to what constitutes "appropriate superintendent role" and "appropriate board member role"?

1. How congruent will assessments of board member and superintendent perception of "board member professionalism" be?

2. How congruent will board member perception among members of the degree of professionalism of board members be?

3. How congruent will board member and superintendent perception be regarding the superintendent's effectiveness in specific administrative task areas?
4. How congruent will board member perception among members be regarding the superintendent's effectiveness?

3. What additional factors seem to be involved which indicate a need for further study?
   a. Do the three variables postulated seem adequate to explain existing conflict during the two year period examined?
      1. Will an examination of board policy decisions indicate that certain issues which are independent of the variables of interest constitute separate sources of conflict, or are the variables of interest and policy inseparable?
      2. Will participant reports, selected observer reports, or newspaper accounts of board member-superintendent interaction suggest additional variables which contribute to conflictive relationships?
   b. If additional identifiable variables seem to incite board member-superintendent conflict, what are they?
   c. What need for further research is indicated?

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The board members and superintendent who served as the subjects of this research have been involved in mutually recognized, overt conflict.

2. The reports of individual participants in the conflict are valid sources of information for this study.
3. Conflict is assumed to be any situation in which at least two individuals serving as either board member or superintendent are in overt, mutually recognized disagreement over policy decision(s) made by the board.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Selection of subjects. This study provides an expository account of the recollections of four board members and one superintendent who have participated over a two year period in mutually recognized, overt conflict. The policy record of the board, the civic beliefs and role perceptions of participants were assessed and compared. The first major limitation, therefore, was that participants must have been involved in admitted conflict.

Four board members and the superintendent of one school system agreed to participate. Since it was necessary that prospective participants agree that they were involved in an ongoing conflict over the two year period to be examined, random selection was precluded. Only four of seven board members served as participants, but this was not regarded as an insurmountable obstacle, since two apparent board factions were represented by the board members who agreed to participate.

Time span. The second major limitation of the study
relates to the time span treated. Since it was the intent of the study to examine civic beliefs and role perceptions of participants and mediated community inputs in a common conflict experience, it was essential to limit the time span examined to that during which the board members and superintendent commonly served. This included the period from January, 1970, through December, 1971. Full records were available for the period in question.

**Generalizability of data.** The final limitation relates to the manner in which the findings, conclusions and recommendations of this study may be used.

Since the study was limited to an examination of one set of board member-superintendent relationships, no attempt will or should be made to generalize findings, conclusions and recommendations to any other board and/or superintendent. At best, the findings may be suggestive of anticipated conditions in districts where circumstances are sufficiently similar to warrant guarded projection and possible implications for preparation or in-service programs. The ability to generalize, however, is precluded by the non-representative nature of the sample.
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A case study approach comprised of five components was used. The five components were:

1. Board policy decisions from January, 1970 through December, 1971 were examined, and those which by virtue of nonconsensual voting pattern admitted possible conflict were subjected to analysis, along with those upon which the board unanimously agreed.

2. Newspaper accounts of incidents and issues related to board member-superintendent conflict during the two year period were examined.

3. Verbal accounts of conflictive board member-superintendent relationships experienced by the participants during a two-year period were recorded by the researcher in individual interviews.

4. Measures of board member-superintendent civic beliefs and self-other role perception were carried out in individual interviews.

   a. The instruments used in this component included:¹

   1. "The Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs"²

¹See Appendix, p. 219

2. Seven Functions of the Superintendent's Job
3. Seven Functions of the Superintendent's Job

Used in the Measure of School Board Adherence to Professional Standards

5. Verbal accounts of the two year period of conflictive board member-superintendent relationships were secured from selected community representatives in individual interviews. These selected representatives included two journalists familiar with the situation, one community leader identified by board members as a liberal non-participant observer, and one identified by board members as a conservative non-participant observer.

Gathering the data. The data gathering process was structured in a manner intended to provide information relevant to the five specified design components.

First, a two year record of board policy decisions was examined to determine those policies upon which the board failed to agree. When those specific issues which elicited dissensual votes were identified, those issues were subjected to a policy analysis, along with those upon which the board agreed.

2Ibid. p. 184.
Katz and Kahn have provided conceptualizations relating to decision making which made it possible to synthesize a policy analysis framework.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Origin Level²</th>
<th>Policy Time</th>
<th>Board's Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Span</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Supt's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type⁴</td>
<td>Against</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application of this framework to all of the policy decisions permitted the aggregation of policy decisions according to certain of the categories included within the framework and by voting pattern. Inferences concerning the relationship of voting pattern to policy


²Level of abstraction. Infra, pp. 145-146.

³Infra, pp. 148-150.

⁴Decisions originate, modify, or eliminate policy.
content were then drawn.

Second, newspaper accounts of incidents of a conflictive nature (using the postulated definition of conflict) were examined and arranged in appropriate chronological order for subsequent utilization in the report of the study.

Third, verbatim accounts of the four board member participants and superintendent were recorded by the researcher based upon the following request for information.

"Please recall to the best of your ability how your board and superintendent got involved in open disagreement over policies. Think back to January, 1970, and then think out loud about how the disagreement developed and maintained itself through December, 1971." (The request for information from the superintendent was modified to fit the recipient, i.e., "...recall...how you and the board...")

This constituted the structure for the initial stage of the interview. Extended monologues resulted from the preceding request.

When the participant had completed the perceived recollections of the two year period, a limited number of probes was used for the purpose of eliciting clarification or elaboration of points which were unclear to the
researcher, or which seemed to deserve elaboration in terms of the weight of information gathered from board minutes.

Fourth, the responses of participants to the instruments presented in design component four were secured as a final part of the interview procedure. The administration of these instruments permitted comparisons of role perceptions and patterns of civic belief which existed between and among the participants.

Fifth, verbatim reports were taken from the non-participant observers identified in component five of the design. The same request for information used with superintendent and board members was appropriately modified and used with all non-participant observers. Since the role perceptions and belief patterns of non-participant observers were not variables of interest, the role perception and civic belief instruments used with participants were not utilized with the non-participant observers.

**Treatment of data.** One of the major objectives of this study was the description of conflict phenomena. The initial treatment of the data consisted of reporting the recollections of participants, non-participant
observers and newspaper accounts in discrete subsections of chapter three. These subsections reflect an internal organization which closely approximates the original order of conflict events. Additionally, those policy decisions of the board which reflected differences of opinion by virtue of differences in voting pattern have been aggregated and reported along with consensual decisions in tabular form according to policy content in chapter three.

Additional implications regarding policy derived from the application of the analytic framework have been reported in expository form.

This treatment has enabled comparative analysis of participant verbal reports, non-participant observer reports, and newspaper accounts. Comparisons within each of these groups and among groups have been made for the purpose of identifying areas of agreement and disagreement relative to the origins, development, and maintenance of conflict. During the course of the comparative analysis an effort was made to identify cues which suggested that the influence of any of the three variables of interest, i.e., belief systems, role perceptions and perceived community inputs, played a substantial role in the development and maintenance of conflict.

The policy analysis enabled an assessment of the
relationship between policy content, disagreement evidenced in the board's voting pattern, and the reports from participants, non-participant observers and newspaper accounts.

Additionally, the results of the measures of participant role perception and civic beliefs have been compared, analyzed and interpreted for the purpose, first, of identifying differences among participants. Second, any differences identified have been compared with evidence obtained in the components described earlier for the purpose of examining relationships which exist between belief patterns, role perceptions and the patterns of conflict evidenced.

The comparative approach has been applied in a variety of ways. In questions involving similarities and differences the facts tend to speak for themselves; i.e., "Does the report of board member A agree with the report of board member B?" The answer was fairly easily determined.

In other instances, however, comparisons have been more cautiously approached. Questions having to do with abstract relationships relied more heavily for answers on the preponderance of evidence as interpreted by the researcher. The answers, when derived, tend to
be more tentative than those to relatively simple questions.

Finally, the question of the ability of the three variables of interest to serve as sufficient explanations for the conflict was addressed. At this point the researcher was forced into heavy reliance on interpretation. In order to address questions of sufficiency it was necessary to determine whether the phenomena described by the terms belief systems, role perception, and community inputs were sufficient individually or collectively to explain the Gestalt which is identified as board member-superintendent conflict.

Conclusions and recommendations have been drawn only where warranted by preponderant and convincing evidence. Where answers are lacking, questions have been left for other researchers to address.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Board member-superintendent relationships are crucial elements in the operation of school systems. Since comparatively little has been done in the area of board member-superintendent conflict, it follows logically that a more complete understanding of conflictive relationships will be of some benefit to several groups of people. A list of potentially interested parties would include
current members of boards of education and superintendents. Others who might benefit from a better understanding of board member-superintendent conflict are those in preparation programs leading to the superintendency, university personnel involved with preparation programs, members of professional organizations which serve board members and superintendents, and those who aspire to board membership. Finally, but certainly not last in order of importance are those who consented to serve as the subjects of this research. Perhaps the findings of this investigation will aid in the establishment of more productive and mutually enjoyable working relationships for them.

By systematically analyzing what has happened in one obvious instance of board member-superintendent conflict and by assessing the perceptions of the participants as to why certain things occurred as they did, a small beginning has been made in the direction of understanding. The results of this study may serve as the beginning of a wider-ranging effort to understand one of the key sets of relationships in the operation and governance of public schools, and as a source of hypotheses which are deserving of additional study.
The organization of the paper. Chapter one has introduced the study and the research design. Chapter two is a review of related literature. Chapter three contains the report of the data. The analysis of data and conclusions are reported in Chapter four. Chapter five includes recommendations and a summary of the study.
CHAPTER II

CONFLICT RELATED LITERATURE: A REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS

INTRODUCTION

A review of the literature of conflict is apt to have two primary effects on the reviewer. First, the plethora of discrete approaches to the phenomenon is of such magnitude that one cannot fail to be impressed by the variety. A second effect, which derives in great part from the first, is that the variety of treatments makes the selection of a utilitarian conceptual model upon which to base further research a difficult task.

In view of these kinds of constraints the present effort has been focused around the following tasks.

First, the essential elements of information gathered from the review of literature have been presented. These elements have been organized in a form which elaborates the relationships between and among definitions, types and models of conflict.

Second, since much of the literature and research is so specific that it is of limited conceptual assistance in the present effort, a synthesized conflict
model has been developed and presented. This model has drawn heavily upon a variety of sources, and has been developed for the purpose of providing a general conceptual framework. An effort was made to build sufficient logical strength into the model to permit conflict analysis which does not rely exclusively on discrete, micro-specific conflict types; i.e., role conflict, personality conflict, etc..

Finally, the relationships among the review of the literature, the synthesized model, and the present research effort have been discussed as a prelude to the third chapter.

CONFLICT

Much of the confusion which attends a consideration of the literature of conflict stems from differences in the definitions used by different writers and researchers. In one instance, conflict is defined as "a moment in the interacting of desires." ¹

Aubert has suggested that conflict is a state between two or more individuals which is characterized

by overt signs of antagonism. As a discrete definition of conflict this is more powerful than the first, in that it introduces explicitly some obvious manifestations of cross-purposes as being characteristic of conflict.

In a list of five "properties which are present in all social conflicts," Mack and Snyder included the following:

1. At least two parties (or analytically distinct units or entities) having some minimum degree of "contact" with and "visibility" to each other;

2. Mutually exclusive and/or mutually incompatible values and opposed values based on "resource scarcity" or on "position scarcity";

3. (a) Behaviors designed to destroy, injure, thwart, or otherwise control another party or parties, and (b) a relationship in which the parties can gain (relatively) only at each other's expense;

4. Mutually opposed actions and counteraction, and;

5. Attempts to acquire power (i.e., to gain control of scarce resources and positions) or to exercise power (i.e., to influence behavior in certain

---

1 Vilhelm Aubert, "Conflict and Dissensus: Two Types of Conflict and of Conflict Resolution," The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1, 2 (June, 1957), 27.
directions), or the actual acquisition or exercise of power. Mack and Snyder’s undefined use of the term "party" presents a possible definitional difficulty, i.e., what is a party? Boulding’s contention that parties to conflict may be persons, organizations or groups helps us to understand what it is that the term party identifies. At the same time, however, a moment’s reflection reveals that Mack and Snyder’s specification requiring one party to gain at the expense of the other(s) may be a conceptual error as it relates to conflict behavior. If one considers the possibility that conflictive behavior between two parties may result in bargaining and/or compromise, it is also apparent that, in the event of compromise, both parties give up something. This consideration is further illuminated by enlisting the help available in the terminology of game theory.


In Rapoport's view, compromise may involve sacrifices by two parties in conflict, but both parties may thereby gain something which would otherwise be unattainable.¹

According to Summers:

...it has been suggested...that when persons holding different views of the world are engaged in conflict, agreement by one person with the others' beliefs or values involves a potential "loss"...where such loss might range from power and authority to self-esteem. It might be further suggested that such ideological conflict between persons is often perceived as zero-sum; only one participant can win.²

Other examples of conflict definitions reveal "tentative" qualities. e.g.--"the collision of incompatible forces within the life-space."³ Psychological conflict has been defined as "a situation where the forces acting on the person are opposite in direction and about equal in strength."⁴ Boulding cites an


⁴Ibid.
additional example from Lewin and Miller which reflects
the use of tentative language.

When an individual is in an
equilibrium of forces in a part of
the field that is not in some sense
optimum for him, he is said to be
in conflict.¹

The pictures of the unwitting victim of conflict
conveyed by Lewin's definitions are not congruent with
others which evoke images of man willfully contending
with forces and/or others.

The tendency to define conflict as an actively
prosecuted phenomenon is apparent in the following.

In this paper the term conflict
denotes a clash of incompatible interests
between individuals and/or groups in
which two or more human beings or groups
actively seek to thwart each other's
purposes, to prevent satisfaction of
each other's interests.²

In this definition the active nature of conflict
is made explicit by the use of the terms "clash" and
"actively seek."

It is interesting to note that one of the most
frequently cited authorities refers to conflict in terms

¹Boulding, Conflict and Defense, p. 81.

²Edward J. Nussell, "Conflict and School-Community
Relations." (Paper presented at a meeting of the American
Educational Research Association, Los Angeles,
California, Feb. 6, 1969), p. 3.
of its intent, rather than attempting to define it. Georg Simmel, the authority cited, developed some of the early seminal thoughts available on the subject around the following:

Conflict is...designed to resolve divergent dualisms; it is a way of achieving some kind of unity even if it be through the annihilation of one of the conflicting parties.¹

The potential variety of conflict episodes which may be described by Simmel's description of the intent of conflict makes this a comprehensive and useful tool in a consideration of conflict.

This brief exploration of the role played by the definition of conflict in the literature of conflict has yielded two basic messages.

One--conflict appears in the literature reviewed as a term lacking in precise, universally applied definition. Two--a large proportion of the literature purporting to deal with conflict seems to have been developed under the assumption that there does exist, in fact, a more-or-less generally accepted definition of conflict. While making this assumption, however, this latter group of writers has not, for the most part,

provided explicit definitions of the phenomenon discussed. These tendencies combine in a fashion which implies a need for more precise, and conceptually tenable understanding of conflict.

TYPES OF CONFLICT

As a part of his effort to develop a conceptual framework upon which to build a general theory of social conflict, Fink summarized a variety of empirical and theoretical data.

Besides Dahrendorf's theory of class conflict, numerous other theories have appeared, covering such phenomena as community controversies, (Coleman, 1957), international conflict, (Koch, et. al., 1960 B; North et. al., 1960), revolution, (Davies, 1962; Johnson, 1966; Tanter and Midlarsky, 1967); war and revolution, (Timasheff, 1965), or intraorganization conflict, (Beals and Siegel, 1966; Goldman, 1966). But none of these theories has ever been adequately tested, let alone accorded the status of a generally accepted account of the phenomenon in its domain.¹

An understanding of the magnitude of conflict types is improved by further pointing out that Ross identified nine types of intergroup conflict; i.e., races, classes, 

sex groups, religious groups, generational, town-country, learned-ignorant, industrial and intraclass.¹ To add further to the enumeration of conflict types, Pink has included Mack and Snyder's designation of individuals, social classes, nations, groups, cultures, coalitions, personalities, organizations, organisms, and systems as potential participants in conflict.²

**Psychological and social conflict.** Bernard³ distinguished three conceptualizations of conflict; the social-psychological, the sociological, and the semanticist. In brief, the first of these conceptualizations reflects the involvement of individual mechanisms in conflict; the second, conflict relations between or among systems. The semanticist view holds that conflict in the sense of mutually incompatible values and goals does not exist.

In her expansion of these conceptualizations Bernard contends that the social-psychological approach

¹Ibid. p. 418.

²Ibid.

has been most thoroughly exploited in the literature, and that it had been expanded to treat both a rational and an irrational, or ill-health aspect of the individual mechanisms involved in conflict.

The sociological concept was viewed as being involved with some implicit theory of cost, which may also be viewed as economic conflict.¹

When Bernard states that (1) "mutually incompatible values do exist, and; (2) there is no unequivocal evidence that misunderstandings always lead to conflict," she presents arguments which are sufficiently compelling to severely question the credibility of the semanticist concept.²

Coser provisionally defined social conflict as a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure, or eliminate their rivals.³

¹The difficulty which is created by the interchangeable nature of conflict terminology is illustrated. Sociological and economic conflict may reference the same phenomenon if individuals or groups are vying for scarce resources, or if defeat for one contending party imposes a cost.

²Bernard, et. al., The Nature of, p. 42.

Here again, conflict is characterized as a struggle over items which are scarce.\(^1\)

It is of further interest to cite a qualifying note which Coser inserted in his discussion.

Conflict, as distinct from hostile attitudes or sentiments, always takes place in interaction between two or more persons. Hostile attitudes are predispositions to engage in conflict behavior; conflict, on the contrary, is always a trans-action.\(^2\)

Boulding, in contrast to Coser, gives considerable weight to the credibility of a personality conflict theory, and expands the rationale for such a theory by using the Buridan's Ass analogy.\(^3\)

In speaking to the same general set of conditions, Levinger says that Lewin outlined three dynamically different cases of psychological conflict.

Situation A, plus-plus conflict, places the person midway between two equally attractive alternatives. Situation B, minus-minus conflict, presents alternatives which, on the one hand, may consist of the performance of

\(^{1}\)James D. Thompson ("Organizational Management of Conflict," The Planning of Change), says that "Questions about reward and resource allocation lead unswervingly to feelings of relative deprivation despite the possible existence of official standards. Feelings of relative deprivation may lead to conflict." (p. 452). Boulding (Conflict and Defense), says that economic conflict arises from scarcity of goods. (p. 192).

\(^{2}\)Coser, The Functions, p. 35.

\(^{3}\)Boulding, Conflict and Defense, pp. 81-83.
a noxious task, and, on the other acceptance of punishment. Situation C, plus-minus conflict involves incompatible forces stemming from the same goal region.\(^1\) Boulding described this third type by saying that the ass may confront a situation in which a skunk is perched atop a bale of hay. The hay attracts, the skunk repels!\(^2\)

The implication of the evidence gleaned from the literature is that psychological conflict must be included in a list of types. It has been characterized as conflict which the individual may experience and engage in apart from involvement with any other individual.

**Role.** According to Boulding, an organization is a structure of units called roles.\(^3\) Having said this, it is interesting to observe that Boulding did not include role conflict in the list of conflict types which he selected to discuss in *Conflict and Defense*. Nevertheless, its treatment elsewhere in the literature suggests that role conflict merits discussion here.

---

\(^1\)Levinger, "Lewin's Approach," pp. 244-246.


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 146.
At the outset, it seems essential that any discussion of role conflict should evolve from a definitive understanding of the term role. Katz and Kahn say that

Role...will refer to a set (of one or more recurrent activities out of a total pattern of interdependent activities) within a single office.¹

Kahn and Wolfe have written:

Each job (role) in an organization may be thought of as defined by the expectations, predictions, and behavior sent in related jobs.²

These two definitions, both of which rely on Kahn's thinking, combine to describe "role" as a phenomenon which involves patterned activities and sent expectations.

Additional clarity is provided by expanding the concept to the level referred to by Katz and Kahn as a "role episode."

They have stated that four concepts constitute a role episode.


1. Role expectations—evaluative standards applied to the personal behavior of the occupant of an organizational office or position.

2. Sent role—communications from members of a role set sent as attempts to influence the focal person.

3. Received role—focal person's perceptions of messages (expectations) sent, including those sent by himself.

4. Role behavior—response of the focal person to information and influence received.¹

Combining the two definitions previously cited with the concepts included in the characteristics of "role episode", it becomes possible to present a picture of "role" which is intuitively acceptable. The example used is the relationship described by the terms board of education and superintendent.

The board-superintendent relationship constitutes a subsystem of the organization defined as the "school system". The "role" of the board member and the "role" of the superintendent are interdependent and they are each described in terms of an office. Although agreement is not absolute, sufficient common understanding of what constitutes the discrete offices exists to stipulate that each role involves recurrent, identifiable activities.

¹Katz and Kahn, Social Psychology, p. 182.
i.e., the superintendent generally is involved with activities having to do with administering and recommending policy. The board member generally works in the realm of evaluating and approving policy.

One major affective variable exists which may exercise considerable influence over a role as it is performed by an incumbent. This variable relates directly to the question, "who may define roles?" and is described by the word legitimacy.

In their discussion of the legitimacy of expectations, Gross, Mason and McEachern concluded:

An expectation may be considered by the person for whom it is held to be legitimate or illegitimate. A legitimate expectation is one which the incumbent of a focal position feels others have a right to hold. An illegitimate expectation is one which he does not feel others have a right to hold. An expectation which is felt to be legitimate will be called a perceived obligation. One which is felt to be illegitimate will be called a perceived pressure.¹

Role conflict. According to Gross, Mason and McEachern:

Any situation in which the incumbent of a focal position perceives that he is

confronted with incompatible expectations will be called a role conflict.¹

Katz and Kahn have identified four basic types of role conflict. These types are; intrasender, intersender, interrole, and person-role.²

Intrasender role conflict describes a situation in which expectations from a single role sender may be incompatible. In the case of intersender conflict, expectations from one sender conflict with those of another sender or senders. Interrole conflict involves the sent expectations of one role being in conflict with the expectations of another role played by the same actor. Person-role conflict derives from the violation of the needs, values and capacities of the role incumbent by the requirements of the role. Katz and Kahn suggest that other types of role conflict may develop from these four basic types.³ e.g., Role overload, or the receipt of more legitimate sent expectations than the incumbent is capable of accomplishing physically comprises one type of person-role conflict.

¹Ibid. p. 248.
³Ibid. p. 185.
In their description of factors contributing to a lack of role consensus, Lipham, Gregg and Rossmiller have cited phenomena which are not entirely consistent with the definitions and specific types of role conflict discussed to this point.

They postulate the following factors:

(1) Disagreement in expectations for a given role incumbent and the several reference groups having a right to define the role; (2) disagreement among the several reference groups; (3) disagreements within any one of the reference groups; (4) differences in perception regarding any one of these types of agreement. 1

Attention should be called to the fact that these authors, rather than identifying conflict as the variable of interest in the extant case, spoke of a lack of consensus. This example highlights the use of terminology characterized by conceptual continua. i.e., rather than consensus being the opposite of conflict, it is, in some treatments, one end of a conflict continuum, characterized by an absence of conflict. The example represents a potentially confusing, but not untenable use of terminology.

In the introduction to the published version of two speeches presented at a workshop for board members, some of the negative effects of a conflict between administrators and board members were pointed out. Further attention was devoted to pointing out the conflict which is sometimes aroused because of the friction in the interface between administrative leadership and board member prerogative. The speaker ultimately characterized role conflicts as conflicts stemming from change.¹

Comments in the body of the papers elaborate on the importance of mutual confidence and trust, the demarcation line between policy-making and administration, the lay-professional dichotomy, and other areas which may be said to relate to role conflict. The effects of the original definition, however, remain stamped in the consciousness of the reader. Role conflict and change become synonymous. Conflict is undesirable, therefore change must be bad because it leads to conflict. Should the speaker have talked about change, or would a clearer understanding of role conflict have been established by addressing the effects of differences in role expectation and the

possibility of such differences leading to role conflict? The question really provides its own answer. Clearly, a need exists for the more universal application of a logically derived, conceptually correct typology of conflict terminology.

This section will be terminated by illustrating Spiegel's description of what he refers to as "role sorting."

He has said that roles may be ascribed. A person is female, young, healthy, etc. Roles may be achieved, as through licensure, contract or appointment. They may be adopted, through suggestion, application of sanction, voluntary modelling, etc., or they may be assumed, which in Spiegel's terms, may allude to the playful adoption of roles.¹

The board member and superintendent occupy roles which are defined, first, in terms of office. Either role may be "achieved" through election or appointment, but each is further defined by formalized codes, rules, policies, and other groups of expectations sent by role senders literally too numerous to mention. Furthermore, the role of the superintendent and board member are constantly being re-defined by changes in sent expectations.

The potential for role conflict inherent in the relationship between formally codified expectations and the less formal expectations which are fed into the superintendent-board role set is great. The setting adds its own special complications to the role relationships existing between and among board members and superintendent. Federal admonitions advocating desegregation clash with the perceived need for local control and affection for the neighborhood school concept. The board member and superintendent who may, in another time, have felt that they "knew" their roles are faced with environmental ambiguities which force constant redefinition of roles. The uncertainty which grows from ambiguity feeds the potential for conflict in the board-superintendent interface.

CONFLICT MODELS

Conflict models have been arbitrarily grouped in one of four categories. Model groups have been designated as (1) Semantic—those made up substantially or entirely of word descriptions; (2) Diagrammatic—those consisting of geometric shapes (usually containing verbal descriptions) and curved or straight lines indicating direction and nature of relationship(s); (3) Mathematical—those utilizing equations for purposes of illustrating conflict propensities and interaction modes, and; (4) Matrices—
usually arranged in a manner to show the interaction of two phenomena; i.e., groups with goals, social unit with inter-unit relationships arranged along two axes in individual matrix cells.

The examples included may also be thought of as belonging to one of two larger classifications; i.e., conflict models may be static—descriptive of a physical state at a given moment without regard for a change in state over time, or dynamic—illustrative of effects of environmental change and/or interaction over time.¹

**Semantic models.** Boulding contends that a general conceptual framework holds in both the static and dynamic models of conflict. Beginning at this point, strong arguments may be generated which support a general semantic model of conflict which describes the phenomenon.

¹Boulding, (Conflict and Defense, p. 2), says there are two broad types of any system—static and dynamic. "In developing an elementary static theory of conflict, an image of the field and the value ordering of each party can be assumed. In dynamic theory this is not true." p. 9. He describes dynamic conflict as a series of reaction processes—processes in which movement on the part of one party so changes the field of the other that it forces a movement on the part of the other, which in turn changes the field of the first, forcing another move, etc.. pp. 24-25.
1. The party.

A party is a behavior unit—an aggregate or organization capable of assuming a number of different positions while retaining a common boundary. Conflict requires at least two parties.

2. Behavior space.

The position of a behavior unit defined by a set of values of a set of variables which are capable of being simply ordered.

3. Competition.

Mutual incompatibility of any potential positions of two behavior units.

4. Conflict.

Competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future position and in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the others.

5. Boundary of possibility.

Limitations on the possible positions occupiable imposed by physical, psychological, legal and financial restrictions.

Kahn and others have implied that a model of conflict-prone organizational roles is comprised of three components, or "kinds of role requirements." Such

---

1Boulding, Conflict and Defense, pp. 2-5.
roles are characterized by:

1. The requirement for crossing organizational boundaries.
2. The requirement for producing innovative solutions to nonroutine problems.
3. The requirement for being responsible for the work of others.¹

Thompson has placed his consideration of organizational conflict in a larger framework by stating:

We have hypothesized that organizations face three types of potential conflict, that each rests on a different set of conditions, and that for each there is an appropriate defense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Conflict</th>
<th>Source of Conflict</th>
<th>Defense Device</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative allocation</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent roles</td>
<td>Labor force</td>
<td>Recruitment and selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing pressures</td>
<td>Task environment</td>
<td>Organizational posture²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thompson has made no claims that this framework may or should serve as a model of organizational conflict.


It is of some interest, however, to make a momentary assumption that the framework is a model, and then to examine it in terms of its ability to explain organizational conflict clearly and unambiguously.

It must be pointed out initially that Thompson has followed the same path chosen by other organizational theorists from the world of business: i.e., Conflict threatens the integrity of the organization, is counterproductive, and therefore bad. Simmel and Coser have waged a spirited disputation of this point, but the fact remains that Thompson follows the business organization pattern in terms of the implicit assumption made concerning the effects of conflict. ¹

Kahn and others have formulated a framework which, either by itself or in comparison with Thompson's framework has apparent logical strengths. In their discussion of core and derivative problems related to organizational stress, they identified three types of core problems which are commonly recognized as potential sources of

¹Coser has suggested that the relationship of the researcher to the decision maker has caused a tendency to treat conflict in the business organization as a dysfunctional phenomenon. "The decision makers are engaged in maintaining, and, if possible, strengthening the organizational structures through and in which they exercise power and influence. Whatever conflicts occur within these structures will appear to them to be dysfunctional." (The Functions of Social Conflict, pp. 22-27).
stress.

1. Intrapsychic difficulty acted out in work environment.

2. Mismatch between role requirements and occupant capabilities.

3. Objective environmental problems.¹

This "model of organizational stress" is readily applicable to the board-superintendent relationship.

The final example of a semantic model of conflict used for the purposes of this discussion is taken from Coleman's Community Conflict.² The Coleman model is obviously dynamic in its total treatment, and, although it is described by Coleman in terms of community conflict, it seems reasonable to suggest that it has utility in other conflict settings as well.³ The example included here represents Coleman's conceptualization of the involuntary processes involved in shifting issues during the process of conflict.

¹Kahn, et. al., Organizational Stress, pp. 338-339.


³McCoy's investigation of components of conflict resident in the school superintendency suggested that the Coleman conceptualization was quite congruent with what actually happened in conflict episodes involving school superintendents. (Supra, p. 7.)
(1) Initial single issue. 

(2) Disrupts equilibrium of community relations. 

(3) Allows previously suppressed issues against opponent to appear. 

(4) More and more of opponent's beliefs enter into the disagreement. 

(5) The opponent appears totally bad. 

(6) Charges against opponent as a person. 

(7) Dispute becomes independent of initial disagreement. 

Coleman's conceptualization suggests that, where an overt community conflict exists, a series of apriori events have occurred. In instances of extant, rancorous, apparently unsolvable community conflict, this model has considerable explanatory strength. Coleman's review of past conflicts supports the model. 

It is obvious that the model does not treat the possibility of resolution occurring at some point during the process as a feature of the model. In his introductory comments, however, Coleman said:

One caution is necessary; we do not mean to suggest that nothing can be done
about community controversy once it begins. To the contrary, the dynamics of controversy can be interrupted and diverted—either by conscious action or by existing conditions in the community. As a result, although the same dynamic tendencies of controversy are found in every case, the actual development in particular cases may differ widely.¹

Diagrammatic models. In the first of the models presented, Mazur has illustrated what he believes to be the triadic status quo under conflict conditions characterized by high arousal.²

\[
\begin{align*}
&TED \\
&+ \\
&\Delta \\
&- \\
&EGO \\
&MAX
\end{align*}
\]

In his discussion of nonrational theories Mazur suggests that the nonrational models preclude any practical applications of quantitative treatments because of the tendency of involved parties to respond emotionally, rather than in terms of any maximizing principle. There is a compelling underlying logic to Mazur's rationale.

¹Coleman, Community Conflict, p. 10.
The preceding example illustrates, for instance, that in cases where Ego and Ted are bound by strong affective ties, Ego's response to Max will tend to take the same form as that which Ego perceives Ted's response to Max to be. Mazur explains this tendency in terms of Heider's theory of balance, which involves the notion that Ego tends to like whom his friend likes, but dislike whom his enemy likes. Ego also tends to dislike whom his friend dislikes and like whom his enemy dislikes.\(^1\)

Kee and Knox\(^2\) have illustrated the ambiguity and difficulty encountered in a consideration of trust and suspicion. They have pointed out the natural tendency to impute good to trust and bad to suspicion, but they quickly suggest that the Aristotelian Fallacy should not apply. Trust and suspicion are not opposite sides of the same coin. Is not blind trust (read "consensus") sometimes psychologically dysfunctional, just as a bit of suspicion (read "conflict") may provide leavening for many relationships?

Kahn and Wolfe have treated the conceptual problems

\(^1\)Ibid. p. 198.

involved with a model of reactions to role conflict variables in ways which have resulted in a relatively simple, yet elegant model.

Variables Involved in Reactions to Role Conflict

Interpersonal Relations: Power, Trust, Respect, Liking, Hostility, etc.

Role pressures from the environment are experienced as Experienced conflict, pressures, tension and are handled by Reactions to felt stress: coping responses

Personality Factors

*Curved arrows mean "affect or modify" Straight arrows are sequences

Pondy has developed a model of the dynamics of a conflict episode which he has treated in an organizational context.

The Dynamics Of A Conflict Episode

---

Consideration of this model in terms of the board-superintendent organization has been of interest. The board and superintendent may be placed conceptually in a "conflict aftermath" posture. Certain amounts of suspicion and mistrust characterize interpersonal relationships which exist among two or more incumbents. (latent conflict). A triggering mechanism (environmental effects, organizational and extra-organizational tensions) causes a member or members of the relationship to feel conflict. Organizational and personal mechanisms (suppression and attention-focus) come into play and cause perception or recognition of conflict. When this happens, conflict may erupt into a manifest state, which is then treated according to the needs and goals of the organization.

**Mathematical models.** A review of conflict literature must treat mathematical models of conflict, however briefly, for the sake of completeness. The mathematical models of conflict have their greatest use in pure theoretical considerations of conflict. They are seen as being of only limited value in the present study because of the problems of quantification involved.

Boulding has explained the efforts of parties in conflict to occupy the same position at the same time
In his summary of conclusions following an analysis of Richardson processes, Boulding wrote:

...The basic parameters of the particular equilibrium curves are (1) the initial hostility, (2) the initial reaction coefficient, and (3) the rate of change of the reaction coefficient with increase in hostility. This implies, of course, what is not in general strictly true, that the particular equilibrium curve can be described by a quadratic equation such as $h_1=H_1 + (r_1-m_1h_2)h_2$. Here, $h_1$ and $h_2$ are the hostility levels of parties 1 and 2. Then, for party 1, $H_1$ is the initial hostility, $r_1$ the initial reaction coefficient, and $m_1$ the decline in reaction coefficient per unit increase in $h_2$, or the rate of diminishing returns in the reaction coefficient. If there are no diminishing returns ($m_1=0$), the reaction functions are linear ($h_1=H_1+r_1h_2$ and $h_2=H_2+r_2h_1$). Solving these two equations we get

$$h_1 = \frac{H_1 + k_1H_2}{1 - r_1r_2} \quad h_2 = \frac{H_2 + k_2H_1}{1 - r_1r_2}$$

It is clear that, the greater the initial hostilities and the greater the reaction coefficients, the greater the equilibrium level of hostility. Xenophobia and touchiness both lead to high levels of hostility. As long as $r_1r_2 < 1$, there will be some position

---

Richardson's equations, named for their inventor, say that the rate of change of hostility of each party is a constant, less a certain proportion of the hostility of that party, plus a certain proportion of the level of the hostility of the other party. (Boulding, Conflict and Defense, p. 28).
of equilibrium, no matter how great the initial hostilities. If...
\[ r_1 r_2 > 1 \], there will be no position of equilibrium.¹

The seminal point of this discussion, indeed, of the model itself, is that mathematical models of the aforementioned type have the theoretical capacity to explain the dynamics of interaction in terms of rates of change in hostility level. This is an exceedingly important feature of models which are capable of aiding an understanding of the dynamics of conflict, quantification problems notwithstanding. Conflict interactions are "fed" over time not only by interpersonal differences, but by the conflict process, itself. Some mathematical models have the capacity to illustrate a total interaction.

Other mathematical models are strikingly different from those just discussed. Patchen has distinguished three major types of theoretical models dealing with "influence" action. According to Patchen,

Cognitive models view the action of A as depending on A's perception about the future results of his action, which, in turn, often depend partly on his expectations about the future action of B.

¹Boulding, Conflict and Defense, pp. 35-36.
Training models view A's actions as depending largely on the previous outcomes of the combination of A's and B's past action. Reaction process models view each of A's actions as being an almost automatic response to B's last actions, based on A's own characteristics and propensities.\(^1\)

While remembering that Patchen cites shortcomings of cognitive models, i.e., their focus on choice behavior, lack of concern with when agreement will be reached, and lack of operationalization and testing,\(^2\) it is, nevertheless, helpful to examine one example of a cognitive model.

Patchen has credited Porsholt for the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad M + pG > 0 \\
(2) & \quad M + qG > 0
\end{align*}
\]

Where:

- \(M\) is the utility to the aggressor of using this means (struggle);
- \(\bar{M}\) is the utility to the defender of using this means (struggle);
- \(G\) is the utility to the aggressor of reaching his goal;


\(^2\)Ibid. p. 397.
$T$ is the utility to the defender of reaching his goal;

$p$ is the probability of victory for the aggressor according to his own belief (values from 0 to 1);

$q$ is the probability of victory for the defender according to his own belief.

According to this model, in order for conflict to occur, the overall value of struggle for both sides must be greater than zero.¹

It is reasonable to suggest that this model has considerable value for conflict theory. Again, quantification problems are considerable, but as a static, mathematical representation of conflict probability, the model is valuable.

Matrices. Although the matrix has been used sparingly for illustrating conflict relationships in the literature surveyed, it seems sufficiently valuable as an illustrative tool to warrant inclusion in this discussion.

Marwell has focussed on what he calls the major kind of group conflict which results whenever group members consider group action. The result, called cleavage, occurs when two or more group members request

¹Ibid. pp. 395-396.
opposing group decisions over proposed action.¹

He has used three differentiating concepts to construct a systematic cleavage paradigm. i.e., (1) The Bales-Parsons contention that system equilibrium is dependent upon adaption, integration, goal attainment and pattern maintenance; (2) the distinction between means-ends in goal movement as; disputes resulting from incongruent group member goals; disagreements resulting from disagreements or agreement on means; (3) the qualifying assumption that a proposal requires some group action; the proposal is simple; it is distinct—may be accepted or rejected; comparatively disinterested group members are not party to the generation of dissensus.²

A second matrix-type illustration has been developed by combining two basic dichotomies. The vertical axis displays individual and collective levels, and the horizontal axis displays intrasystem and intersystem


²Ibid. pp. 428-430.
conflict. The matrix takes the following form:  

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc}
\text{Individual Level} & \text{Intrasytem Conflict} & \text{Intersystem Conflict} \\
\hline
\text{Intrapersonal} & \text{Interpersonal} \\
\text{Collective Level} & \text{e.g. Intranational} & \text{e.g. International}
\end{array}
\]

This model may be applied to the board-superintendent relationship, but not without some conceptual difficulties. A final example has been selected for inclusion which seems, on its face, to present a more complete picture of social conflict.

Dahrendorf's classification\(^2\) of social conflicts is modelled on industrial societies, and is based not only on structural levels, but also on structural relations between parties.

---

\(^1\)Fink, "Some Conceptual Difficulties." 421.

\(^2\)Ibid. 419.
According to Fink, Dahrendorf has reduced the fifteen potential types of conflict by grouping phenomena into six main types. (1) **Role conflicts**—top row. (2) **Compe-
tition—cells 4 and 7. (3) Proportion struggle—cell 10. 
(4) Class conflicts—cells 5, 8, and 11. (5) Minority 
conflict and deviation—cells 6, 9, and 12; and (6) Inter-
national conflicts—bottom row. ¹

SYNTHESIZED MODEL

Introduction. The final portion of this chapter has 
been included for the purpose of providing a reasonably 
precise, parsimonious conceptualization of "conflict". It 
has become apparent that conflict has been treated in such 
a variety of ways, and from such disparate points of view 
that a conceptualization of the term is presently charac-
terized by ambiguity and elusiveness. As Pink² has 
suggested, however, it does seem possible to synthesize 
a conflict model and a conceptualization of the phenomenon 
which are sufficiently comprehensive to enhance the 
observation and analysis of conflict.

During the process of reviewing some eighty pieces 
of literature as a prelude to the development of this 
chapter, certain common themes and conceptual "threads"

¹Ibid. p. 420.
²Supra, p. 32, Pink, for a comprehensive discussion 
of the need for, and some of the difficulties attending 
the attempts to formulate a general conflict theory.
emerged on a sufficiently frequent basis to form a conceptual Gestalt related to conflict. This Gestalt seems on its face to be sufficiently strong to withstand intuitive tests of its ability to "explain" conflict from a theoretical point of view.

It is possible to attach an almost-inexhaustable list of qualifying modifiers to the term conflict. If this is done, it follows logically that an almost-inexhaustable number of conflict theories may exist. From a theoretical point of view it seems that the analysis of conflict would be aided by refining the potentially lengthy list of conflict types into theories into its most concise form.

The attempt which has been made here to accomplish such a refinement has taken the following form.

First, a definition of conflict has been selected for inclusion which is conceptually strong. To this base, prerequisites for conflict, types of conflict, conflict modes and a conflict model have been added which seem to comprise a logical, conceptually complete "theory".

Definition. The definition of conflict provided by Boulding¹ has been selected for inclusion here on the basis of parsimony and ability to explain conflict

¹Supra, p. 46.
phenomena in relatively simple, utilitarian terms.

Conflict is:

Competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions and in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other.

Several elements of this definition deserve elaboration. First, the term competition connotes the active nature of participants in conflict. Parties compete. Second, awareness of incompatibility seems to be an essential ingredient in conflict. In the absence of awareness as the part of parties to conflict, conflict will be latent, rather than active. Third, the phrase "wishes to occupy" conveys the impression of willful action which, on the basis of the literature surveyed, also seems to be an essential ingredient of conflict.

Prerequisites. In order for the definition of conflict to have practical utility it is necessary that it be based on certain conceptually sufficient premises, or prerequisites for conflict. These prerequisites have also been taken from Boulding's work.¹ For the purposes of this discussion the components have been re-ordered from that in which they originally appeared.

¹Ibid.
The following elements, referred to here as prerequisites, constitute the minimum conditions for conflict.

1. The Party.

A party is a behavior unit—an aggregate or organization capable of assuming a number of different positions while retaining a common boundary. Conflict requires at least two parties.

At this point, an explicit understanding of "party" is essential. A behavior unit, for the purpose of this discussion, is defined as any of the following: discrete elements of an individual personality or combination of individual personality elements; a person; an aggregation of individuals; organized groups of individuals; i.e., a school board, a faction of a board, a political party, etc..

The final sentence in the definition of "party" is also noteworthy. Two parties are required for conflict. That is, at least two competing elements of an individual personality, at least two individuals, at least two aggregates of individuals, at least two groups, or at least two organizations are necessary for conflict.

2. Competition.

Mutual incompatibility of any potential positions of two behavior units.

If parties are to engage in conflictful behavior
competition is essential. Note that the definition of competition relates to mutual incompatibility (between and among parties) of potential positions. The element of competition is an essential element of the conflict definition mentioned earlier.

3. Behavior space.

The position of a behavior unit defined by a set of values of a set of variables which are capable of being simply ordered.

Simply stated, behavior space refers to the parameters which define the behavior of a party to conflict in terms of the order of priorities which the party attaches to the potential position(s) for which the party is competing.

4. Boundary of possibility.

Limitations on the possible positions occupable imposed by physical, psychological, legal and financial restrictions.

This element is closely related to behavior space, but it is also distinct from behavior space in that the boundary of possibility is viewed as environmental constraints which define the behavior of parties. Behavior space, on the other hand, is self-determined by parties.

Types. The plethora of conflict types observed in the literature, i.e., economic, international, equal
versus equal, superordinate versus subordinate, etc., may be subsumed under two basic types.

The first distinct, major type is referred to here as **psychological conflict**. Included under this umbrella are all of the so-called intrapersonal conflicts to which individuals are subject due to internal competition. Conflicts stemming from differences in elements of an individual's personality, role conflicts which are not communicated to others, and similar generic types of conflict which remain confined within an individual may be defined broadly as psychological conflict.

The second major type of conflict which is logically tenable in terms of a general theory of conflict is **social conflict**. All of the major types of interpersonal conflict are capable of accommodation under this broad definition. Interpersonal conflict between two individuals, conflict between two aggregates, groups, societies, states, nations etc., involve social interaction—hence, the term social conflict.

Convincing arguments may be mounted which favor the inclusion of role conflict as a third major type. The sheer volume of the written material related to role conflict in the literature, in fact, supports such an argument. For the sake of definitional parsimony, however, it is contended that no irreparable harm is inflicted on
conflict theory by subsuming role conflict under the two major conflict types mentioned previously. It is further contended that such subsumption actually strengthens the definition of conflict types in terms of conceptual utility.

Modes. Having just argued that there seems to be considerable intuitive strength in conceptualizing conflict under two major headings, one relating exclusively to the individual, the other relating to two or more involved individuals or groups, it now seems essential to address the problem which attends the rules under which conflicts are acted out.

In this regard Rapoport\textsuperscript{1} has provided a helpful conceptual framework. He has characterized conflict as fights, games, and debates. For the purposes of this discussion it has been deemed helpful to synthesize a theory of conflict around the concepts of type and mode. Type, it has been pointed out, refers to the nature of the involvement of parties in conflict. The specific major types of involvement have been defined as psychological and social.

Rapoport's first type, fights, referred to here as

\textsuperscript{1}Supra, p. 29.
the first mode of conflict, defines conflict in which one party intends to utterly defeat another in order to occupy some mutually incompatible position. A fight is a conflict which is acted out in the absence of rules, and without regard for the safety of the parties to the conflict.

Rapoport's second conflict type, referred to here as mode two, is game conflict. A game conflict, as the term implies, is acted out according to explicit rules which the parties to conflict accept. A "social rule" might consist of—"one party may not physically harm another." Or, in the case of some social organizations, conflict behavior may be governed by organizational rules of compromise, as is frequently the case in union-management conflict.

The third conflict "mode", Rapoport's debates, references conflict in which one party attempts to convince the other of the rightness of the position of the first. As a conflict mode, debate is viewed as mild conflict. The element of competition is certainly present, but the outcome of the conflict is not viewed as being as critical to the future welfare of conflicting parties as in the two previous modes.

Model. Having come this far in the consideration of conflict some may be tempted to dismiss the total effort because of allegations of undue license taken with
the process of synthesis. It seems conceptually possible, however, to synthesize a rather simple "systems model of conflict". The model is capable of subsuming either psychological or social conflict within its parameters, and it includes the concepts elaborated previously in the section on synthesis.

The behavior of the parties (personality elements of one individual, two individuals, groups, etc.) may be either rational or irrational, and the conflict mode may be either fight, game or debate.

A Systems Model of Conflict

A. B. C. D. E. F.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Parties a...n in agreement} & \quad \text{Conflict issues} & \quad \text{Party a} & \quad \text{Efforts to resolve conflict} & \quad \text{Successful} & \quad \text{Parties a...n in agreement} \\
\quad \text{No conflict} & \quad \text{Conflict} & \quad \text{Party n} & \quad \text{Efforts not successful} & \quad \text{Time}
\end{align*}
\]

A number of features of this model require elaboration. First, the designation in part A of parties a
through n admits for inclusion any number and kind of parties for examination. Elements of an individual personality would constitute the simplest example of conflict. Several nations involved in economic or ideological conflict might be viewed as the most complex example to be considered.

Second, the notion of conflict as a dynamic phenomenon is implied by the inclusion of the time line. Parties interact and engage in conflict over time.

Third, the element of conflict issues is introduced in part B of the model. If conflict issues do not result in overt conflict, the interaction of the parties loops back to a consensual state, or "parties a...n in agreement". If issues do result in conflict, however (part C), the parties are then portrayed separately (part D), which involves the element of competition. As parties to conflict engage in fights, games, or debates in their efforts to resolve the conflict (part E, which involves the concept of boundary of possibilities), they are either successful (part F), or unsuccessful. In the latter case, the episode loops back to part B-C and new issues may be introduced, or the conflict is reentered and a recycling of parts C through E takes place.

The broken loop signifies the on-going nature of human relationships. In the rubric of board-superintendent relationships, consensus or agreement on policy will
prevail, or conflict will arise. As to the functional or dysfunctional nature of the relationships, it can only be said that "it depends on the intent of the individuals involved and the educational priorities which they bring to the relationship." Conflict, in and of itself, is neither good or bad. The outcome of conflictful behavior will determine the goodness or badness of the conflict.

LITERATURE, MODEL, AND RESEARCH RELATIONSHIPS

Portions of this chapter have suggested that the relationships among discrete theoretical and empirical efforts related to conflict seem to be based in disparate theoretical bases. If the present effort was to have roots in a comprehensive, yet manageable theoretical framework, it was necessary to formulate one. This was done, and the result seems to have sufficient face validity to serve as a conceptual basis for the study.

The second consideration, the relationship of the present effort to the literature and to the model is based on the following premises.

First, in the literature of educational administration, conflict is treated primarily in hortatory fashion. i.e., "The administrator must learn how to manage conflict." or--"You must deal authoritatively with conflict
and learn not to fear it." Statements like this are on the order of truisms for the administrator, but it is questionable whether one can manage that which is understood imperfectly or not at all. The present effort was designed to enlarge an understanding of operational conflict. The effort has been based on tenable theoretical concepts.

Second, the few available studies in educational administration which have treated conflict have relied primarily on a quantitative approach. The present effort has emphasized an approach to the study of conflict which is intended to improve understanding of its dynamic quality.

Chapter three, the report of data, has been structured in a manner intended to convey to the reader a feeling for the content of conflict, the relationships between and among actors, and the chronology of the development of conflict between and among board members and superintendent.
CHAPTER III

THE CHRONOLOGY OF BOARD MEMBER-SUPERINTENDENT CONFLICT: VARIATIONS ON RECURRING THEMES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter has been prepared in eight parts. Part one is an introduction, which provides an orientation to the setting of the study, some of the characteristics of the board, and the means by which the data were gathered. Part two provides an overview of the two year chronology of conflict from January, 1970, through December, 1971. The perceptions of conflict of board members, superintendent, two reporters and two citizens have been included in parts three, four and five.

Part six presents the data related to board member and superintendent evaluation of board role and superintendent role, along with the results of the administration of the "Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs."

Part seven provides an overview of the number and type of, and vote by the board on policies in eight policy categories. Part eight summarizes the chapter and introduces chapter four.
The setting. The data for the research were gathered in a major metropolitan area of a major midwestern state. The name and exact location have been treated anonymously.

The city which forms the core of the metropolitan area has a population of approximately 250,000. Its major economic base is diversified manufacturing. The ratio of majority to minority group members is approximately 66 to 33%. The school system which serves the city has approximately 55,000 students and 2,400 professional staff members. During the period treated by the research the district's pupil population was served by eleven high schools and fifty-eight elementary schools.

The board and superintendent. The city board of education has seven members, elected on an at-large basis. During the period treated the board members included Mrs. X., a retired school teacher. Mrs. X. was aligned

---

1The names of the board members have been codified to preserve their anonymity. The board was comprised of two factions. The liberal faction's names were placed in alphabetical order, coded, and are referred to throughout the study as Mr. A., Mr. B., Mr. C., and Mrs. D. The names of the conservative three-member minority faction were also alphabetized, and are referred to throughout the study as Mrs X., Mr. Y., and Mr. Z. A, B, C, and D are liberals. X, Y, and Z are conservatives.
with an identifiable three member conservative board faction and worked closely with the conservative Serving our Schools (SOS) organization. SOS organized formally in June of 1969 and, in July, endorsed four board candidates, one of whom was Mrs. X.¹

Mr. A., a "liberal" board member, was appointed to the board in early 1969 to fill a vacancy created through resignation. He directs a community research organization and is a trained political scientist.

Mr. Y., an attorney, was elected to the board in November, 1969, with the endorsement of the SOS group. He was identified with the conservative board faction.

Mr. B., an accountant, served as a board member since 1966. His 1970 board membership resulted from "a flurry of activity which left a bad taste in the mouths of many citizens." This "flurry" is explained below.

Reverend P., a 1969 board incumbent, concerned because the new board to take office in January would have no blacks, resigned to make way for the appointment of a black person. Three members of the then-incumbent board appointed a fellow member.

¹From a file article of the Journal Herald.
"The man appointed by the lame-duck board was Mr. B....SOS was enraged."¹ Mr. B. identified with the liberal board faction.

Despite the fact that SOS-backed candidates won three of the four available board seats in the November, 1969 election, they did so with a plurality of the votes cast. Of the total votes cast in the board election, the six moderate-liberal candidates received a majority. The vote spread was so great, however, that the conservatives, with only four candidates, won three of the four seats. Part of the consternation of SOS at the appointment of Mr. B. stemmed from the fact that the fourth SOS candidate, who ran fifth in the election, was also black, but was not appointed. Additionally, Mr. B., the re-appointed incumbent, had declined to run for re-election due to the press of business and family matters.

Mr. Z., the third conservative board member, was a retired company executive, who, in his earlier years, had been a high school principal. His candidacy was backed by the SOS group.

Mr. C. was a liberal board incumbent noted for his reticence in board meetings. Mr. C. owns and operates a store.

¹Ibid.
Mrs. D., the only successful liberal candidate, is a homemaker and wife of a municipal official.

The superintendent, Dr. C., assumed his post in June, 1968. He is an experienced school administrator and holds an earned doctorate in education. Prior to coming to the city he had experience as an assistant superintendent in another urban system, and as an assistant superintendent in the state department of education. He came to the system with the understanding that he was to move it toward integration, in keeping with a resolution passed by the board in 1968. Dr. C. replaced a superintendent who retired after more than 20 years' service to the system.

Gathering the data. The data for this study were gathered from three major sources. The first data source consulted was the official minutes of the board covering the period from January, 1970, through the January, 1972 organizational meeting when the seven member intact board group for the two year period adjourned sine die. The researcher read the complete record and recorded information relating to policy content, names of individuals moving and seconding resolutions (in some instances this information was not entered in the minutes), the level of abstraction of policy, space affected (a synthesis of policy content and agency or group affected),
superintendent's position (not apparent in a vast majority of cases), and the names of members voting for and against adoption, abstaining, or passing. Since the majority of decisions originated or modified policy, this aspect of the analytic framework was not treated.

The second data source consisted of four board members (two board members declined to participate and one board member who had agreed to participate passed away before the interview stage), the superintendent of schools, two newspaper reporters who were familiar with the board of education by virtue of their coverage of board activities, and two citizens. One of the citizens was an active member of the SOS group and a "board watcher". The second citizen was a liberal who had served on citizen study groups for the board. Both citizens were selected as a result of board members recommending them as being representative of the conservative and liberal ideology, respectively.

The third data source was newspaper accounts of items relating to the board of education and superintendent. These items included accounts of board meetings, citizens' meetings, letters to the editor, and news stories reporting events related to the central concerns of this study. All of the news reports relating to the board and superintendent for the two year period of interest were consulted. Issue contents were noted, and, in cases where
board members and superintendent made statements which were quoted, the contents of quotations which contained evidence of conflict were recorded for reference and comparison with other data sources.

THE CONFLICT CHRONOLOGY

Introduction. The following section has been organized around a series of critical incidents. The term, "critical incidents" refers to those major events which occurred during the two years which seem to characterize the nature, intensity and general chronology of board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict.

The sources of the chronology were the board minutes and newspaper accounts of board meetings. The chronology does not represent an exhaustive report of all incidents, but should be read, rather, as a representative report of the nature and content of conflict.

The chronology follows what may be termed a "theme and variations" form. The major theme centers around desegregation and school district reorganization. Finance, local control, personnel, and other apparent transformations of issue, along with the personalization of conflict, are closely related to desegregation and school district reorganization. This relationship should be remembered as the chronology is read.
The outgoing president of the 1969 board of education set the stage for what was to be experienced by the new board when he said:

The school board is an irresistible target for the shafts of frustrated and often enraged parents, teachers, right wrongers, left wrongers, taxpayers, know nothings, and know-it-alls. All of society is being raged against, but the hardest symbol is education. Because when you say "school" you touch on a man's past, the future of his children, and his wallet.¹

He stated that the questions of race, teacher militancy and money place "an almost impossible task on the duly constituted authorities."

Following his remarks, the four newly elected board members presented their certificates of election and the board began its official tenure. Their first vote, on the election of a president, was four to three. The vice-president was elected by the same margin.

Thus began a pattern which, although by no means followed exclusively, was to become familiar. The four to three pattern followed the liberal and conservative inclinations of the individual members.

Neither the president nor the vice-president had been elected to the board. The president, Mr. A., and the vice-president, Mr. B., had both been appointed to

¹From the minutes of the board, January 5, 1970.
the board. They were to be reminded of their appointed status from time-to-time throughout the two ensuing years.

Desegregation and curriculum. On January 22, Mrs. X. attempted to alter the district's freedom of enrollment plan by striking the requirement that student transfers result in the improvement of racial balance. The motion received three yea votes, four nay votes.

In February, Mrs. X. questioned a proposed contract with the American Educational Research Council for the development of teaching prototypes for "Developing Curricula for the Education of Youth in Meeting Modern Problems". Mrs. X. suspected that the prototypes would contain elements related to sex education. Mr. Y.'s motion to table the item lost, four to three. The vote to approve the contract was unanimous. At the same meeting a resolution urging the President of the United States to take action to speed desegregation in the North avoided being tabled by a vote of three to four. The resolution was approved, four to three. During the discussion of the motion to table, Mrs. X. presented a statement which voiced strong support for local control.

During March, SOS and some Model Cities officials entered a cooperative effort to resist moves toward desegregation. SOS opposed busing blacks to white schools. The Model Cities people favored keeping blacks in black
schools so community control could be gained.

Finance and promises. At the March 19 meeting two liberal board members presented a resolution to hold a special election for a badly needed additional tax levy. As a part of the resolution, citizens were assured that decisions of major importance relating to school policy would not be made without at least four months prior notice. Specific examples of "major decisions" included "major busing increases, the creation of middle schools, and the creation of specialized high schools." Following a split vote to amend the amount of the levy the resolution was passed, six to one. Mrs. X. cast the dissenting vote. She said after the meeting that she could support three mills. Mr. Y. voiced support for a larger amount. Mr. Z. would support a levy if answers to two or three policy questions were forthcoming. The administration said that 13.2 mills would be required to maintain existing programs and to continue growth.

Desegregation and district reorganization. At the April 2 board meeting Mrs. X. read a scathing indictment of the superintendent into the record. She faulted him for proposing alterations of school attendance boundaries and attributed a levy failure to the "threat to neighborhood schools" posed by his proposal.
The superintendent explained the lack of a busing feature in his plan and repeated his total commitment to "ending racial isolation." His proposed "pod" system of organization—combining areas of the system for administrative services—was suspected as the possible beginning of an integration plan.

At the same meeting, Mr. B. came to the superintendent's support by saying: "We are not going to allow some little racist to dictate his views on this board. We will bus as long as they make buses if it means a better quality education."¹

The verbal exchange between board members became more acrimonious on occasion. At one point Mr. B. suggested that Mr. Y. was "not competent to do his job."

Mr. Y. said he was being "vilified by the gentleman on my left."

Mr. B. replied, "That's alright, Mr. Y. You don't have to call me a gentleman. You can call me 'boy'."²

From the superintendent:

²Ibid.
I recognize the tragedy that many of us, as secure white persons in this society, have lost a spiritual freedom that many black persons have. There is an extended family life—including much more generosity than most of us know even in our inner family circles. There is a commitment to freedom which extends beyond their concern for self to a real understanding of what freedom of spirit and thought means to all mankind. This seems almost lost in our concern for material freedom; the defense of what we own.

The superintendent said that he has "learned a great deal from the black community..., and some things from the white community, too, that I don't cherish quite as much...."

Finance and local control. Throughout April the board minutes and newspapers recounted the efforts of the board to agree on support for the levy, the efforts of SOS to raise money to fight increased taxes, and the efforts of citizens and school personnel to understand the elusiveness of some of the board members on the subject of needed money. At the same time, Mr. G., SOS leader and assistant elementary principal, was interpreting the district's financial needs for his constituents and for the press. His estimate of financial need was lower than the administration's, and the arguments continued to

†Ibid.
be centered around the threat to the concept of the neighborhood school posed by administrative plans.

Mr. Z. referred to the neighborhood school as the "seedbed of democracy". Furthermore, he felt that "when we get down to the nitty gritty, many people are concerned whether their money will go for neighborhood schools, or—and I say this with reservation—for integration."¹ A citizen added, "We're for integration but we don't want to give up our neighborhood schools."²

**Personalization and intensification of conflict.** In May a city-wide Citizens' Advisory Council was formed. A letter to the editor criticized the board for not listening to the voice of the people in the last two levy elections (they were defeated), and mentioned "hand picked board members", and "arrogance" of the board.³ Teachers urged against program cuts, and the superintendent characterized the educational program as "a racist education and an education which shortchanges children."⁴

¹May 1, 1970, *News*.
²Ibid.
Board member Mrs. D. has "had it. We've got to be more than a listening post."\(^1\) Mr. Y. suggested "ear examinations, because I've got the idea that... (the voters) are not entirely enthusiastic about the educational program."\(^2\)

At the same time, special programs, largely funded through federal sources, were being attacked as wasteful and too expensive to maintain in view of the strained financial conditions of the district.

On May 5, a ten and one-half mill levy was defeated. Mrs. X. refused to endorse the levy and refused to appear with the superintendent to discuss the issue.

At a board meeting in late May, Mr. Z. expressed confusion at being confronted by so many budgets that he wanted "to forget them. I want to consider facts."\(^3\) He stated that once he had facts, he would be willing to support whatever millage was needed and to work for it. He was applauded.

Mrs. D. chided Mr. Z. because of the abundance of information that had already been given to board members.

\(^1\)Ibid.
\(^2\)Ibid.
\(^3\)May 28, 1970, *Journal Herald*. 
In early June the superintendent began a series of "doorstep tours" to improve understanding of school needs. Mrs. X. didn't have time this week, but would reconsider after study. Mr. Y. refused to participate because he had been labelled "juvenile" by the superintendent and considered himself at odds with him. Asked if anyone would refuse to participate, the superintendent said, "I don't think so." \(^1\)

A June 11 analysis of school problems cited the December, 1969 firing of the model cities education project director, levy defeats, board factions, lack of communication, SOS' leader, Mr. G., and "plants" in board meeting audiences as sources of problems. SOS is accused by some of making things go badly so it can "save" the system after the coming November election. Mr. G's. possible designs on the superintendency are mentioned. \(^2\)

Also in June Mr. Z. vows that he will "not be railroaded in the question of a levy." He still "lacks facts." Mr. Y refuses to offer "abject surrender" to the board majority for the sake of unanimity. Mrs X. believes 6.5 mills will move the system through the crisis,

\(^1\)June 9, 1970, *Journal Herald.*

stating that she expects state tax reform or more aid.¹

**Administration as target.** In July the board disagreed on a resolution requiring administrators to live in the district. In July the board also attempted to negotiate a trade—conservative member support of a levy for a softening of the liberal position on desegregation.² The superintendent reports that the district is under orders to racially balance the teaching staff by September, 1971, and that a compliance review of pupil desegregation will be forthcoming.³

In August the ouster of the superintendent by the board is suggested by a letter writer. SOS¹ Mr. G. calls proposed cuts in the school program, including sports, "shocking," and refers to them as "scare tactics."⁴ The board also approved, 7-0, the submission of a 10.5 mill levy in September.

**Board member-board member conflict.** In September, the levy lost. Following the defeat, the board president

castigated Mrs. X. and Mr. Z. for their lack of support and called for their resignations. Mr. Y., the third conservative member, was praised for his efforts.

His response?—"They lose me when they attack my friends."¹ A September 9 Journal Herald article quotes Mr. Y. as calling for the resignations of Messrs. A. and B., citing their appointive status, and a need for either "new leadership or a new electorate, because what we have now isn't working."

New participants and issue variation. In mid-September the teachers voted to invoke sanctions on the system. On September 12, the board approved an 8.5 mill levy for submission in November. The state entered the picture at this point and seriously crippled the credibility of the board's need for increased funds by ordering financially troubled districts to borrow to cover deficits. On November 3, the levy was defeated.

Superintendent C. called for the creation of middle schools at an October Rotary meeting. His "Seven Fundamental Changes" recommended ending racial isolation, improvement in learning environment, greater sense of community, upgrading professional services, individual instruction, cost reduction, and an improved financial

In late October, following a request and cancellation of the request for an audit and charges from Mr. G. that the board was attempting to hide financial data, board members signed an agreement to not introduce new programs supported by general funds if the electorate would approve an 8.5 mill levy. The board voiced unanimity and determination to see the levy pass.

In December, Mr. Z. walked out of a board discussion of material to which he referred as a "desegregation plan." Mr. Y. refused to sit with other board members as long as the superintendent "sits as an equal member." Following an effort to delay action on the completion of staff balancing for five years by conservative board members, the board unanimously approved seeking recommendations on voluntary teacher transfers to ease staff racial imbalance.

The January voting on officers for the new year was a replay of the 1970 election—4-3. Mr. B. was elected president. The ostensibly silent Mr. C. became vice president.

---

3 Minutes of the Board, December 10, 1970.
Desegregation and district reorganization. In January the board unanimously directed the superintendent to develop recommendations concerning neighborhood middle schools, a pilot magnet school program and specialized high schools. The board also unanimously endorsed the concept of scattered site housing and urged governmental agencies to adopt the same principle regarding public housing. The matter of advertising for bids for interior painting didn't fare as well. It passed, 5-2, with Mrs. X. and Mr. Z. voting "nay."¹

The board's unanimity on school reorganization was short-lived. At the January 21 meeting a motion to table action on a proposed reorganization statement presented by the superintendent was defeated 3 yea, 4 nay. The endorsement of the plan and directives to develop further recommendations concerning prospective middle school sites were approved, 4-3.²

During the January 28 meeting the board agreed to maintain all programs at their present levels until funds were exhausted. The board president, in the absence of opposition, stated that the board was giving general consent to taking timely action to rescue the

²Minutes of the Board, January 21, 1971.
district financially by placing a levy on the ballot during the current (1971) year.¹

The superintendent as target. During the February 4 meeting the superintendent reported many staff members to be interested in possible transfer to reorganized schools. A motion to immediately stop any further reorganization of schools until "further direction by the people" was introduced and seconded by Mrs. X. and Mr. Z. It lost, 3-4. A subsequent motion of intent to not rehire the superintendent, introduced and seconded by Mr. Y. and Mrs. X., respectively, was tabled, 4-3.²

During the meeting of February 28, the superintendent received a new two-year contract by a 4-3 vote, after a motion to table the resolution lost 3-4. This was accomplished after citizens sought, in late December and January, to secure temporary injunctions to prevent the borrowing for operation, the renewing of the superintendent's contract, and the reorganizing of teacher assignments and attendance boundaries.³

¹Ibid., January 28, 1971.
A February 20, 1971 Journal Herald "Public Forum" characterized SOS as "the rallying point for all the sick, neurotic kooks and bandwagon joiners in the community." In a News article of the same date Dr. C. was labelled "an excellent superintendent who has been grossly, and quite intentionally, misrepresented by the harpy chorus that regularly twitters and shrills against him at board meetings."

School district reorganization. During early March the board acted unofficially to delay the middle school decision. At a public forum on the matter 51 speakers favored the reorganization, 34 spoke against it, and others switched the issues to Superintendent C., sensitivity training, busing and levies.  

A March 8 News article elaborated charges by Mr. G. that middle schools will "provide ripe grounds for narcotics peddlers, the spread of venereal disease and extortion." He also criticized black-white encounter sessions for administrators. A March 9 News "Letter to the Editor" cites hate as the primary problem, rather than real differences.

---

In a March 11 column the writer said:

Seldom have I seen a group do so many ill-advised—in my opinion just plain stupid—things for the right reasons. Ever since the election of three SOS members to the school board, the majority has run scared and given the unmistakable impression of running roughshod.

A New York Times reporter and an NBC-TV crew attended the March 18 meeting of the board. The board, amid cries of "Stop the vote! Stop the vote!" and a flurry of thrown marshmallows, approved the establishment of five middle schools and fourteen reorganized elementary schools. During the meeting a clipboard was thrown. At its close, one mother screamed, "You've ruined our children's lives—the middle schools will be private!"¹

At the April 29 meeting of the board a resolution seeking assistance to reduce racial isolation and to improve educational opportunity was approved 4-3. An attorney from a regional Civil Rights Office urged board action on the matter prior to a formal finding against the system.²

In April Mr. G., the leader of the SOS, was demoted

²Minutes of the Board, April 29, 1971.
from assistant principal to teacher. On June 4 he announced his candidacy for the board of education. Two other candidates joined him in a three member SOS slate to seek three available board seats in November.¹

A May 7 Journal Herald article cited an Office of Civil Rights Attorney's survey of the schools. He reported that twenty-seven of the fifty-eight elementary schools had less than ten percent black enrollment. "This, combined with the fact that there is evidence of teacher segregation along the same lines is strong evidence to make us believe that you might say 'where there is smoke there is fire'." He suggested that it would be preferable to correct the problem voluntarily, rather than to be faced with a legal mandate.

During June the "Independent Citizens for Good Schools" organization was formed for the purpose of screening board of education candidates who would support moderate-liberal educational approaches. In June the board also transferred approximately six-hundred staff members for the purpose of achieving racial balance. Approximately one-hundred of these were selected by lot.

In July a state department of education report suggested that all the city schools have not-less-than

¹Journal Herald file story.
fifteen percent, nor more-than forty-five percent black enrollment by September 1972.¹

The-superintendent offers to resign and an election is held. In August, one of the superintendent's recommendations concerning reorganization of the administrative staff was tabled, on the motion and second of Mr. A. and Mrs. X., 6-0. Later in the meeting the superintendent culminated an impassioned statement with an offer to resign and walked out of the meeting after asking to be excused.²

By August 8, sixty-four of the seventy elementary administrators had vowed to resign if the board accepted the superintendent's resignation. Twenty-three additional black and sixteen additional white administrative officials joined the movement.³

By August 5, eleven persons had filed for the three-seat November board race. Liberal candidates were flooding the slate—a move which was to contribute to their loss of board control.

At the August 11 board meeting President B. read a

²Minutes of the Board, August 5, 1971.
³August 8, 1971, News.
statement endorsing the superintendent. Messrs. A. and C., along with Mrs. D. asked to be associated with the statement. Messrs. Y., Z., and Mrs. X. asked to not be associated with it. A motion and second by Mr. Z. and Mr. Y. to accept the superintendent's resignation was rejected, 3-4.¹

During September the board approved, 6-1, a resolution concerning general policies for the period during which schools would be closed due to the exhaustion of funds.²

In October the board called for a special election on a 10.5 mill tax levy to be held in November and changed the school calendar to permit closing.³

On November 3, SOS' Mr. G., was elected to the board, Mr. B. was elected and a liberal, Mr. L., was also elected. Liberal candidates garnered 61 percent of the votes cast, but in January, control would swing to the conservatives.

Voters approved a 13.6 mill renewal at the same election, but because of the exhaustion of funds, schools closed on November 5. A week later, voters approved 10.5

¹Minutes of the Board, August 11, 1971.
³Ibid. October 14, 1971.
mills in new taxes and the schools reopened.

New casks: old wine. In December the "Committee of 75" called for integration of the metropolitan area and the board approved three resolutions. One called for an end to segregation in housing and employment. The second requested state assistance in developing an integration plan, and the third ordered racial and economic integration of the school system. The votes on the resolutions were 5-2.

Before the year ended, the three conservative board members failed in two attempts to overturn the three desegregation-related resolutions. The attempts failed—4 to 3.

PARTICIPANT PERCEPTIONS OF CONFLICT

Introduction. This section contains reports of board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict as perceived by four board members and the superintendent. The rationale for this approach was based on the assumption that participant reports of conflict recollections constitute the most reliable and valid method of assessing conflict from the point of view of individual participants.

The responses were made to the following request for information.
Please recall to the best of your ability how your board and superintendent (or—in the case of the superintendent—'how you and the board') got involved in open disagreement over policies. Think back to January, 1970, and then think out loud about how the disagreement developed and maintained itself through December 1971.

This request resulted in responses from participants which ranged from approximately thirty, to fifty minutes in length. Responses were recorded on audio tape, transcribed, and those transcriptions formed the basis of this report.

The perceptions which seemed, to the researcher, to constitute the characteristic perceptions of the individual participants, have been reported in the following subsections.

Superintendent's perceptions. The superintendent wanted "a board that is as well informed as any in the country." He made an effort, therefore, to provide the board with as much information as possible. This was corroborated by one interviewee's statement that a former board member had "received more information during the first three months of Dr. C's tenure than in the preceding twelve years combined."

From the superintendent's point of view the issues around which conflict centered changed from 1970 to 1971.
During the first year, finance, integration and Mr. G., the SOS president, were viewed as central issues. During the second, the superintendent viewed curricular and organizational problems as matters of central importance. He believed that there was an imposed hiatus on financial issues because of the state legislature's unwillingness or inability to enact a viable school aid bill during much of the second year.

At the same time, he saw the board majority during the second year saying "well look—we've tried to find consensus for a year, and what's it got us?—Nothing but a year's delay in doing anything significant for the schools."

The superintendent cited a movement toward integration of the schools sensed by part of the populace and the subsequent organization of SOS, along with the desire on the part of three newly elected school board members as being antecedents to the onset of conflictive board member-superintendent relationships during the two years. He believed that there was a conscious effort on the part of the three-member minority faction to "encourage people to think of any problems in the schools as being the administration's."

Mrs. D.'s perceptions. Mrs. D. viewed the loss of
autonomy on the part of principals and teachers, along with a concurrent expectation on the part of the then-new superintendent that teachers and principals become increasingly accountable as one set of conflict antecedents.

...if you look at the founding people in the Serving our Schools organization you will find that it's teachers and dissident school administrators who basically formed that organization...[Mrs. X.] saw the direction in which the schools were going and she did not agree with it, and therefore she got out.¹...she decided she would come back and do something about it for the people who couldn't get out who believed as she did.

Well that's all right—that's fine. That's good old "American Tradition." This is really the germination point, I believe, of the conflict between those individuals who eventually were elected to the board and the current superintendent.²

Mrs. D. also cited differences of opinion on finance, integration, and "Why schools exist" as bearing particularly on board member, board member-superintendent conflict.

They [SOS] will tell you that schools are established for the purpose

¹Resigned from teaching.
²From a recorded interview.
of teaching cognitive skills.
...I'm for that, too, but I honestly believe that the school...has other responsibilities—to continuously point out to the community that there are contributing factors to a child's educational achievement. If he comes to school hungry, if he comes to school without proper clothing, if he comes to school sporadically, if he has a teacher who looks down his nose at 'those poor kids who can't learn'—these types of thing all affect how a kid does in school.

Now you talk about that to them—that's socialistic. I would be more apt to say that that's being humanistic.¹

And, elaborating on this kind of difference, the superintendent said:

I think they genuinely believe in conspiracy theories, because they actually propound them. There is some master string puller, who has the destiny of the whole city in his hands. This may be the federal government, it may be Mr. A....²

And, again from Mrs. D.:

Myself and one other board member are convinced that much of the thinking

¹Ibid.
²From an interview with the superintendent.
behind the lack of support for levies was maybe not the need for money—they knew that the need was there—but to put Dr. C. in a precarious position because of their personal animosity toward him.¹

Mr. A.'s perceptions. Mr. A. supported this theory in his recital of conflict antecedents.

There were many individual axes to grind. I think these were the first sources of the appearance of SOS and the kind of position taking that eventually resulted in various kinds of policy conflict.

Mr. G. who in 1969 was president of SOS, was transferred... through some sort of convoluted reasoning...that kind of bitterness get transferred to Dr. C.²

Mrs. X., a first grade teacher...for a number of years...prior to her retirement, I am told, applied to become a reading supervisor...and was turned down each time...by the previous superintendent. Again, that bitterness seemed to transfer itself.

The third factor, I think, is that there was an association of Mr. Z., Mrs. X., and Mr. G. as active members of the landlord's

¹From an interview with Mrs. D.

²Mr. G. was a teacher in the system before being made an assistant principal by the former superintendent.
association.

My personal contention is that these people [Mrs. X. and Mr. Z.] came on [the board] with an anti-tax position.

In addition there was an agglomeration of people who were bitter about something that had affected them personally.

Mr. A. also agreed with Mrs. D.'s contention that differences of opinion between and among board members had roots in disparate ideological convictions relating to what role schools should play. He also cited "the encroaching pressure of the black community" moving into a previously predominately white area of the city, basic disagreement of conservative board members with "the press for change...that has come with prime movement from inside the administration," the reorganization of school structures from a K-8, 9-12 plan to an elementary, middle, high school arrangement, and disagreement over the amount of financial resource necessary.

Mr. B.'s preceptions. Mr. B. believed that lack of consensus on the part of the newly elected 1970 board members on the need for a 10.5 mill levy approved by the previous board constituted one of the major antecedents

\[1\] From an interview with Mr. A.
of the conflict which characterized the board-superintendent relationship. That levy was actively supported by one of the newly elected board members. Along with this, an agreement on the part of the previous board that a twelve-million dollar surplus should be exhausted before additional funds were sought seriously strained the ability of the three conservative board members to believe that additional funds were needed. An attitude of "if there was a twelve million surplus last year, what happened?" seemed to characterize their perception of the status quo. They never completely overcame the belief that the administration and liberal board faction either had extra funds "stashed" someplace, or, in the absence of extra funds, that they were in league to use large amounts of money gained from additional levies for integration, busing, and the destruction of the neighborhood school concept.

Mr. B., along with Mrs. D. referred to the initial 4-3 vote in January of 1970 as a kind of "turning point" in the future relationship of board members.

Also:

The thing that really made the political entity [SOS] strong in the district stemmed from the methodical developments of the school board beginning in 1966, when we attempted to point out, through the use of statistical
data, that there were differentials in the supplies, equipment and staffing of so-called black schools. ...we were able to get...a resolution of intent... [which] specifically acknowledged that these things had occurred and that now the board will...move forward and try to do something about it.

We simultaneously elected a superintendent in the middle of 1968 indicating and pointing out that this was the position of the board, and, 'can you, in accepting this position, follow the mandate?'

The superintendent agreed that he could...In August, 1968, there were 39 administrators appointed by the superintendent. Nineteen of them were black and, for the first time, a high administrative position was put in the hands of a black administrator. ...I think these were the things...that caused the animosity that was ingrained in the newly elected board members, who had apparently promised that, if they got in, they would undo all of this.¹

Mr. B. attached significance to the role which differences of opinion over economic and racial isolation played in the ongoing conflict. He is an enthusiastic supporter of equal educational opportunity, and bringing a speedy end to economic and racial isolation.

Mr. Y.'s perceptions. Mr. Y recalled the trauma of the dismissal hearings conducted at the time the Model

¹From an interview with Mr. B.
Cities Educational Director was fired. He said that the superintendent

...called us together and insisted on firing twelve more Model Cities people. At that time we refused to do this, saying we had just gone through the hearings. It seemed inappropriate at best to fire twelve more people and start through this all over again.

At that time we three, at least, refused to do this, and possibly later as they [the liberals] didn't want a 4-3 split. They wanted unanimous support for the superintendent. At that time Mr. B. indicated in a discussion that I could be exterminated. I asked him what he meant, and he indicated that a lot of people just showed up missing....

Mr. Y. cited declining enrollments, the "flight to the suburbs," and the perceived threat to the composition of the city and the nature of the neighborhood school posed by involuntary desegregation as being primary concerns in the minds of conservative board members.

HEW came up again with the issue about teachers being assigned on a racial basis. Of course, it's primarily true that many of the white teachers were in schools where there was black enrollment. It seemed obvious that while there might be neighborhood schools, there sure

1 From an interview with Mr. Y.
couldn't be neighborhood teachers. We had no particular objection to reassigning these schools.¹

Mr. Y. then related his lack of conviction that an agreement between the Office of Civil Rights and the school system to effect staff desegregation had any weight in law. Mrs. X. shared this viewpoint enthusiastically. In her words, the superintendent "lied" about the force of the agreement.² She convinced the researcher that she was convinced that the superintendent had deliberately misrepresented the effect of the agreement, and that the agreement was, in her mind, not binding.

It got to the point that, every time he [the superintendent] came up with a solution, I wondered how many buses he owned....Nearly every solution that he came up with was geared to the requirement that we start busing people.³

These factors, along with perceived administrative ineptitude—trying to do too many things at once—constituted the major focus of Mr. Y.'s disagreement with the superintendent's efforts in behalf of the school

¹Ibid.
²From a telephone conversation with Mrs. X.
³From an interview with Mr. Y.
system. The effects of these disagreements on issues were heightened, however, by an incident during which the superintendent told Mr. Y. that a comment he had made was "juvenile." Mr. Y. remembered the effect of that remark.

Some common perceptions. Members of each board faction believed that members of the other faction met in regular formal sessions outside board meetings to discuss issues and strategies. Neither side would admit to any more than "very occasional" sessions, or spending "a whale of a lot of time on the telephone", to discuss issues. All interviewees agreed that the board and superintendent met only a very few times in informal study sessions during the two years.

The almost-exclusive use by board members of the terms "we" and "they" during the interviews bore mute testimony to the irrefutable fact that board members perceived themselves as members of one or the other of two extant factions. The "we" and "they" referred to either the conservative or the liberal faction, depending on the affiliation of the interviewee.
REPORTERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONFLICT

Introduction. Two reporters who covered the meetings of the board of education were interviewed for the purpose of gaining non-participant observer perspectives on board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict. One reporter covered the board of education from January, 1970, through the early part of 1971. The second reporter covered board activities from early 1971 through the end of the period examined.

They were asked to respond to the following request.

Please recall to the best of your ability how the board and superintendent got involved in open disagreement over policies during the time which you covered the board's activities.

Both reporters were present during the initial stage of the interview. The reporter who covered the initial period responded first, and then left. The second reporter then responded to the period which he had covered.

The researcher made written notes during the interview, and those notes were edited. A consolidated report of the reporters' perceptions follows.

Reporters' views.¹ Mr. B.'s appointment to the

¹From an interview with two reporters who covered the board during the period treated.
board was the initial issue. All black candidates were defeated and Rev. P. stepped off the board. Conservatives claimed Mr. H. should have been appointed since he ran fifth in the election.

Financial information was a point of contention. Mr. Z. didn't understand issues and "was never quoted except to point out how ludicrous something was." He would get so confused he would "vote against his partners."

The superintendent's outspoken tendencies led to conflict. He frequently belittled the board minority and missed opportunities to move Mr. Y. into at least a neutral position. He has firmed Y.'s position.

Mr. A. accused SOS of sabotaging the November election. He called on Mr. Z. and Mrs. X. to resign. It was an attempt to wedge between Y. and the others, but Y. didn't budge.

The votes got to be predictable. You would know what would be 7-0 and 4-3. It also became apparent that someone was quarterbacking the minority. There had to be strategy meetings. Z. and X. tend to be ungrammatical. They would read questions which were obviously not theirs--technical, and worded in ways to create an issue where perhaps none existed. They were designed to play to the audience.
Big rooting sections would attend with signs, and there would be alternate booing and cheering, depending on the point being made. Attempts were made to pack meetings. Seats would be filled at 6 o'clock for a 7 o'clock meeting. It got to be a regular thing to switch meetings from the board room to a nearby high school auditorium. Ten to twelve hundred seats would be very nearly filled, and the conflict management squad of the police department would attend if issues were fiery.

A strong possibility exists that someone in the central office staff was "leaking" information. On several occasions board members would get advance information on issues which did not seem likely to emerge. Mr. G. (SOS' president) would call the reporter and ask whether he had heard about things that were to happen.

The reporters staged a skit for members of the administrative staff called "Up the School Board." At the next meeting, one board member referred to another throughout the evening by the not-too-well-disguised pseudonym assigned the board member's role in the earlier skit. Someone had "spilled the beans."

Meetings have been characterized by occasional personal attacks by board members. Issues have been slanted to "slap" the other side. There was little cross-communication. Mr. Y. talked to Mrs. D, and occasionally to
Mr. B.—seldom to Mr. A., Mrs. D. communicated best with the other side. The polarization is sufficient that sides never communicate. They are locked into public postures.

The superintendent, since he's not directly responsible to the public, takes a lot of "guff" from the minority which is transferred from majority members.

The audiences would challenge A. and B.. Staff desegregation was a big issue—the campaign to get teacher volunteers who would transfer to racially balance staff got considerable attention.

There was a long scrap over the middle school proposal. Encounter sessions, the pod system—the city is now divided into three administrative districts.

The purchase of buses has been an off-and-on issue, and the community would pick out isolated issues. Mr. G.'s demotion was very much an issue.

During the last few months of 1971, the "Committee of 75" made a presentation to the board on desegregation. Desegregation is a major issue. Fiscal responsibility is another issue. The conservatives were always accusing the administration of fiscal irresponsibility. The minority did what they did out of a "feeling of commitment to a potentially racist constituency."

In December the board admitted that segregation
existed and voted for desegregation on a Metropolitan basis—five to two.

CITIZEN PERCEPTIONS OF CONFLICT

Introduction. The researcher asked board members to nominate citizens who represented the conservative and liberal viewpoints, respectively. In order to enhance the possibility of securing "polar" points of view, the researcher selected a conservative citizen nominated by the conservative board member participant, and a liberal citizen nominated by a liberal board member.

The rationale for this selection procedure was based on the contention that board members would tend to nominate non-participant observers who would most favorably represent their faction's point of view. In order to capitalize on this inherent tendency, the conservative's conservative, and the liberal's liberal were contacted and interviewed.

The citizen non-participant observers were asked to respond to the following request.

Please recall to the best of your ability how the board and superintendent got involved in open disagreement over policies during the period January, 1970, through December, 1971.

The researcher took notes during the interviews (both exceeded one hour), and the salient perceptions of
conflict reported by the citizens have been reported in the following sub-sections.

**A conservative's perceptions.** A conservative citizen believed that the dissent and conflict which characterized much of the board-superintendent relationship stemmed from the board "not being responsive to the needs of people."¹

"Community concerns" provided the initial thrust for the development of SOS. Prior to the 1969 election the "All City" committee had screened and endorsed candidates for the board of education, and elections were primarily a matter of formality.

Mr. G. (the SOS leader) appeared on television and announced that they were seeking board candidates. The citizen knew Mr. G. well enough to call and recommend a candidate. The group (SOS) developed a platform and elected three board members in November, 1969.

This citizen heard rumors that their neighborhood elementary school was to be made a middle school. She got "indefinite answers" to queries about the plans for their school, and this, along with distrust stemming from perceived manipulation of facts concerning organizational

¹From an interview.
plans and financial need, formed a pattern which charac-
terized the relationship between conservative and liberal
citizens and board members.

Racism has been used to cover
some of the underlying causes. A
divisive force is at work in the city.
There is no logical explanation for
many of the things that happened.
It seems that something or someone
is at work to divide the community.

People are concerned about their
children's education and safety. Some
people have the opportunity to move--
lower economic levels do not. If some
people hadn't had SOS to cling to,
violence may have erupted.

The media refused to air our
concerns. When I read a statement at
a board meeting, I was asked why I was
'making an issue'. I had to in order
to relieve some of the tensions of
those people and to get them some
recognition. The superintendent had
to be made an issue.¹

According to her, the SOS membership is opposed to
segregation and is for integration as long as it happens
naturally. "People should want to live in a community
because they want what the community has to offer."

But:

People are not created equal and
are going to generally want to stay with

¹From an interview.
their own kind. Economic integration will simply cause the have-nots to emphasize their own shortcomings. As long as kids are being helped to grow, why worry about issues such as balanced enrollments?¹

The superintendent's personality "tends to be abrasive." He and the liberals are "one." In this citizen's view, the liberal board majority simply ignored the wishes of one segment of the community. This view was supported by a statement by Mr. Y., a conservative board member.

Whatever the superintendent did was supported by the majority, so I always had the feeling that what I thought didn't make a hell of a lot of difference.²

A liberal's perception. For a liberal citizen, the first watershed in his tenure as a board-watcher occurred when the SOS faction of the board opposed a levy vote "in protest of administrative programs."³

This individual believes that much of the controversy

¹Ibid.
²From an interview with Mr. Y.
³From an interview.

During one of the levy campaigns he heard that one board member requested that someone "Get those Jew liberals off my back."¹

So the conflict, again, was seen to center around ideological issues. Should racially and economically "different" types of students be commingled? The liberals believe that they should, because "society must become more of a salad -- a situation in which each group retains its characteristics, but is permitted individuality."

The conservatives favored a retention of the status quo. Mr. G. was "getting information from somewhere," and the controversy was perpetuated.

ROLE EVALUATIONS AND MEASURES OF CIVIC BELIEFS

Introduction. The assessments of role performance and civic belief patterns reported in this section were carried out within limitations imposed by the following definitions.

Superintendent's role and board member's role have been limited to include only those tasks which the aforementioned perform in connection with their official offices. For the purposes of this study those duties were

¹Ibid.
limited to include tasks which Gross, Mason and McEachern defined as "seven functions of the superintendent's job," and items defining "school board adherence to professional standards." One additional question was appended to each of these measures to assess whether participants had engaged in behaviors which superintendent and/or board members perceived to be inappropriate.

The researcher read the questions which appear in tables one and two to participants, and their responses were recorded on audio tape.

The sixty-item "Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs" was completed in written form by each of the participants in the presence of the researcher, after the completion of the parts of the interview relating to conflict recollections and the evaluation of role performance.

Superintendent's role. The evaluation of the superintendent's role performance by the board and by the superintendent was based on work done previously by Gross, Mason and McEachern. 

1 Supra, p. 16.

The board members were asked to rate the superintendent's performance either excellent (E), good (G), fair (F), or poor (P) in eight areas. These included personnel administration, financial administration, school plant management, instructional direction, pupil services, public relations, general planning and over-all performance. The statements from the original work by Gross, Mason and McEachern were modified to reflect the fact that the measures were to apply to the two-year period being considered.

In order to assess the degree to which board members agreed with each other and with the superintendent on the evaluation of the superintendent's role, board members were asked to give their perception of how other board members rated the superintendent's performance and how the superintendent rated his own performance.

The superintendent was asked to rate his own performance and to give his perceived notion of board member ratings of his performance.

In order to make a determination relative to the superintendent's engaging in behavior which was perceived as inappropriate or unacceptable, a ninth question was appended to the original eight.

That question was:

"Did the superintendent do anything during the two
years which you believe a superintendent should never do?"

The responses of the four board members and the superintendent to the nine items on the "Evaluation of the Superintendent's Role" have been entered in Table 1.
## Table 1

### Role Evaluations: Superintendent’s Role

**Question 1.** How did you rate the superintendent's performance in personnel administration between January, 1970, and December, 1971? Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member's Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation</th>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
<td>Mr. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member's Evaluation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Superintendent's Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Liberal Board Members
²Conservative Board Members
TABLE 1, Continued

Question 2. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in financial administration during the two year period? E, G, F, or P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member's Evaluation</th>
<th>Mr. A</th>
<th>Mr. Y</th>
<th>Mr. B</th>
<th>Mrs. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Superintendent's Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>$p^2$</td>
<td>$G^1$</td>
<td>$G-E$</td>
<td>$G^1, p^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendent's Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Board Members' Evaluation</th>
<th>Dr. C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>$F-G$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Liberal board members

2 Conservative board members
TABLE 1, Continued

Question 3. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in school plant management during the two years? E, G, F, P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member's Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of Superintendent's Self-Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perception of Board Members' Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A</td>
<td>Mr. Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+, E¹</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. A. qualified his rating by saying that he really didn't know what the superintendent's influence was in this area.

¹Liberal board members
²Conservative board members
TABLE 1, Continued

Question 4. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in instructional direction during the two years? E, G, F, P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member's Evaluation</th>
<th>Mr. A.</th>
<th>Mr. Y.</th>
<th>Mr. B.</th>
<th>Mrs. D.</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E on intent,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Perception of Board Members' Majority rated Evaluation highly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Superintendent's Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>F-P²</td>
<td>E¹</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E-G-E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Liberal board members
²Conservative board members
*Because of the excellent work of the assistant superintendent
Question 5. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in pupil services during the two years? E, G, F, P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member's Evaluation</th>
<th>Mr. A</th>
<th>Mr. Y</th>
<th>Mr. B</th>
<th>Mrs. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G (lacks E money to do better)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Superintendent's Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>E&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;, P&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4-3, Higher, Lower</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendent's Response:

- Perception of Board Members' Evaluation: Conservatives may rate lower

<sup>1</sup>Liberal board members

<sup>2</sup>Conservative board members (Some didn't want ancillary services)
Question 6. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in public relations during the two years? E, G, F, P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member's</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>F at best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. B.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. D.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation

- $E^1, P^2$ (on effort)
- Range from $P-E$ to $G-P^3$

Perception of Board Members' Evaluation

- "All would have me take a lower profile."

Self-Evaluation

- F

1. Liberal board members
2. Conservative board members
3. One liberal board member, G, others.
TABLE 1, Continued

Question 7. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in general planning during the two years? E, G, F, P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr. A</th>
<th>Mr. Y</th>
<th>Mr. B</th>
<th>Mrs. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Member's Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation</td>
<td>E¹ P²</td>
<td>G¹</td>
<td>Lower²</td>
<td>G¹ P²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Superintendent's Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
<th>Dr. C.</th>
<th>Perception of Board Members¹ M.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹Liberal board members
²Conservative board members
## Question 8

How did you rate the superintendent's over-all performance during the two years? E, G, F, P?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member's Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perception of Board Members' Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Other Board Members' Evaluation</td>
<td>Perception of Board Members' Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(^1) p2</td>
<td>E(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Superintendent's Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Liberal board members

\(^2\) Conservative board members

* On over-all drive to change system for the better. Reserves judgement, because superintendent tended to get too far ahead of the public.
TABLE 1, Continued

Question 2. Did the superintendent do anything during the two years which you believe a superintendent should never do? If so, what?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. A.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;He was over-verbal and sermonized on the subject of desegregation. In response to a comment by Mr. Y., he burst out with—'Oh, that's juvenile!' Mr. Y. never forgot that, and that began his really strong efforts to get rid of Dr. C. Mr. B. and Mrs. D. are probably unaware of this. Mrs. D's acutely aware of it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Y.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;He cursed board members in private—called people racist and ignorant because they didn't support levies. He called me juvenile, and debated board members in public.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. B.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;One time he attempted to make a comment to a citizen who was performing during the hearing of the public in a school board meeting. He should not have done that. I just don't recall any serious things....At least one other board member criticized him for what I did.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs. D.</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Actions—no. Comments—yes. He doesn't know when to be still. He should not verbally take on board members with whom he disagrees. I don't think that's his position. He should make his position known, but not chastize. He has not usurped power.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendent's Response

Dr. C. **"No."**
Board of education role. The evaluation of the board's role during the two year period was accomplished by asking respondents to say whether the board had or had not behaved in ways which define "professional board behavior." Board members were asked to respond either "yes" (Y) or "no" (N) to questions related to twelve areas of school board behavior. Respondents were also asked whether they agreed as individuals with the board's behavior. Respondents were also asked whether board members had engaged in inappropriate behavior during the two year period.

The results of the evaluation board role performance appear in Table 2.
TABLE 2

ROLE EVALUATIONS: BOARD ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did your board pay the expenses to allow the superintendent to attend meetings of professional organizations, visit other school systems, and do other things which keep him up-to-date on educational developments?</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>Y Y^1 Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the board appoint only teachers nominated by the superintendent?</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>Y Y Y^2 Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. "It wasn't allowed the last time (January, 1972), but he never used it anyway."  
2. "Required by law. Board can only disapprove. It never did."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Did your board help &quot;sell&quot; good education to the community?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did your board have a clear statement of the policies under which the school system should operate?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 to 3

2"Ideological differences made it difficult."

3"Had statement, but not kind that should be used."

4"You can't pass the buck to the superintendent."
TABLE 2, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y = Yes; N = No</td>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did your board take full responsibility for its decisions?</td>
<td>Y¹</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Did your board have a clear-cut statement of the division of responsi-
  bility between the school board and the superintendent?               | N      | N      | N⁴     | N       | Y      |
| Did you agree with the procedure?                                       | N      | N³     | Y      | N       | N⁵     |

¹"The majority did."
²"Many times we supported things that we didn't agree with."
³"Would like to have seen the president serve as board's spokesman."
⁴"State board members' handbook."
⁵"They were not well-understood and followed."
TABLE 2, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y = Yes; N = No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did individual board members give directions to the superintendent?</td>
<td>Y¹</td>
<td>Doesn't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did board members give directions directly to the superintendent's subordinates?</td>
<td>Y¹, Y</td>
<td>N, Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Conservative members tried to, without success.
² "He took direction in that they approved of what he did."
³ "I think we can tell him what we think."
⁴ A board member elect did. (Mr. G.)
TABLE 2, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y = Yes; N = No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did board members keep the superintendent informed of important matters that came to their attention?</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In deciding important issues did members vote as representatives of important blocs or segments?</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>N N N N N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The majority did.

2. "SOS clearly voted as a bloc."

3. "The majority did. We voted as we did because we shared common beliefs."

4. "SOS always. It may have appeared that the others did."
TABLE 2, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Board Member Responses</th>
<th>Superintendent's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Was yours a board which functioned as a unit—not as individuals?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Was yours a board not afraid to take stands in advance of community thinking?</td>
<td>Y³</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you agree with the procedure?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ "Individuals on both sides were conscientious. Don't see anything wrong with it."

² These individuals shared the belief that occasional disagreement may be healthy.

³ The majority did.

⁴ The board always had citizen participation.

⁵ In 1971, the majority did.
13. During the two year period did any board member ever do anything which, in your opinion, a board member should never do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>&quot;I think all of the SOS just stuck their heads into the sand with regard to facts they could not refute... [Two liberal members] sort of followed blindly whatever direction Dr. C. wanted to go ...I think that's very unhealthy.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
<td>&quot;When I introduced a resolution on open enrollment to keep a political promise a board member called me incompetent and a racist...in a political situation you might do that, but not as a board member. I joked occasionally and was criticized for it, but I'm not sure it was improper.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. B.</td>
<td>&quot;There were occasions when board members attacked one another verbally. Board members walked out on occasion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. D.</td>
<td>&quot;Yes. Harassing other people—giving directions, giving out privileged information, mimeographing it and passing it out in the community. Quizzing and 'chewing out' superintendent's subordinates.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendent's Response

| Dr. C.       | "I referred to Mr. G.'s actions as a board member elect. I think board members should not be talking with or trying to influence staff....no board member should be bound to a bloc." |
Summary. Table 2 has reported the responses of four board members and the superintendent to questions which related to board members role. These responses are analyzed in chapter four.

Measures of Civic Belief. One of the original postulated research questions was:

Will an examination of the civic beliefs of board members and superintendent reveal substantial differences between and among individuals?

This question was addressed by administering the "Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs"\(^1\) to the four board members and superintendent who participated in the study.

It is believed that the scale can be useful in a number of ways in research. It should be helpful in charting similarities and differences in liberal-conservative climate among various levels of the power structure within cities, counties, and school districts where the latter are not coterminous with either of the former. ... It is possible that it will provide additional insight into how decisions are made or issues affecting schools, and perhaps other political matters. ... The reliability of the 60-item version, by the split-halves method, was .907.\(^2\)

---


For the purposes of the present study the instrument was used to determine whether, and, if so, how great any differences in measures of civic beliefs between and among participants would be. The participants who responded to the instruments items included three "liberal" board members, Mr. A., Mr. B., and Mrs. D.—one "conservative" board member, Mr. Y., and the superintendent, Dr. G. The possible range of scores on the instrument is from 60, "perfect conservative", to 300, "perfect liberal".

The instrument is included in the Appendix. Table 3, which follows, lists the scores of participants on the scale. The responses have been compared in Chapter four.
### TABLE 3

**PARTICIPANT SCORES ON "THE FLORIDA SCALE OF CIVIC BELIEFS"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. B.</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. D.</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A "perfect liberal" score = 300.*
BOARD POLICY DECISIONS

Introduction.

Disagreement [on policy making] stems from the attempt to find appropriate values to guide policy choices...the problem is not only disagreement on values, but on the difficulties any one analyst has with his own values. Contemporary social science draws a sharp distinction between fact and value. Values cannot be empirically tested. Analysis can therefore neither verify any one person's values nor command agreement among persons on their values.¹

Brickell has described policy as a guide for discretionary action—narrow enough to give guidance, but broad enough to leave room for discretion. "If it does not leave room for discretion, it is not a policy."²

This section contains data related to the policy decisions made by the City Board of Education during the period January, 1970, through December, 1971, and the January, 1972 adjournment Sine Die of the board. Data have been listed in expository and tabular form.


Presentation of data. Each policy decision acted upon by the board during the two year period was analyzed for the purpose of determining: (a) policy origin, (b) policy level, (c) policy content, (d) time span covered, (e) decision type, (f) superintendent's position, and (g) board vote.

Policy origin was largely incapable of being determined in terms of establishing the individual or group which originally requested a given action. For the purposes of this research, therefore, "policy origin" refers to the board member originating action on the policy. "Policy level" refers to the level of abstraction of individual policy decisions. The criteria which governed the assignment of levels of abstraction were:

"Low level of abstraction" referred to decisions on policy, the effects of which would be substantially predictable and known before the fact. For example, the election of board officers, approval of minutes, and motion to table action have a predictable effect.

"Intermediate level of abstraction" referred to decisions which would have a result which was only partly predictable. E.g., the acceptance of a gift for a human relations study would result in the hiring of a person or persons to perform the work but the recommendations which result, and the long-range effects of those
recommendations would be substantially unknown.

"High level of abstraction" referred to policy decisions which have effects which are substantially unknown. e.g., urging the state legislature to act on a state foundation program, or urging the President of the United States to press for desegregation in the North.

These measures are admittedly rough, and should, therefore, be regarded as approximations, rather than as precisely measured quantifications.

Table 4 on the page following contains a summary of the board's policy decisions categorized by level of policy abstraction and voting pattern.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-0-2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-0-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-0-1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4-2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-0-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>*<em>100</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total
% of Grand
Total
(382) 37.4 41.1 21.5

*Does not equal 100 due to rounding error.
For analytic purposes policy content was subsumed under one of eight categories. These categories were lettered A through H and have been referred to by letter throughout the remainder of the research. The letter, related category and sub-categories follow:

A. Board related decisions.

Includes: officer election, setting meeting dates, adoption of rules and regulations, school board association membership approval, minute approval, determining meeting location, and parliamentary procedure.

B. Curriculum related decisions.

Includes: approval of curriculum development contracts, acceptance of gifts for specific curricular offerings, submission of curriculum plans for state approval, affirmation of intent to operate a particular program, granting permission to establish curriculum committees, to initiate, modify, or eliminate programs, etc.

C. Superintendent's recommendations.

Includes items related to: resignations, retirement, leaves of absence, staff appointments, special assistance programs, contract modifications, changes in staff assignments, authorization of professional trips, securing consultant services, paying consultant stipends, auxiliary services for non-public schools, change orders, instituting grant applications, model cities personnel, textbook adoption, curricular change, etc.
D. School district reorganization and desegregation.

Includes decisions on: open enrollment policy, urging presidential action on desegregation, resolution requesting mass transit study, school redistricting, consultant services from HEW, extension of desegregation deadlines, staff integration, study sessions relating to desegregation, etc.

E. Personnel.

Includes: appointment of Model Cities personnel, residency requirements for administrators, decisions on administrative contracts and individual personnel singled out for action.

F. Finance.

Includes: appropriations resolutions, establishment of service fund, urging legislative action on finance, establishment of scholarship funds, requests for tax advances, issuing tax anticipation notes, acceptance of bids for notes, approval of tax levies, establishing levy amounts, seeking financial information, etc.

G. Community-related agencies.

Includes: endorsing community agency projects, contracts with urban corps, youth corps, requests to city commission, etc.

H. Supporting services.

Includes decisions relating to: student safety measures, transportation (not related to desegregation), insurance matters, building repair, remodel-
ing and maintenance, health services, property purchase for school expansion, equipment, furniture, rolling stock, lunch programs, textbooks, drop-out studies, etc..

Table 5 contains a two-year record of the board's policy votes categorized by voting pattern and by policy categories A through H.
TABLE 5

TWO YEAR VOTING RECORD OF THE CITY BOARD
BY VOTING PATTERN AND POLICY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Pattern*</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-0-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-0-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-0-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-0-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total by Category | 102 | 14  | 48  | 43  | 20  | 81  | 13  | 61  | 382  | 100** |

% of Grand Total

| 26.7 | 3.7 | 12.6 | 11.3 | 5.2 | 21.2 | 3.4 | 16  |       |      |

*The first number denotes positive votes, the second, negative, and the third, abstentions or passes.

**Total does not equal 100 percent exactly due to rounding error.
One final table concludes the presentation of data related to board policy decisions. Read across rows, this table presents the motions initiated by the board member listed under the heading "Motion or resolution by:" the number listed at the intersection of the horizontal row and vertical column designates motions initiated by the board member listed at the left margin and seconded by the board member entered in the top row.
TABLE 6


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion on Resolution by</th>
<th>Mr. A</th>
<th>Mrs. X</th>
<th>Mr. Y</th>
<th>Mr. B</th>
<th>Mr. Z</th>
<th>Mr. C</th>
<th>Mrs. D</th>
<th>Total Motions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. X.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Y.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Z.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Seconds</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No second recorded in minutes.

**The total here does not agree with the total from Table 5 because some motions were acted upon without being introduced by a board member.
SUMMARY

This chapter has been devoted to a presentation of data. The data presentation included a chronology of conflict, the conflict recollections of board members, superintendent, two reporters, and two citizens, and the results of role evaluations, responses on the "Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs", and the presentation of data related to policy decisions.

Chapter four is devoted to the analysis of these data for the purpose of answering the research questions postulated in Chapter one.
CHAPTER IV

THE PATHOLOGY OF BOARD MEMBER-SUPERINTENDENT CONFLICT

INTRODUCTION

In order to analyze and understand the implications of the research data, it is essential that prior understandings be reiterated or re-emphasized. The first of these is the apparent reality against which the data were tested.

During the course of the data gathering process it became apparent that a series of "critical incidents" constituted a framework of the reality of conflict. First, the board which was serving prior to the period treated by this research announced its intent to redress perceived inequality of educational opportunity. This intent was stated in a 1968 resolution which acknowledged a differential in educational opportunity between black and white schools. It further specified the intent of the board to take steps to correct that inequality. That board hired Dr. C. in 1968 with the understanding that he was to take steps to implement the board's intent.

The 1969 formation of the Serving our Schools organ-
ization under the leadership of Mr. G. appears to be the second major incident in the chronology. Prior to the formation of SOS, the All-City committee had screened and endorsed board candidates. SOS's entry as a screening and endorsing agency broke the former political monopoly of the All-City committee and heralded the institution of a competing political constituency.

The November, 1969 election of three SOS-backed board candidates placed two ideologically opposed board factions in positions to engage in overt, face-to-face conflict during the ensuing two years. The two major policy sources of conflict during the two years were finance and school desegregation. This constitutes the "framework of reality" against which the conflict perceptions of participants and observers were to be tested.

The second requisite understanding is related to the conceptual framework of conflict which has guided the analysis of conflict.

The conflict model presented in Chapter two has served as the conceptual basis for the analysis of data. The elements of that model and attendant definitions which received major emphasis were: (1) Parties to conflict, (2) Conflict issues, and (3) The nature of conflict.

Conflict, as evidenced by disagreement on policy decisions of the board, is indicative of "competition
in which the parties are aware of the incompatibilities of potential future positions and in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other."¹

The parties to conflict are the board members and superintendent. Individuals whose names have appeared in the report of data, but who were not part of the formal board-superintendent relationship have been viewed as issue and attention-focussing mechanisms rather than parties to conflict.

The "nature of conflict" for the purposes of this research has been viewed and treated as sociological conflict—i.e., conflict which occurred between and among board members and superintendent, between board factions, and board factions and the superintendent. Differences in role perceptions and role expectations which seemed to influence the course of conflict have been treated as forms of sociological conflict.

Analysis of data. The format of the presentation of analyses has been structured to conform generally to the order of the research questions presented in Chapter one. The major departure from the exact order of

¹Supra. p. 46.
questions has consisted of placing major questions at the end of a group of subsidiary questions, rather than at the beginning. The re-ordering of major and minor questions has permitted a more logical approach to the process of answering major questions.

The primary analytic methodology has been comparative analysis. Statistical treatment was applied to certain data. i.e., policy decisions of the board have been subjected to chi-square analysis for the purpose of comparing the proportions of total decisions in eight policy categories with conflictive decisions in each of those categories.

This chapter has been devoted to answering questions concerning the relationship between board member-board member, and board member-superintendent conflict as the dependent variable, and belief systems, role perceptions and perceived community inputs mediated by the board of education as independent variables, to questions related to the sufficiency of the ability of the independent variables to explain conflict, and to questions related to possible additional conflict variables.
VARIABLE INTERDEPENDENCE

Effects. The first major question addressed by this research was:

Do belief systems, role perceptions and perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education operate independently or interactively in the arousal and maintenance of board member-superintendent conflict?

Before attempting to answer this question, the answers to four second-priority questions must be examined.

The first second-priority question was:

Will verbatim reports of board members, superintendent, and selected community observers be consistent or discrepant as they relate to the origins, development, and maintenance of conflict over a two-year period?

Individual reports of the conflict given by the superintendent, board members, and non-participant observers revealed substantial differences in individual perceptions of conflict.

The superintendent cited the intent of the previous board of education as a conflict antecedent. He perceived finance, integration and Mr. G. to be major issues during 1970. He perceived curricular and organizational problems to be major issues during 1971. He also perceived board member and community member tendencies to transfer emphasis from conflict issues to the administra-
tion as a source of difficulty throughout the two-year period.

Mrs. D. perceived the loss of administrative and staff autonomy and the attendant development of SOS as harbingers of conflict. Mrs. D. also cited finance, integration and philosophical differences related to the role of the school as major conflict sources.

Mr. A. perceived "individual axes to be ground" which resulted from transfers and wished-for, but unattained promotions, the anti-tax position of minority faction board members, lack of consensus on the amount of funds needed by the school district, and the fund-seeking efforts of the previous board as conflict antecedents.

Mr. A. agreed that philosophical differences over the role of the school and board member perceptions of integration and the administrative "push" for integration as sources of conflict.

Mr. B. perceived the initial 4-3 vote of the board on officers and actions of the previous board to integrate the schools as primary antecedents to the conflict which ensued. Mr. B. tended to view the ongoing conflict as a reiterative ideological conflict having its roots in issues related to equal educational opportunity.

Mr. Y. viewed the superintendent's action with the model cities educational director and the superintendent's
efforts to force additional changes in model cities personnel as initial conflict events. He also cited perceived effects of integration, "flight" to the suburbs, declining enrollments and rising costs as sources of conservative concern and conflict. Mr. Y. also expressed the belief that the superintendent was planning to use busing to achieve integration, and that the superintendent was generally inept as an administrator.

The reporters viewed Mr. B.'s appointment to the board as the initial issue. They also cited finance, the outspoken tendencies of the superintendent and intermember board dynamics as conflict sources. Occasional references to bus purchases and integration-related issues were also viewed by the reporters as conflict sources.

One citizen's primary view of the board's difficulties was based on perception that the board didn't "listen to the people." A second citizen was dumbfounded that board members found it so difficult to agree on the magnitude of the district's financial need.

This evidence leads to the conclusion that the individuals interviewed had different internalized perceptions of board member-superintendent conflict. If those perceptions are placed within a rather broadly conceived rubric comprised of "desegregation, finance and personality," then a certain amount of commonality of viewpoint may be teased out of the data. The over-all
impression, however, is that the individual experiences conflict through a very personal set of perceptual filters. There is a tendency to attribute good to "self" and bad to "others."

The second, second priority question was:

To what extent will these reports suggest that these three variables operated independently or interactively in the arousal and in the maintenance of conflict?

Taken collectively, the participant and non-participant observer reports present convincing evidence that civic beliefs, role perceptions, and community inputs mediated by and through the board interacted to arouse and maintain conflict. The evidence suggests that the initial conflict issue centered around the prior board's formal action to reduce economic and racial isolation. (e.g., the formation of SOS around an ideology committed to preserving the neighborhood school, and "freedom of choice".) These kinds of concerns encouraged a polarization of opinion which became formalized through the election of board members who would constitute an opposing faction. The initial differences in civic belief which aroused concern around the perceived threat of desegregation were expanded and transformed to include on-going inputs from the vocal poles of the community. (e.g., concern about "busing", district reorganization, etc.)
As the superintendent and two distinct board factions worked to advance their perceived "mandates", conflicts arose which may be attributed to disagreements over role performance.¹

The third second priority question was:

To what extent will an examination of board policy decisions suggest that the content of policy may arouse conflict, and to what extent may policy content be related to and subsumed under the three variables of interest?

This question was addressed by subjecting the data contained in Table 4 to statistical analysis. The statistical test used was the chi-square test of proportionality.² Its application for the purpose of answering the question related to policy content as a source of conflict consisted of comparing the proportion of total votes made on policies in each of the postulated eight policy categories (expected percent) with the proportion of dissensual votes in each of the eight categories (observed percent). The results of the chi-square test are presented in Table 7.

¹See Table 1, page 124, and Table 2, page 134, which contain participant responses to questions on superintendent's role and board member's role.

### Table 7

**Chi Square Test of Proportionality Comparing Total Policy Vote Proportions with Proportion of Conflictive Votes by Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Category</th>
<th>Observed Percent of Total Conflictive Votes (N)</th>
<th>Expected Percent (N)</th>
<th>Minus Expected (0-E)²</th>
<th>(0-E)²/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. (Board Related)</td>
<td>20.0 (23)</td>
<td>26.7 (102)</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>44.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. (Curriculum Related)</td>
<td>1.8 (2)</td>
<td>3.7 (14)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. (Superintendent's Recommendations)</td>
<td>8.9 (10)</td>
<td>12.6 (48)</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. (District Reorganization &amp; Desegregation)</td>
<td>29.5 (33)</td>
<td>11.3 (43)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>331.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. (Personnel Related)</td>
<td>8.9 (10)</td>
<td>5.2 (20)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. (Finance Related)</td>
<td>17.0 (19)</td>
<td>21.2 (81)</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Community Agency Related)</td>
<td>2.7 (3)</td>
<td>3.4 (13)</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. (Supporting Services)</td>
<td>10.7 (12)</td>
<td>16.0 (61)</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>28.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 38.39^* \\
\chi^2_{df7} = 24.32^1 \\
^*P > .001 \\
^1Ibid. p. 467.\]
Category D, policy decisions related to desegregation and school district reorganization, contributed 29.31 of the total 38.39 chi-square test of proportionality value units. Since a chi-square value as-large-as 38.39 would occur by chance fewer than once in one-thousand such tests, the probability that factors other than chance influenced the disproportional tendency of the board to disagree on decisions related to desegregation is greater than .999.

In plain language, all of the policy decisions of the board were placed in one of eight policy categories according to type. The researcher then determined the percent of the total number of policy decisions which each of the eight categories represented. The same process was carried out for dissensual policy decisions, and the resulting proportions of dissensual decisions in each of the eight policy categories were compared with the proportions of total decisions made in each of the eight categories by means of chi-square analysis.

Convincing statistical evidence supports the contention that desegregation and school district reorganization, as a policy issue, served as a source of conflict a significantly greater proportion of the time than did any of the other policy categories.

The second portion of the question, "to what extent
may policy content be related to and subsumed under the three variables of interest?" requires a more subjective analysis.

First, the evidence suggests that perceived threats associated by community members with desegregation resulted in the formation of SOS, a political faction which opposed involuntary integration. It is also probable that differences in the civic belief pattern provided the initial impetus, in the form of perceived threats, which resulted in the formation of SOS. It seems probable, therefore, that desegregation was the initial policy issue which aroused overt opposition. The opposition, in turn, seems to have had its roots in differences in civic beliefs.

As soon as two distinguishable board factions were seated in early 1970, the variables related to perceived community inputs and differences in role expectation came quickly into play. The answer to the question relating to the extent to which policy issues may be subsumed under the variables of interest, therefore, is: "to a great extent." In fact, the evidence suggests that much of the overt disagreement between and among board members and superintendent which may be attributed to differences in civic beliefs, role perceptions and perceived community inputs had its roots in disagreements on the basic question of desegregation. Much of the disagreement on
finance and personnel related either directly or indirectly to the desegregation issue. Disagreements on financial issues were frequently grounded in community and board member uncertainty as to whether funds would be used for "integration." Contested board decisions concerning the superintendent's tenure and Mr. G.'s demotion also related directly to the positions those individuals took on the question of desegregation.

These conclusions are supported by evidence contained in the minutes of the board. During the two year period treated it became common practice for members of opposing factions and the superintendent to argue against resolutions supporting ideologically opposed points of view by either supporting the concept of the neighborhood school and freedom of choice (the conservative argument), or by supporting the need for quality integrated education and guaranteed equality of educational opportunity (the liberal argument). It became apparent to the researcher that objective consideration of issues on their merits frequently flew in the face of participants personalizing arguments, impugning the motivation and character of other participants, and suspecting ideological opponents of subterfuge and conspiracy.

The fourth second priority question was:
To what extent will newspaper accounts of board member-superintendent interactions be consistent with participant and selected observer reports?

With only one notable exception the newspaper accounts of the two-year period are consistent with the data gathered during the interviews and with data contained in the minutes of the board of education. The exception relates to the alleged reason for the superintendent's offer to resign.

That offer resulted from a motion by Mr. A. which was seconded by Mrs. X. to table recommendations of the superintendent concerned with the assignment of administrative personnel. The newspaper attributed the offered resignation to the proliferation of "liberal" board candidates, and their apparent unwillingness or inability to coalesce in a manner which would be politically viable.

As one might expect, both newspapers seemed to emphasize the conflictful nature of the relationships of the board and superintendent. Reference to Table 5 will verify that the board voted unanimously to support policy decisions about seventy percent of the time. Perusal of the newspaper accounts of board activity does not reflect the impression that the board agreed on seven out of every ten decisions.

There is also evidence which suggests that the reporting of board activities was biased toward the liberal
point of view. Facts were consistently and correctly presented, but "quoting Mr. Z. to point out how ludicrous a conservative position was"¹ was not done without bias.

The initial major question may now be addressed. It was:

Do belief systems, role perceptions and perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education operate independently or interactively in the arousal and maintenance of board member-superintendent conflict?

The evidence suggests that, in the very early stages of conflict, differences in civic belief constituted an independent variable in the arousal of conflict. This initial independent action was quickly transformed, however, and the three independent variables became interactive in their affect. It is probable that civic belief patterns constituted the major source of conflict influence throughout the two year period, but it is impossible to separate any one of the variables from the others. They seem to feed each other and the ongoing conflict.

VARIABLE SUFFICIENCY

The second major question addressed was:

¹Supra, p. 113.
Are the factors described by the terms belief systems, role perceptions and perceived mediated community inputs sufficient to explain conflict which existed between and among board members and superintendent during the two year period examined?

As in the case of the first major question, it has seemed logical and correct to reserve the answer to this question until two second-priority and four third priority questions have been addressed.

The first of the two second-priority questions was:

Will an examination of the civic beliefs of board members and superintendent reveal substantial differences between and among individuals?

Table 3 on page 145 reported the results of the administration on "The Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs". Four board members and the superintendent responded to the items on that instrument. The results revealed that the difference between the score of the one "conservative" board member and the lowest score of the three "liberal" board members responding was thirty-three points. The point spread between the lowest of the three "liberal" board member scores and the superintendent's score was twelve points.

The answer to the question, therefore, is that the difference between the conservative board member's score and the lowest liberal score was more than twice as large
as the point spread which separated liberal scores. The spread which separated the conservative member from the liberal members and superintendent was relatively large, in comparison with the spread between the low and high "liberal" scores, and, had a hypothesis accompanied the question, in the direction which would have been expected.

The second of the second-priority questions was:

Will an examination of role perceptions held by board members and superintendent reveal substantial differences between and among individuals with regard to what constitutes "appropriate superintendent role" and "appropriate board member role"?

An answer to this question was approached by answering four third-priority questions. The first of these was:

How congruent will assessments of board member and superintendent perceptions of "board member professionalism" be?

On questions which Gross¹ postulated as relating to board member professionalism, the following became apparent.

1. Payment of superintendent's expenses?

Board members and superintendent agreed that the board was willing to pay the superintendent's expenses entailed during activities designed to up-date the superintendent's professional knowledge. They agreed with that procedure during the two year period.

2. Appointment of superintendent’s nominees?

The board members also appointed only teachers nominated by the superintendent and members and superintendent agreed with that practice.

3. "Selling" good education to the community?

Responses to this question were mixed. One liberal board member and the superintendent said that the board did not help sell good education to the community, and they did not agree with the board not doing so. Two liberal board members said that the liberal majority did sell good education to the community. One of these respondents supported the practice, the other felt that the whole board should help sell the community. The conservative member perceived that the whole board did help sell good education to the community, but disagreed with the practice because of the difficulties presented by supporting that which you do not believe.

4. Clear statement of policies under which the system should operate?
This question also drew a "mixed" response. Two liberal board members and the superintendent perceived that such a policy statement was not in use and disagreed with the practice. One liberal member said that a statement was available but was inappropriate, and that he disagreed with using an inappropriate statement. The conservative respondent perceived that a clear statement was available, and that he agreed with it.

5. Board took full responsibility for its decisions?
Two liberal members said that the majority did, and that they agreed with the practice. The superintendent and one liberal member said that the board did not take full responsibility for its decisions, and that they disagreed with the practice. The conservative member said that the board did take full responsibility for its decisions, but he disagreed with the procedure because conservative members were frequently required to support things in which they did not believe.

6. Clear-cut statement of the division of responsibility between board and superintendent?
The responses indicated confusion on the part of respondents. The four board members responded that the board did not have a clear-cut statement of the division of responsibility. The conservative respondent amended his response by saying that he would like for the board
president to serve as the board's spokesman in all official matters, and one liberal board member said that they did have the state school board association handbook for guidance. The superintendent said that guidelines were available, but that they were not well-understood, or followed. Four of the five respondents disagreed with the practice, and the fifth agreed with perceived guidelines with reservations.

7. Individual board members gave directions to the superintendent?

One liberal board member attributed such behavior to the minority board faction, but that same member said that he had submitted names of possible candidates for an assistant superintendent's position for the superintendent's consideration. He also said that the superintendent ignored his suggestions. He did not agree with the practice. A second liberal board member shared the perception that minority faction members had attempted, unsuccessfully, to direct the superintendent, and that he disagreed with the practice. One liberal member perceived that such attempts had been made, and said that it was alright to "tell him what we think."

The conservative board member perceived that the superintendent took directions from the majority faction because of their tendency to endorse the superintendent's actions. He did not support the perceived direction
The superintendent did not perceive that individual board members had attempted to direct his activities and stated agreement with their not doing so.

8. Board members gave directions to superintendent's subordinates?

Three board members and the superintendent agreed that such attempts had been made, and disagreed with the practice. The superintendent attributed the behavior to a board member-elect. Mr. B. was unaware of any such attempts and agreed that they should not be made.

9. Board kept superintendent informed?

All of the board members perceived that they had kept the superintendent informed on important matters and agreed with the practice. The superintendent perceived that only the board majority had kept him fully informed. He gave evidence to support his contention.

10. Board members voted as representatives of blocs?

The responses to this question would be comical if the resulting decisions were not so crucial. The division here was along "party lines", with liberals accusing conservatives of bloc representation and vice versa. The superintendent was more objective in his response, when he said "SOS always. It may have appeared that the
others did." All five respondents disagreed with the practice.

11. Board functioned as a unit?

The four board members and superintendent agreed unanimously that the board did not function as a unit. One liberal board member disagreed with the practice, but the three remaining board members and superintendent were not convinced that the apparent polarized board representation of its perception of the community's educational needs was all bad. Some of the respondents expressed the opinion that disparity of opinion on the board may be not only essential, but healthy in a situation where large differences in community opinion are apparent.

12. A board not afraid to take stands in advance of community thinking?

Two liberal board members perceived that the majority did. One liberal contended that the board always acted after it had brought citizens abreast of an issue through involving them in study groups, and disseminating information. The conservative board member believed that the board did take stands in advance of community thinking. The superintendent felt that the board majority took stands during 1971, but not in 1970. Two liberals and one conservative supported "stand taking", 
and one liberal and the superintendent disagreed with only one perceived faction being willing to take advance stands.

Question thirteen was appended to Gross, Mason and McEachern's original twelve.

13. Board members did things which a board member should never do?

The response of three board members included references to "name calling" between and among members as an undesirable role behavior. One board member agreed with the superintendent's contention that board members should not attempt, as individuals, to influence staff members. This same board member viewed the dispensing of privileged information by board members as an undesirable behavior. Another member disparaged "closed mindedness", whether it be liberally or conservatively practiced, as an undesirable behavior. The superintendent perceived board "blocs" as being basically undesirable, despite his earlier contention that a certain amount of adversary representation is essential in the presence of disparate community opinions.

A summary response to the question of board member-superintendent congruency of perception on "board professionalism" requires qualification.

Where the behavior was well-defined and mutually understood, congruency of perception was high. Specific
examples of congruent perceptions were apparent in questions related to the payment of superintendent's expenses, appointment of teachers nominated by the superintendent, keeping the superintendent informed on important matters, the board voting as blocs and functioning as individuals.

Perceptual congruency was low on questions related to the board "selling" good education, taking responsibility for its decisions, and having a clear-cut statement of the division of responsibility of the board and superintendent.

It seems reasonable to suggest that sufficient lack of common perception between board members and superintendent existed to serve as a potential source of conflict.

The second third-priority question was:

How congruent will board member perception among members of the degree of professionalism of board members be?

The answer to this question, on the basis of the evidence, is that representatives of each faction perceived members of the opposite faction to be unprofessional in their board member role. The tendency to attribute poor role behavior to members of the opposite faction was an obvious, although not exclusive tendency.

One liberal member also perceived "blind devotion" to any cause as a threat to professional boardmanship.
Three of the four board respondents viewed "name calling" as an unprofessional practice.

Board members unanimously rated themselves "professional" on three items, i.e., Paying superintendent's expenses, appointing only superintendent nominees, and keeping the superintendent informed on important matters. Congruence was low on whether the board "sold" good education, whether the board had a clear-cut policy statement for school system operation, and whether the board took full responsibility for its decisions.

The board agreed unanimously that they did not have a clear-cut statement of the division of responsibility between themselves and the superintendent. They also agreed unanimously that they voted as representatives of blocs, and that they functioned as individuals rather than as a unit. These particular characteristics evidence a lack of professionalism.

The pattern of board member responses to the thirteen questions of board professionalism supports the contention that board members concur substantially that theirs is an unprofessional board.

The third of the third-priority questions was:

How congruent will board member and superintendent perception be regarding the superintendent's effectiveness in specific administrative task areas?
Table 1 on page 124 provides the data which were analyzed for the purpose of answering this question.\(^1\)

In the area of personnel, board member evaluation of the superintendent ranged from excellent to poor. The two remaining board evaluations were good and fair. The superintendent rated himself fair to good. Congruence between individual board member evaluations and superintendent self-evaluation was low.

Board members awarded the superintendent's performance in finance two excellents, one good and one poor. The superintendent again rated his own performance fair to good. Congruence was still fairly low.

In school plant management the ratings of the board were two goods and two excellents. The superintendent stated that he "didn't touch that area."

Instructional direction produced perfect congruence with two rather portentous qualifications. The conservative board member rated the superintendent's intentions excellent, and the superintendent attributed the success of the instructional program to the efforts of an assistant superintendent.

Congruence in pupil services was also high. Three board members assigned "good" ratings and one member

assigned "excellent". The superintendent rated himself "good".

The congruence of board member-superintendent perception of superintendent performance in public relations was also high. The board ratings were fair (at best), poor-minus, excellent and poor. The one member who assigned the excellent rating was one of two members who "approved whatever the superintendent did," according to one member of the same liberal faction.

In general planning the board members tended to rate the superintendent higher than he rated himself. Board ratings were good, fair, excellent, good. The superintendent's self-rating was fair.

Over-all performance was fairly congruent in rating. Board members rated the superintendent excellent, fair, good-plus and fair to good. The superintendent's self-rating was "good."

A ninth question was added to the original eight used by Gross, Mason and McEachern. The ninth question asked whether the superintendent had done anything during the two years which, in the opinion of respondents, he should never have done.

The board member responses to this question elicited a common theme—the superintendent tended to talk too much, to the wrong people, at the wrong time, and on inappropriate subjects.
The superintendent perceived that he had engaged in no inappropriate behaviors during the two year period. On this question the members of the board were in substantial disagreement with the superintendent. They disagreed to varying degrees, but they perceived unanimously that the superintendent was vocal to an excessive degree. The superintendent failed to share that perception, and congruence, therefore, is completely lacking on this aspect of the superintendent's role.

The second-priority question posed on page 11 may now be addressed. The question was:

Will an examination of role perception held by board members and superintendent reveal substantial differences with regard to what constitutes "appropriate superintendent role" and "appropriate board member role"?

With regard to the "superintendent role" it is evident that board members and superintendent differ openly on the matter of the superintendent taking a proactive position on potentially abrasive issues. The respondents also seemed to agree that the board was substantially unprofessional in its role behavior in terms of the postulated criteria, and that board members and superintendent should refrain from "name calling."

While board members and superintendent tended to disagree with "unprofessional board behavior," however,
there was a notable tendency on the part of several participants to believe that a board which truly reflects community sentiments serves some useful purpose in school governance, even though such practice may entail overt conflict.

One of the most striking features of the responses of board members to questions related to board role and superintendent role consisted in the tendency of members and, to a substantial degree, the superintendent, to perceive similar behaviors differently in terms of the group or ideological affiliation of the actor perceived. i.e., When "my" faction votes as a bloc, it's because we share common beliefs; when "they" vote as a bloc, they are engaging in subterfuge, or representing the interests of some special interest group. To a substantial degree, the "rightness" of a particular role behavior seemed to be a function of the affiliations of the perceiver and the perceived. When a given behavior was perceived to have an intended result which was antithetical to the ideology of the perceiver, that behavior was perceived as "wrong."

Having examined the two second-priority and four third-priority questions, it is now possible to refocus attention on the second major research question.
That question was:

Are the factors described by the terms belief systems, role perceptions and perceived mediated community inputs sufficient to explain conflict which existed between and among board members and superintendent during the two year period examined?

If it had been possible to establish a strong rationale to support a contention that the conflict experienced by board members and superintendent remained issue centered throughout the two year period, it would have been possible to argue convincingly that the three independent variables, along with related issues, explained all of the experienced conflict. The conflict did not remain issue centered throughout, however, which leads to the conclusion that the three independent variables are not sufficient to explain all of the conflict which existed.

ADDITIONAL CONFLICT FACTORS

The third major research question was:

What additional factors seem to be involved which indicate a need for further study?

Answers to this question, as in the case of two preceeding major questions, have been built up by answering one second priority question and four third-priority questions.
The single second-priority question was:

Do the three variables postulated seem adequate to explain existing conflict during the two year period examined?

As in the case of the major question, an answer to the second-priority question has been delayed to permit an examination of the four third-priority questions.

The first of these was:

Will an examination of board policy decisions indicate that certain issues which are independent of the three variables of interest constitute separate sources of conflict, or are the variables of interest and policy inseparable?

An examination of the relationship of policy issues to the independent variables did not support a conclusion that any single policy issue constituted a separate source of conflict. Exacerbation of a policy issue to the point of open interpersonal conflict was consistently accompanied and apparently affected by interaction with the independent variables.

Conflictive interaction, however, did appear to yield a relatively independent conflict "issue". This "extra" issue was the personal animosity and mistrust which were engendered by policy-issue related conflict.

The researcher concluded that, in this case, the "whole" of ongoing, unresolved conflict exceeded the sum of the contributing parts. The excess was comprised of
personal animosity and mistrust between and among participants. Personal animosity and mistrust appear to have cumulative carry-over effects from one discrete policy-centered conflict episode to another.

It is apparent that the participants in the case examined shifted the emphasis from policy issues to personal issues. E.g., During consideration of a policy issue, Dr. C. referred to a statement by Mr. Y. as "juvenile". That appellation stuck in Mr. Y.'s mind. He used the remark against the superintendent in a newspaper quote, he referred to it in the interview with the researcher which took place more than a year after the incident, and the incident was also mentioned by one reporter and one liberal board member, both of whom stated that the superintendent's remark created an irrevocable polarization of Mr. Y.'s position via a via the board and superintendent.

This example illustrates a tendency on the part of the actors to retain "perceptual echoes," or memories of events which are personally, rather than issue oriented. This finding is consistent with Coleman's contention that, as conflicts evolve, charges against the opponent as a person are made, and the dispute tends to become independent of the initial disagreement.¹

¹Supra, p. 50.
This finding also suggests that episodes of the type illustrated probably shift conflict from the "game" category or the kind of conflict which is played out according to the parliamentary rules which govern the board's activities, to the "fight" category, in which the offended party seeks to figuratively destroy the opponent without regard for the niceties of controlling rules.

An additional category of variables, therefore, seems to be comprised of personal issues and lack of trust which may have had roots in legitimate policy issues, but which grew beyond the confines of "policy" and eventually became independent of policy issues. Board members may substantially agree that a policy is desirable, but because mutual trust is insufficient to sustain an objective examination of issues, the issues are never fully heard, the majority faction "enforces" its point of view, and the non-trusting expectation of the minority faction is reinforced. Examples of this were cited in Chapter three.

The second third-priority question under additional factors was:

Will participant reports, selected observer reports, or newspaper accounts of board member-superintendent interaction suggest additional variables which contribute to conflictive relationships?
Two pieces of evidence suggest that the newspapers themselves may have exerted a subtle, but substantial influence in the conflict.

The conservative citizen interviewee reported that the newspapers and radio stations were not interested in publicizing the SOS point of view until after she had made a statement at a board meeting. Her belief that the superintendent had to be made an issue in order to give SOS members some recognition raises rather serious questions about what might have happened if the media had given the conservative point of view "equal time" at some earlier stage.

The statement of one reporter that a conservative board member was quoted to illustrate the ludicrousness of the conservative position, along with the overtly pro-liberal stance of both newspapers raises some questions. These questions are related to the extent to which seeing a particular point of view presented in an unfavorable manner effects the polarization and hardening of that point of view. It appears, therefore, that newspapers have contributed to the conflict. Although they are unarguably in the business of presenting news, newspapers are also in the business of selling newspapers, and, as Crain has suggested, "conflict is news, peace is not."  

The third second-priority question was:

If additional identifiable variables seem to incite board member-superintendent conflict, what are they?

One additional relatively independent source of conflict exists. The possibility consists of the perceived effects of federal intervention in local school affairs.

The city board first addressed the question of equality of educational opportunity in 1966--two years after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. An agreement between the school system and the Office of Civil Rights did exist during the period examined and was perceived by the conservative constituency as a threat to the neighborhood school. That agreement did relate to staff desegregation, and this fact was apparently twisted by some parties opposed to desegregation in attempts to confuse the issue.

It may be argued that civic belief differences created a polarization of opinion which acted upon federal influences in a manner which led to conflict. The question remains, however, that, had perceived federal intervention not occurred, would local differences in civic beliefs by themselves have ultimately led to conflict? Using this kind of criterion, the effects of perceived federal intervention clearly qualify as possible independent sources of conflict.
The fourth third-priority question was:

What need for further research is indicated?

Three lines of investigation seem to be worthy of additional study.

First, the role played by variables generally classified as "federal intervention" is worthy of study. A potentially productive line of investigation would entail assessing the effects which federal desegregation guidelines had on members of the board which served immediately prior to the period treated by this investigation. Did the perceived possibility of federal intervention motivate the previous board to act, or did variables of the type examined in the present study prompt that action?

In order to address this question, it would be necessary to talk with board members and other individuals knowledgeable of the events which led to the 1969 board's resolution of intent. The possibility of federal intervention serving as an independent source of conflict cannot be either accepted or rejected in the absence of such investigation.

The second possibility—conflict as a source of conflict—or the effects of personal animosity and lack of trust, which accompany conflict, on conflict, would require a more rigorous investigative approach than that
used in the present study. At the outset it would seem impossible to isolate the cumulative effects of conflict on conflict in the absence of control groups. That is, it may be productive to observe boards that experience continued conflict which centers around unresolved underlying issues, and compare the incidence rate and intensity of such conflict with that experienced by a board or boards whose efforts to resolve conflict are successful, and whose continuing relationships are therefore not encumbered by accumulation of personal animosity and mistrust.

In order to successfully undertake such a study it would be necessary to select comparable board groups, develop standardized evaluative instruments, and train objective observers.

A third potentially productive type of investigation would consist of assessing the comparative effects on board-superintendent conflict of different approaches utilized in reporting news of board-superintendent conflict.

Any meaningful comparisons of the effects of liberal, conservative and/or neutral press coverage on board member-board member-superintendent conflict would require the identification of two or more board member-superintendent groups which are comparable in relational aspects other than the nature of press coverage. In the
absence of comparable groups, methods of statistically equating groups for research purposes would have to be devised. Either approach would require stringent experimental controls, but the potential information yield supports a contention that such an investigation would be worthwhile.

The one second priority question to which an answer was postponed may now be addressed.

Do the variables postulated seem adequate to explain existing conflict during the two year period examined?

An unqualified affirmative answer to this question is impossible. Three factors prevent an unqualified response.

First, the possibility exists that perceived federal intervention motivated the prior board's actions to improve equality of educational opportunity. If perceived federal intervention did affect the prior board's actions, such perceived intervention would qualify as a possible independent conflict-arousing variable. The possibility also exists that, in the absence of perceived federal intervention, the previous board would have not been sufficiently motivated to address problems related to equal educational opportunity. Had the previous board not taken action to equalize educational opportunity, it is questionable whether the development of community and
board factions, along with the ensuing conflict, would have had reason to occur.

Second, since conflict did occur, and was reiterated periodically throughout the two year period without apparent acceptable compromise or amelioration of underlying issues, a distinct possibility exists that unresolved conflict served as an additional, independent conflict variable. The evidence clearly indicated that opposing parties to the conflict became more adamant in their commitment to opposing points of view as time passed. In the absence of the introduction of radically different conflict issues over the two year period it seems that conflict itself introduced an added element of rancor to the relationships.

Third, it was impossible to exclude the possibility that the press coverage of board member-board member-superintendent conflict exerted a separate influence on the frequency and intensity of conflict.

It is impossible, therefore, to contend that differences in civic beliefs, differences in role perceptions, and perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education accounted for all of the conflict experienced by the participants.

The initial major question in this section was:
What additional factors seem to be involved which indicate a need for further study?

The effects of perceived federal intervention, personal considerations (conflict as a source of conflict), and the treatment of conflict by the press must be examined in order to determine their relationship to the independent variables examined in this study.

These phenomena may be sufficiently related to the independent variables studied to be included as non-independent conflict sources. It was beyond the scope of this study to fully assess those relationships, however, and the real nature of those relationships remains to be determined.

CONCLUSIONS

A series of major conclusions based on the results of this investigation have been drawn. These conclusions have been evolved from, and summarize the answers to the research questions.

First major conclusion. The conflict experienced by the board of education and superintendent during the two year period examined had its roots in differences in belief systems, differences in role perceptions, and in perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education.
On the basis of the evidence it seems that the parties began their formal board-superintendent relationship in January, 1970, in conflict. In terms of the conflict model presented in Chapter two, the parties never succeeded during the two year period in resolving the conflict. Despite the fact that superficial differences in issue were apparent, the major underlying conflict issue was, and continues to be, school district reorganization and desegregation.

Second major conclusion. Differences in belief systems, differences in role perceptions, and perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education operated interactively throughout the two year period to arouse and maintain conflict. The evidence suggests that differences in civic beliefs sparked the initial confrontation between and among board members and superintendent, but the second and third variables came into play very quickly. The evidence suggests that these three variables operated interactively throughout the period treated. e.g., On one occasion the board asked the superintendent to present a plan for district reorganization. Mr. Y. presented the enabling motion. When the superintendent presented his plan conservative members (a) voiced concerns that the plan threatened the concept of neighborhood schools (civic beliefs were
threatened), (b) said that the superintendent had moved too quickly (disagreed with the role played by the superintendent), and (c) expressed concerns related to neighborhood school patrons (mediated community inputs).

**Third major conclusion.** It cannot be stated with assurance that belief systems, role perceptions and perceived mediated community inputs exhaust the possible list of conflict sources which operated in the arousal and maintenance of conflict. It has been impossible to exclude perceived effects of federal intervention, personal animosity and mistrust, and the effects of press coverage as possible, additional independent variables in the arousal and maintenance of board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict.

**Fourth major conclusion.** The evidence suggests that conflict never occurred during the two year period in the absence of the willful participation and prosecution of issues by competing parties. Conflict was seen, therefore, as a phenomenon incited and maintained through a process, and as a result, of human interaction. The conflict type was sociological, inasmuch as it was interpersonal, and its modality was "fight".
Fifth major conclusion. None of the conflicting parties can disavow responsibility for the conflict. Neither board faction listened to the other. They "talked at" each other, but did not seriously attempt to resolve their differences. The superintendent, in the face of bilateral board requests to assume a lower public profile, apparently did not.

The board began its tenure as two identifiable, opposed factions. The ongoing adversary positions pursued by the two factions, ostensibly fed by perceived ideological, quasi-political affiliations of the two factions contributed to an increasing degree of factional polarization throughout the period examined.
CHAPTER V

REFLECTIONS ON THE STUDY: SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

Objectives and nature of the study. The two major objectives of this study were:

1. To provide an extensive expository account of a two year period of conflictive interaction between and among a superintendent and board of education as the interactions were reported by board members and superintendent, evidenced in policy votes of the board, and reported by selected non-participant observers and in local newspaper accounts.

2. To determine whether board member-superintendent belief systems, role perceptions and perceived community inputs mediated by and through the board of education operated interactively or independently as they affected board member-superintendent conflict.

These major objectives were addressed by selecting a fairly large (approximately 54,000 students), school system's board and superintendent for study. This board and superintendent had been involved in open, admitted
conflict for almost two years at the time the study was designed.

A case study comprised of five components was utilized to meet the postulated requirements of objective number one, and to answer a series of major and subsidiary questions derived from the second objective.¹

The five components of the case study design included the following:

1. Board policy decisions from January, 1970 through December, 1971, were examined, and those, which by virtue of nonconsensual voting pattern admitted possible conflict, were subjected to analysis, along with those upon which the board unanimously agreed.

2. Newspaper accounts of incidents and issues related to board member-superintendent conflict during the two year period were examined.

3. Verbal accounts of conflictive board member-superintendent relationships experienced by the participants during a two-year period were recorded by the researcher in individual interviews.

4. Measures of board member-superintendent civic beliefs and self-other role perceptions were carried out in individual interviews.

a. The instruments used in this component included:

   1. "The Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs."

¹Supra, pp. 9-11.
2. Seven Functions of the Superintendent's Job.

3. School Board Performance Items Used in the Measure of School Board Adherence to Professional Standards.

5. Verbal accounts of the two year period of conflictive board member-superintendent relationships were secured from selected community representatives in individual interviews. These selected representatives included two journalists familiar with the situation, one community leader identified by the board members as a liberal non-participant observer, and one identified by board members as a conservative non-participant observer.

Information gathered from the interviews of participants, non-participant observers, and from newspaper reports which were conflict-related was used to reconstruct a chronological report of the two-year period of conflict.

Information gathered during the administration of civic belief and role perception instruments, along with policy analysis information was examined, compared, and subjected to limited statistical analysis. The application of these procedures led to the following conclusions.

**Summary of conclusions.** The rancorous conflict experienced by the board of education and superintendent studied was rooted in differences in civic belief systems, differences in role perceptions, and in the differential
effects of community inputs mediated by and through the board of education. Although the three independent variables described by the terms belief systems, role perceptions, and mediated community inputs seemed capable of explaining a preponderance of the conflict experienced, it was impossible to exclude the possible intervening effects of perceived federal intervention and conflict, itself, as potential additional sources of conflict. The evidence led to the conclusion that the three independent variables had an interactive effect, rather than independent effects on the arousal and maintenance of conflict.

The evidence also led the researcher to conclude that conflict, as defined and examined within the context of this study, did not exist in the absence of active participation and prosecution on the part of board members and superintendent. Conflict came to be viewed by the researcher as a dynamic, participative phenomenon.

Finally, it was concluded that, inasmuch as no participant seemed to make a concerted, persistent effort to resolve the conflict, at least a portion of the responsibility for the perpetuation of conflict must be borne by all participants.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction. During the interview, Mrs. D. remarked that if she had her experience as a board member to live over again, she would have been more insistent that one of the conservative board members be elected vice-president. She believed that to do so would have promoted more harmonious board member relationships. "But," she said, "hind sight is always 20/20."

This statement served as a caveat which has guided the development of recommendations, and should also guide the reader's assessment of those recommendations in the following ways.

First, the recommendations have been drawn only after an extensive consideration of large amounts of conflict-related information, and should be considered, therefore, to be generally applicable to the period treated, rather than as incident-specific conflict intervention techniques.

Second, a concerted effort has been made to avoid making any kind of value judgement concerning the appropriateness of past actions of parties to the two-year period of conflict. This stance has been assumed primarily for the sake of retaining an objective point of view, but it also has resulted from the knowledge that post hoc analysis of conflict provides some analytic advantages not
available to active participants in an on-going conflict.

For these reasons, the temptation to say that under certain circumstances the superintendent or board should obviously have done certain things has been avoided. Instead, the recommendations included here provide some alternative ways of viewing board member-board member, board member-superintendent interaction, along with some modes of action which represent potential alternatives to the ways in which the subjects in this study acted, and some suggestions related to the use of the methodology employed in this study in other research efforts.

Prior to presenting the recommendations a group of three generalizations has been included. In the researcher's opinion, these generalizations constitute a set of minimum conditions which must necessarily precede the consideration of recommendations. In the absence of these pre-conditions, the recommendations which follow would be relatively meaningless.

Generalization, as used for the purposes of this discussion means a set of conditions, characteristics or qualifications which apply to the conflict examined within the limits of this study, and which are essential to the recommendations which follow.

Generalization one:

A conflict issue is not necessarily
synonymous with the conflict. Sociological conflict in the present case was aroused only after issues had been processed and internalized by individuals who held incompatible civic beliefs, different perceptions of "appropriate" board member and superintendent role behavior, and who were constrained to mediate incompatible community inputs. Unresolved conflict which exists for an extended period of time may be fed by conflict, itself, and by interpersonal mechanisms or intervening variables which are relatively issue-independent.

Generalization two:

Conflict mediation and resolution are unlikely to occur in the absence of an understanding of the nature of conflict, the nature of issues which customarily contribute to conflict, and the nature of differences in the mechanisms which lead to overt conflict.

Generalization three:

Conflict resolution and board member-superintendent consensus are not likely to occur in the absence of uniform desire across conflicting parties for resolution and consensus, and in the absence of a commitment to achieving resolution and consensus.

The recommendations have been placed in one of four groups. One group contains recommendations which relate to the board of education and superintendent as a body. The second group includes recommendations pertaining primarily to the board of education. The third group includes recommendations relating primarily to the super-
intendent. The fourth category of recommendations is intended for the use of other researchers.

A rationale follows each of the recommendations. The rationale provides an opportunity for the researcher to elaborate the reasons which prompted each of the recommendations. The rationale also provides the reader with an evaluative context against which to test the adequacy of the recommendations.

Board of education and superintendent. These recommendations might have been addressed by the board and superintendent any time during the two year period of conflict. Board control shifted to the conservative faction in January, 1972, and that control was maintained until Mr. Z's unexpected death in April. Four of the remaining members and the superintendent who served during the January 1970-December 1971 period are on the current board, and the dynamics of the situation seem sufficiently similar to support the contention that many of these recommendations will still be viable.

Recommendation one:

Determine the constituency which the board can serve as a body.

Rationale: Some of the subjects of this study voiced the opinion that a factionally divided board may be a symptom of the school system's vitality and health.
This is probably true, in part. But it is also possible that such a contention is, at least in-part, a fatuous rationalization as it relates to the long-term best interests of the school system.

It seems logical to assume that, where factions exist, considerable energy will be expended to wage factional war which could otherwise be devoted to unified attempts to improve education on several fronts. The creation of a cooperative board member-board member-superintendent relationship would have the potential to prevent the possible quadrennial shift from liberal to conservative to liberal board control, and the attendant attempts to undo what the preceeding controlling faction had done. It seems reasonable to assert that a board which has a unified committment to students and to the educational welfare of all students will, in the long run, serve a more useful educational function than a board which is perenially factionalized.

This recommendation does not imply that the board should seek to avoid conflict at all costs. It is virtually axiomatic that occasional, purposeful conflict can be functional and productive. It is just as axiomatic, however, to assert that a board-superintendent relationship which is characterized by conflict, will be less productive in the long run than a cooperative relationship.
Recommendation two:

Initiate private study sessions for the purpose of clarifying and agreeing on board member and superintendent roles.

Rationale: Some of the board members seemed to believe that the perusal and discussion of issues in private would be interpreted by the public as collusion. It was also apparent, however, that the virtually exclusive use of public meetings by the board for all purposes subjected individual members to unusual, and perhaps unnecessary constituency pressures.

The evidence indicated that board member and superintendent understanding of their roles was characterized by ambiguity. Honest attempts to explain and clarify roles, and to correct misunderstandings and misperceptions in a private, comparatively threat-free environment is worth several trials if the board is committed to discharging its corporate responsibility as a corporate body.

Recommendation three:

Hold private study sessions for the purpose of identifying, admitting, and overtly adopting responsibility for covert motivations and for acknowledging issues which lead to conflict.

Rationale: Initially, this may seem to be a vacuous recommendation. The reader may say that it is patently obvious that conflict revolves around ideological
differences, and beg to leave it at that.

Closer observation of the evidence, however, suggests that, in the eyes of the individual participant, conflict is always attributable to something that "they" did. The "they" may be the superintendent, or a member or members of the opposing faction. Until the "theys", whoever they may be, become capable of saying "I", or "We, through certain kinds of identified action, found myself or ourselves in disagreement with your point of view,"—until all participants become capable of granting a certain legitimacy to an opposing point of view—conflict will prevail.

Anything less than overt admission and ownership of covertly held views will contribute to further game-like behavior, but not to an improvement in understanding or relationships.

Recommendation four:

Hold private study sessions for the purposes of developing an understanding of the policy making process and agreeing on decision rules.

Rationale: Much of the circus-like atmosphere which has characterized public meetings of the board may be related to the sudden, "jump-shift" reactions of certain board members to proposed policies. If this kind of atmosphere is to be avoided to any extent, it is
necessary, first, that the board subscribe as a body to the intent of certain policy directions. For example, if the board subscribes to the notion that equality of educational opportunity is a desideratum, it follows that policies which speak to that intent should receive unanimous, public, overt and covert board member support. If this example does not speak to the unanimous intent of the board, then reasoned compromises must be implemented which identify those policy qualities which do satisfy the board's intent.

Second, the board should identify sets of decision rules which will govern its corporate action. e.g., in the case of an intensively factional board, would it be desirable to require at least a 5-2 majority on all decisions, rather than a simple majority? Would it be desirable to identify sets of policy criteria which would constitute a sine qua non on any policy decision? i.e., unless a policy can survive tests of its ability to treat clients indiscriminately, or tests of "reasonableness," it will not be approved.

It seems that a perpetuation of circumstances which forces the board to confront conflict engendering policies without resort to higher level decision rules will only result in a maintenance of the status quo.

A further example of how decision rules might be used to govern decisions has been taken from the board's
record. In early 1971 the board requested unanimously that the superintendent present plans for reorganization which would include magnet schools, middle schools etc. The superintendent produced a plan in short order, and was promptly denounced by certain board members for attempting to destroy the identity of the neighborhood school.

If the board's unanimous decision had been guided by decision rules designed to communicate their intent to the superintendent, they would have saved the superintendent and his staff time, would have avoided making him a "goat" for their own errors, and, further, would have avoided transferring more of their own and the community's animosity to the superintendent for a "mistake" which resulted from their own unanimous action.

Recommendation five:

The board and superintendent should consider using an ombudsman to aid their efforts to improve interpersonal processes.

Rationale: The board of education may not, and should not abdicate its decision-making responsibility and role. It seems, however, that a disinterested "third party" might serve effectively from time-to-time as an objective, procedural referee.

An objective referee might be able to point out to
members of both factions that they tend at times to cross the boundaries which separate reason from coercion, and fact from illusion. Such an individual could interject, in the middle of a heated dispute—"You are making an unwarranted personal accusation."

The successful trial of such a recommendation would require that all conflicting parties agree on the person who might serve as ombudsman. It would also be necessary that the individual be personally qualified to act in such a capacity, and would further require the development of guidelines which would govern his or her relationship with the board and superintendent.

Board of education. The following recommendations are intended primarily for the board's consideration as a body.

Recommendation one:

The board should explore alternative methods of board member recruitment.

Rationale: Prior to 1969 election to the board depended upon the endorsement of the All-City Committee. The evidence suggests that, for a period of at-least twenty years prior to 1969 board recruitment was a clearly defined, understood, and accepted matter. Prospective candidates were socialized, normed and endorsed by a
clearly defined system which was neither seriously questioned nor challenged.

In 1969, however, a political rivalry was formed via the introduction of SOS, which successfully went outside the existing normative structure and elected three candidates. The formerly unchallenged All-City Committee seems to have ceased to exist as a viable entity since that time, although a new, similarly motivated organization has developed.

In view of these developments it would seem to be instructive to objectively examine alternative methods of board member recruitment. The current method relies substantially on quasi-partisan political techniques, but board members are elected at-large. The last election witnessed sixty-one percent of the vote being awarded to liberal candidates. Despite this majority, control of the board swung to the conservative faction because of factional disparities in the number of candidates. Election of members by high school district might result in a more reliable electoral method, and in a more representative board. The current state statutes would not permit such an approach, but a consideration of alternatives seems to be in order.

An additional consideration which supports the examination of alternative recruitment strategies is apparent in the allegiance which board members have shown
their political constituencies in the board meeting setting. The presence during board meetings of opposing, vocal claques seemed to contribute little to the setting which would enhance the rational, objective consideration of policies on their merits. If this status quo is, in fact, deleterious to rational board processes, it would seem that a consideration of alternatives which would depoliticize the role of the board is in order.

One alternative approach which might contribute to the political insularity of the board consists in moving to an appointed, rather than an elected board. This approach is also precluded within the present statutory framework, but consideration of the implications and desirability of an a-political board is not prohibited.

Recommendation two:

Examine and evaluate the effects of public, political role playing on the part of board members.

Rationale: This recommendation revolves around the question of appropriate board member role. Is board membership primarily political or a-political? Is the board member's "constituency" the whole public, students, or an identifiable faction of the public?

If the board member serves the whole public, then quasi-political behavior designed to attract the support
and favor of certain ideological factions seems to be precluded. If the board member serves the whole public, but finds that public consensus on given policy questions is lacking, then the board member would seem to have an obligation to seek acceptable compromises.

This rationale will be perceived by some as distasteful, but the alternatives to compromise are unilateral enforcement of a point of view, and/or factional warfare.

Political role playing and the "playing to the galleries" which that entails does not seem to be particularly conducive to cooperation and compromise.

The superintendent. The following recommendations are intended primarily for the superintendent's individual consideration.

Recommendation one:

Reassess the effects which his leadership style had on his relationship with the board as-a-whole, and on board member-board member relationships.

Rationale: The board members interviewed unanimously expressed the opinion that they would prefer that the superintendent assume a lower public profile. In view of this kind of sentiment, it would seem appropriate for the superintendent to evaluate the kinds of interactions and pressures which may have been attributable to the
pro-active stance which he assumed in working with issues related to equality of educational opportunity. This rationale does not suggest in any way that the superintendent modify or compromise his beliefs. It does suggest, however, that he objectively and dispassionately weigh and compare the positive and negative effects which his vocal, visible leadership style has had on his relationship with the board, and on board member-board member relationships.

Recommendation two:

Consider the adoption of alternative patterns of administrative behavior.

McCarty and Ramsey¹ include four community power structures in their model of types of community power—the dominated, factional, pluralistic and inert. They contend that these four types of community power structure are usually reflected in a dominated, factional, status congruent or sanctioning board of education. They further contend that the appropriate role for the superintendent to assume in each of these respective situations is—functionary, political strategist, professional advis-

or, or decision-maker. In the extant case the superintendent assumed a role which would be most appropriately termed that of professional advisor, rather than decision-maker. The appropriate behavior for the superintendent who is faced with a factional board, according to McCarty and Ramsey, is that of the political strategist. In assuming that role he avoids becoming exclusively identified with one faction or the other, and thereby retains the ability to work with either faction.

The contemplation of a professional future as a political strategist may be anathema to the superintendent involved here. But, according to McCarty and Ramsey,

On the factional board, the necessity for the superintendent to be coy about wholehearted support of majority decisions is a safety measure he cannot afford to overlook, although it often annoys the majority.¹

Other researchers: The following recommendations are intended for the consideration and possible use by other researchers.

Recommendation one:

Other researchers should not attempt to generalize the findings of this research to other instances of board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict.

¹Ibid., p. 118.
Rationale: The findings of this study resulted from the extensive assessments of board member-board member, board member-superintendent interaction in only one setting. The findings, therefore, relate to interactions and situational dynamics which are ideosyncratic to the research site and to the involved subjects. It follows that attempts to generalize the findings of this study to other instances of board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict would be methodologically incorrect and would yield potentially invalid conclusions.

Recommendation two:

Other researchers are encouraged to adopt the research methodology used in this study for the assessment and analysis of board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict in other locales, and to evaluate the utility of the model in other settings.

Rationale: The research design was useful in the setting of the present study. Consequently, it should be tested in settings of a different character. The definition of conflict, the conflict model, the specification of conflict as the dependent variable and the specification of civic beliefs, role perceptions and community inputs mediated by and through the board as independent variables seem to constitute a conceptually
viable research model which could be productively applied in other settings.

In short, while the findings of this study are incapable of generalization, the methodology of the research has proven itself to be worthy of utilization in other settings, and should therefore be treated as a generalizable research methodology.

IMPLICATIONS

The exhortations which appear in textbooks on administration for the purpose of admonishing administrators to learn how to manage conflict are well-founded. The work carried out in this research has provided a rather broadly-conceived theoretical framework of conflict which seems capable of supplementing those exhortations to understand the nature of board member-board member, board member-superintendent conflict.

This framework provides a theoretical basis for the study of conflict between and among board members and superintendent which goes beyond the level of exhortation to understand and manage. As such, it would seem to have value in pre-service and in-service training programs designed to aid board members and superintendents in the development of conflict management skills.
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
SUPERINTENDENT'S FORM

Assure anonymity of treatment: Interview will take approximately one and one-half hours. "I'll stop you at appropriate times and provide the necessary structure for the interview."

The interview is in four parts. The first part is based on one question.

PART ONE

1. Please recall to the best of your ability how you and the board, or members of the board, got involved in open disagreement over policies. Think back to January, 1970, and then think out loud about how the disagreement developed and maintained itself through December, 1971.

PART TWO

Ok. I think that will do it for the first portion of the interview. In the second part, I'd like for you to give me two ratings on each item. First, I'm going to ask you to tell me how you rate yourself on one aspect of the superintendent's position at a time. You may rate yourself Excellent, Good, Fair or Poor on each item. Next, I'll ask you whether any of the board members would, in your opinion, have rated you differently. I'll also ask you to specify who board members rating you differently were, and the rating assigned.

Ready? Ok.


Would any board member serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?
2. How did you rate your performance in financial administration during the two years mentioned? (E G F P)

Would any board members serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?

3. How did you rate your performance in school plant management during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any board members serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?

4. How did you rate your performance in instructional direction during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any board members serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?

5. How did you rate your performance in pupil services during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any board members serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?

6. How did you rate your performance in public relations during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any board members serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?

7. How did you rate your performance in general planning during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any board members serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?

8. How did you rate your performance over-all during the two years. (E G F P)

Would any board members serving then have rated you differently? Who? How?

9. Did you do anything during the two years which you believe a superintendent should never do as a part of his job?

What?
PART THREE

Ok. Next, I'm going to read a list of twelve things that a board of education might do as a body. After each statement, if your board behaved according to the statement during the two years, say yes. If not, say no. I will then ask you if you agreed or disagreed with the board's behavior and why.

DID YOUR BOARD?

1. Pay the necessary expenses to allow the superintendent to attend meetings of professional organizations, visit other school systems, and do other things which keep him up to date on educational developments? (Y N)

Did you agree?

2. Appoint only teachers nominated by the superintendent? (Y N)

Did you agree?

3. Help "sell" good education to the community? (Y N)

Did you agree?

4. Have a clear statement of the policies under which the school system should operate? (Y N)

Did you agree?

5. Take full responsibility for its decisions? (Y N)

Did you agree?

6. Have a clear-cut statement of the division of responsibilities between the school board and the superintendent? (Y N)

Did you agree?

7. Individual school board members give directions to the superintendent? (Y N)

Did you agree?
8. Give directions directly to the superintendent's subordinates? (Y N)
   Did you agree?

9. Keep the superintendent informed of important matters that came to your attention? (Y N)
   Did you agree?

10. In deciding important issues the members voted as representatives of important blocs or segments? (Y N)
    Did you agree?

11. Was it a board which functioned as a unit—not as individuals? (Y N)
    Did you agree?

12. A board not afraid to take stands regarding education in advance of community thinking? (Y N)
    Did you agree?

PART FOUR

Ok. The final portion of the interview is in written form and should take about 12 minutes. Read the instructions and if you don't have any questions, go ahead and complete the instrument.

THE FLORIDA SCALE OF CIVIC BELIEFS
By Ralph B. Kimbrough and Vynoe A. Hines,
University of Florida

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. Circle the symbol which best represents your position on each statement as follows:

SA — Strongly Agree
A — Agree
N — Neither agree nor disagree
D — Disagree
SD — Strongly Disagree
1. Socialized medicine would ruin medical standards and fill our nation with people having imaginary ailments.

2. The idea of equality should not be restricted to political equality.

3. Centralization of government tends to destroy the rights of the individual.

4. History shows that economic and social planning by governments does not necessarily lead to dictatorship.

5. Federal participation in local affairs can exist without undesirable federal control.

6. Moderates, who preach appeasement by urging us to give up our fight against centralized government and liberal constitutional interpretation, do so mostly for their personal political gain.

7. What a state does with its schools should be its business, not the Supreme Court's.

8. The most serious political issue of our day is the encroachment of the federal government upon states' rights.

9. Local government is grass-roots democracy at work and represents the voice of the people better than centralized government.

10. The federal government taxes the states and then sends this money back, minus what is wasted in Washington.

11. The federal government is often more representative of the people than some state governments.
Free enterprise, with an absolute minimum of governmental control, is the best way to assure full productivity in our country.

Private enterprise is the only really workable system in the modern world for satisfying our economic wants.

When individual producers and consumers are left free to follow their own self-interest, natural economic laws operate to produce the greatest public good.

The growth of our economy depends upon an increase in the activities of government to satisfy human wants as well as an increase in our private economy.

The principle of free competition is a natural law which should govern our business system without governmental interference.

The growth of large corporations makes government regulation of business necessary.

Government regulation of the market should occur only in cases of monopolies such as public utilities.

Money taken in by taxes is lost to the economy, since government is non-productive.

We should get back to hard work to cure our country's ills.

A growing national debt is nothing to worry about if the national income is growing at the same rate.
22. The price of aid to education, from a larger unit of government to a smaller one, is that the smaller one must do what it is told.

23. Income taxes are more equitable than sales tax.

24. To keep taxes from rising is commendable but in reality taxes should be cut.

25. The government is doing things which we simply cannot afford at public expense.

26. Deficit spending is a bad public policy except possibly in time of war.

27. All government spending should be on a pay-as-you-go basis.

28. In ordinary times public buildings, roads, and other permanent construction are the only things for which the government should borrow money.

29. The government should meet the needs of the people, if necessary, through borrowing money or increasing taxes.

30. If the country and the state are to make progress we are going to need additional taxes.

31. Good financial principles for private enterprise are equally good principles for government.

32. Government spending is naturally wasteful.

33. We are spending more than the people can really afford to spend for government services.
34. The collecting and spending of tax money is most wasteful at the federal level, and least wasteful at the local level of government.

35. We could still increase spending for important government services without harming the nation's economy.

36. Congress should accept the sensible virtue other businesses have learned—that of living within one's means.

37. Our government can and should do more to promote the general welfare.

38. Private enterprise could do better many of the things that government is now doing.

39. The best governed is the least governed.

40. It is more important to teach Americanism than to teach democracy in our public schools.

41. Charitable services for those in need should be left to voluntary groups.

42. Government in the United States is not the enemy of business.

43. Increased government services in the social welfare programs may increase an individual's freedom.

44. Legislative reapportionment is undesirable because city residents do not understand rural and small town problems.

45. The Supreme Court has assumed powers not given to it by law or custom.
SA A N D SD 46. Federal aid to schools, aid to the aged through social security, more stringent civil rights laws, and laws of like nature, are dangerously parallel to methods used in socialistic countries.

SA A N D SD 47. The government should increase its activity in matters of health, retirement, wages, and old-age benefits.

SA A N D SD 48. Some races are by nature inferior mentally, emotionally and physically.

SA A N D SD 49. If one has enough ambition and is willing to work hard, nothing but extremely bad luck can stop him.

SA A N D SD 50. Unless we change social conditions, many children of minority groups will be unable to realize their full potentialities.

SA A N D SD 51. The Monroe Doctrine should be revitalized and maintained by the Armed Forces of the United States.

SA A N D SD 52. The United Nations has become an international debating society paid for by the United States.

SA A N D SD 53. Our foreign policy has been motivated too long by a nature incapable of self-government.

SA A N D SD 54. People of most underdeveloped countries are by nature incapable of self-government.

SA A N D SD 55. We could recognize nations such as Red China without implying that we approve of their forms of government.

SA A N D SD 56. Production is greatest in an economic system based upon competition and some pressure.
If everyone would "take care of number one" there would be little need for such things as social security, health services, and other social welfare measures.

Government has a responsibility for protecting not only property rights but human rights as well.

Providence is the proper source for social change.

This country was made great by persons who were willing to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

BOARD MEMBERS' FORM

Assure anonymity of treatment: Interview will take approximately one and one-half hours. "I'll stop you at appropriate times and provide the necessary structure for the interview."

The interview is in four parts. The first part is based on one question. Here is the first question:

PART ONE

1. Please recall to the best of your ability how your board and superintendent got involved in open disagreement over policies. Think back to January, 1970, and then think out loud about how the disagreement developed and maintained itself through December, 1971.

PART TWO

Ok. I think that will do it for the first portion of the interview. In the second part, I'd like for you to give me three ratings on each item. First, I'm going to ask you to tell me how you rate the superintendent on one aspect of the superintendent's job at a time. There are
eight aspects of the job about which I'll ask for ratings. You can rate the superintendent Excellent, Good, Fair or Poor on each item. Next I'll ask you which of the other board members you think would have rated him differently and, finally, how you think he rated himself.

Ready? Ok.


Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

2. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in financial administration during the two years mentioned? (E G F P)

Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

3. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in school plant management during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

4. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in instructional direction during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

5. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in pupil services during the two years? (E G F P)
Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

6. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in public relations during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

7. How did you rate the superintendent's performance in general planning during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

8. How did you rate the superintendent's over-all performance during the two years? (E G F P)

Would any of the others serving on the board then have rated him differently? Who? How?

How would he have rated himself?

9. Did the superintendent do anything during the two years which you believe a superintendent should never do as a part of his job? What?

Do you feel that others shared your belief? Who?

PART THREE

Ok. Next I'm going to read a list of questions relating to things that a board of education might do as a body. After each question, if your board behaved according to the statement during the two years, say yes. If not, say no. I will then ask you if you agreed or disagreed with the board's behavior and why.

(See page 223 for questions)

PART FOUR

(See part four, p. 224).
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