ANALYSIS OF THE GROWTH OF TEACHER MILITANCY IN AMERICAN PUBLIC EDUCATION*

HARUO OTA

One of the most surprising phenomena since the 1960s in American school systems has been the increasing militancy of the country's public elementary and secondary classroom teachers and their organizations. Specifically, the decade of the 1960s will be remembered as one that saw a myriad of social protest movements. Taking a cue from the larger society, the decade of the 1960s will be remembered in the education field as a period of widespread teacher militancy. At the beginning of the decade, school teachers were regarded as more conservative and acquiescent than any other group.[1] Today, all that has changed. Teachers take collective actions considered militant and progressive. If we take a look at the statistics with regard to strikes and collective bargaining by teachers, we can easily imagine "the prevalence, scope, strength, and defiance" of militancy among teachers during that period of time.[2]

Table-1 shows the number of strikes, personnel involved, and mandays lost from 1960-61 to 1979-80 school year. During the period, over two thousand strikes took place involving about 1.4 million teachers. Although there had been one hundred and four strikes with approximately 23,000 teachers from 1940 to 1959,[3] the decade of the 1960s saw a vast increase in the militancy of public school teachers. For example, the strikes in the 1967-68 school year alone represented more than the total number of teacher strikes which had occured from 1940 to 1959. There was a substantial increase in the number of strikes in the 1969-70 school year, reaching 181. A total of eighty-five percent of the teacher strikes which occurred during the 1960s took place during the last three school years of the decade — 1967-70. In addition, 96.9 percent of the estimated man-days lost during the decade occurred during those three years. This clearly indicates that teacher strikes after 1960 were very much different from previous ones. When teachers in Connecticutt went on strike in 1946, the New York Times devoted a whole front page to the report. Yet, in 1968, there was very little reporting on strikes in various states.[4] This shows that teacher strikes had become so common that they had lost news value.

Table-2 shows the change in teachers attitudes toward strikes. Teachers who

Table-1

Teacher Strikes

School Year	Number of Strikes	Number of Teachers Involved	Number of Days Idle
1960-61	3	5,080	5,080
1961-62	1	22,000	22,000
1962-63	2	2,200	3,000
1963-64	5	11,980	24,020
1964-65	12	15,083	27,453
1965-66	18	33,620	49,220
1966-67	34	10,633	29,079
1967-68	114	162,604	1,433,786
1968-69	131	128,888	2,733,802
1969-70	181	118,636	911,032
1970-71	130	89,651	717,217
1971-72	89	33,352	248,080
1972-73	143	114,508	1,553,223
1973-74	154	74,873	718,518
1974-75	235	173,491	1,343,219
1975-76	144	57,755	593,960
1976-77	138	65,100	713,500
1977-78	202	84,081	801,881
1978-79	217	85,585	1,048,037
1979-80	221	96,885	1,217,540
	2,174	1,386,005	14,193,647

Sources: 1960-61 to 1970-71 from NEA, NEA Research Memo, December, 1971, p.5; 1971-72 to 1973-74 from NEA, Negotiation Research Digest, October 1973, p.23 and December 1974, p.15; and 1974-75 to 1979-80 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Labor-Management Relations in State and Local Governments: 1980, State and Local Government Special Series №86, 1981, pp.111-138.

support strikes have increased greatly in number as is shown in the following percentages: 53.3% in 1965 to 73% in 1970. In addition, by 1970, most teachers had approved strikes which demanded not only higher salaries, satisfactory teaching conditions and negotiation agreements, but also, remedy of unsafe conditions for pupils and improve-

ment of the instructional program. [5]

In addition to strike support, collective bargaining has begun to symbolize teacher militancy. From 1961 to 1965, there were forty representation elections for collective bargaining held in which 100,000 teachers participated. By 1973, forty-four states and the

Table-2

Should teachers strike?

	1965	1967	1968	1969	1970
Yes, same as other employees	3.3%	4.4%	8.8%	5.9%	10.0%
Yes, but only under extreme conditions	50.0	54.4	59.4	56.4	63.0
No, never	37.8	33.7	22.8	30.4	20.8
Undecided	8.9	7.5	9.0	7.7	6.2

Source: NEA, Today's Education. February 1971, p.27.

Table-3

Classroom Teacher Collective Bargaining Agreements

School Year	Number of School Systems With Agreements	Percent of School Systems With Agreements	Number of Teachers Covered With Agreements	Percent of Teachers Covered With Agreements
1966-67	389	1.7	208,433	10.3
1968-69	1,027	(a)	448,142	20.7
1970-71	1,825	10.1	697,324	30.3
1972-73	2,556	(a)	934,794	39.2
1973-74	4,748	28.4	(a)	(a)
1974-76	5,531	33.8	(a)	(a)
1977-78	7,761	47.9	1,678,082	61.0
1978-79	8,051	50.3	1,721,683	61.3
1979-80	8,197	(a)	1,740,050	61.4

Sources: 1966-67 to 1972-73 from NEA, Negotiation Research Digest, January 1974, p.15 and 1973-74 to 1979-80 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Labor-Management Relations in State and Local Governments: 1980, 1981, pp.56-70.

(a) Data not available.

District of Columbia had negotiated teacher collective bargaining agreements, and nearly 40% of the nations's teachers had been working under some form of bargained contracts between school boards and teacher organizations.[7] In the 1978-79 school year, one-half the school districts had bargaining units for teachers and more than 60% of teachers were in bargaining units (See Table-3).

This article focuses primarily upon the factors which explain the rapid and large scale of militancy among teachers. Before the explanatory factors can be discussed, however, it is first important to review the basic direction and character of the two main teacher organizations before the 1960s, the National Education Associaton (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

For most of its long existence, the NEA had been essentially a professional association. As such, its membership had included not only classroom teachers but also school principals, superintendents, professors of education, and educational administrators. This was because the NEA held the idea that anyone who dealt with education should share common purposes and interests regardless of differences of titles and positions. Thus, the NEA had tried to become the association for all professionals in education. This idea of the association for all educators is one of the factors which would slow the entrance of teachers into the collective militant actions. As Raymond E. Callahan puts it:

> Unfortunately for teachers, the leaders in the NEA, and especially in the permanent bureaucracy, have been former school administrators. In addition, the most influential department of this "teachers" organization has been its Department of Superintendence. It is obvious that, while teachers and superintendents have much in common... they also have areas in which their interests conflict. Thus, it would have been unrealistic to expect the superintendents to push hard for a powerful teachers association which would have forced them to negotiate with it over such matters as salary or teaching load.[8]

The function of the NEA was two-fold: (1) "to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession" : and (2) "to promote the cause of education in the United States."[9] In view of its genteel respectability, the NEA could not very well strive only for the latter.[10] The NEA held that a thorough grounding in pedagogical knowledge and skills was as important to teachers as the mastery of an esoteric body of knowledge is to physicians and other professionals. The responsibilities of the profession in terms of its service to society had the effect of making it a profession in terms of its service to society. This had the effect of making teaching competence and the professonal conduct

of its members central concerns of the NEA. To put it another way, the improvement of teachers' professional performance and the establishment and maintenance of better service to pupils and to the public at large were deemed necessary to "promote the cause of education in the United States" and to establish teaching as a profession at the same time. As for the advancement of the "interests of the teaching profession," the NEA considered that this would come about through a vigorous effort to professonalize teaching. Any type of activity directed toward salary improvement and better working conditions was discouraged because such activity was thought to degrade the image of teaching as a profession that served society. Even discussions of teacher salaries were perceived as "unprofessional" and "rank unionism." [11] The only effort the NEA made to improve teacher salaries was to gather extensive data on the economic condition of teachers and to supply these to people who were in a position to make decisions: school boards, state departments, federal officers, and the like. [12]

In short, the NEA doctrine that there was a unity of interest among all educators and that gains for teachers should follow increases in the quality of professional practices prevented the NEA from entering into collective actions to pursue teacher financial welfare.

From the beginning, the AFT, on the other hand, was organized as a teacher union affiliated with organized labor. The AFT consisted mainly of classroom teachers. While NEA was an organization controlled by administrators, the AFT's sole purpose was to protect the interests of classroom teachers. The impetus for the formation of the AFT was two-fold: (1) "to obtain for teachers all the rights to which they are entitled" : and (2) "to raise the standards of the teaching profession by securing the conditions essential to the best professional service." [13] In contrast with the NEA's strategy, the AFT meant to elevate the status of the teaching profession by stressing improved working conditions and salaries. Collective bargaining was formally adopted as a negotiating tool in 1935. In fact, however, since no agreements were made with school boards until 1961, collective bargaining for a long time was merely a stated policy. [14] Because of its minority status, the AFT was incapable of implementing this course of action.

As we have seen, the basic direction and character of the NEA and the AFT were quite different with regard to promoting the interest of teachers. Equally important, the NEA always attracted the overwelming majority of the teaching force. It probably is fair to say that the dominant conservative doctrine of the NEA, which emphasized professional responsibilities of teachers rather than their professional rights, prevented

teachers from developing militant activities.

We now shift our attention to the development of teacher militancy and the main explanatory factors of the militancy. In the initial stages of teacher militancy, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) — a local organization of the AFT in New York City— played a most important role. A brief review of the development of teacher militancy in New York City may halp to illustrate an overall idea of what teacher militancy is like. [15]

The UFT called a strike on November 7, 1960. About 4,600 teachers went out on strike, demanding the right to bargain collectively, an increase of salaries, and an improvement of working conditions. The one-day strike was strongly opposed by the Board of Education and the city administration, and there were no immediate concession to the demands. However, the Condon-Wadlin Law prohibiting strikes by public employees was not invoked and no teachers were dismissed. As a result of the strike, many teachers were elated that they had been able to take collective action against the Board of Education. Teachers began to look to the UFT for leadership.

After the strike, the UFT concentrated its movement on collective bargaining. In June, 1961, there was a referendum by teachers to see if they wanted collective bargaining with the Board of Education. The vote was 26,983 for bargaining and 8,871 against. The referendum resulted in an election to decide which organization would bargain collectively for teachers with the Board of Education. In the representation election, three organizations qualified for the ballot. The UFT, supported by organized labor, overwhelmed the other organizations. The UFT then engaged in negotiations with the Board of Education, demanding an increase of salaries and an improvement of working conditions. But the negotiations made little progress and were finally broken off in April. The second strike by the UFT was set on April 11-12, 1962. This time, more than 20,000 teachers participated and twenty-five public schools in the city were closed. As a result of this strike, the Board of Education consented to an agreement which became a historical written contract of forty pages.

Following this important agreement, almost every year during the 1960s there were votes by teachers for strikes in conjunction with the New York City agreement. The UFT, after the first victory, expanded its membership; by 1964 one-half of the teachers in New York City had been unionized; by 1967 this had reached 80 percent. At the beginning of the 1970s, the UFT negotiated a contract covering almost all classroom teachers in the city.

This UFT victory was of great significance because it pushed both the AFT and the

NEA rapidly down the road of unionization. The AFT immediately took action to expand this teacher unionism that had emerged in New York City from a local into a national trend. The Union then launched a national campaign to establish bargaining rights for teachers. During the ensuing years, the AFT succeeded in winning bargaining rights in Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and many other major cities in the country.

Under the pressure stemming from the AFT collective bargaining movement, the policies and activities of the NEA underwent a drastic transformation. The NEA held an annual convention in the summer of 1962 during the same time the UFT was having collective bargaining with the Board of Education. An address made by one NEA official spoke to his worry over the developing threat by the AFT. In a speech entitled "The Turning Point", he pointed out that the NEA had not been able to meet the various demands by teachers especialy in urban areas. The UFT success, he said, was predicated upon labor support. He finally warned that unionism was a challenge to the principles of the NEA. In order to meet the challenge, he proposed that the NEA increase services toward various teacher organizations and reinforce local affiliates. [16]

Urban project, which was found in March 1962, was a trial to reform the NEA's organizational structure. Its purpose was "to strengthen the ability of professional organizations in urban communities to advance the welfare of teachers and to improve schools." [17] This project was expanded in 1965, and called the "Urban Service Division." About 580 million dollars were spent for this Project within four years from 1962 to 1966. That the budget for the Project reached 13% of total expenditure for the NEA in 1965 indicates the importance of the Project. [18]

After the reformation of the local organizations, some changes in actual strategies were undertaken in the following years. In 1962, two resolutions were adopted about the subject of teacher board relationships. One was on "Professional Negotiations," which could be referred to as collective bargaining. The other was on "Professional Sanction" which could be referred to as a strike. Actually, professional negotiations means a bargaining between teacher organizations and school boards which leads to a written contractual agreement. In 1967, the NEA adopted a resolution about strikes which read: "The NEA recognized that under conditions of severe stress strikes have occured and may occur in the future." [19] Thus, by the end of the 1960s the NEA had become as much a political organization as a labor union.

There is no doubt that the most important factor of the rapid development of teacher

militancy was the success of the AFT militant policies and strategy. However, it is necessary here to examine the reason why the AFT policies had been so effective in the 1960s.

A number of factors have been cited to account for the growth of teacher militancy.

Table-4

Ratio of the Average Annual Salary of Public School Instructional Staff to Per Capita Income Payments

Year	Salary in Dollars	Per Capita Income	Income Ratio
1929-30	1420	703	2.02
1931-32	1417	529	2.68
1933-34	1227	375	3.27
1935-36	1283	472	2.72
1937-38	1374	573	2.40
1939-40	1441	556	2.59
1941-42	1507	719	2.09
1943-44	1728	1102	1.57
1945-46	1995	1234	1.62
1947-48	2639	1316	2.00
1949-50	3010	1384	2.17
1951-52	3450	1652	2.09
1953-54	3825	1804	2.12
1955-56	4156	1876	2.21
1957-58	4702	2045	2.30
1959-60	5174	2161	2.39
1961-62	5700	2264	2.52
1963-64	6240	2455	2.54
1965-66	6700	2765	2.42
1967-68	7630	3162	2.41
1969-70	8272	3421	2.42

Note: This table is from Erick L. Lindman, "Are Teachers' Salaries Improving ? " in Phi Delta Kappan, April 1970, p.420.

We can place them into four general categories:

(1) economic conditions of teachers

(2) personal characteristics of teachers

(3) organizational environments of schools

(4) social and political influences

Historically, American school teachers had been suffering from low pay and low social status. There is abundant evidence for this "sorry history" [20] of teachers. The Annual Report by the Philadelphia Board of Controllers in 1864, for instance, reported that "a large portion of the teachers receive less than the janitress who sweeps the School House." [21] In 1867, Boston teachers earned $2.50 a week, 50 cents less than Negro cooks in the same area earned despite racial discrimination. [22] The poor economic conditions of teachers have not changed even in the twentieth century. As William E. Eaton points out:

> The national pay average of teachers of $512.00 in 1913 was abysmally low. In that same year the United States government paid its employees an average of $1,136.00, salaried employees averaged $1,066.00, ministers averaged $899.00, wage earners averaged $594.00 and the factory workers $578.00. Even in comparison with other local government employees the $512.00 figure was only 70 percent of that of policemen and 71 percent of that of firemen. [23]

In Table-4, we can see the relatively low ratio of the average annual salary of public teachers to per capita income payments after World War II, especially in the forties and the fifties. For example, the ratio was 2.72 in 1935-36, 1.62 in 1945-46 and 2.21 in 1955-56. According to a survey in 1961, 47.4% of male teachers had second-jobs during the school year. [24] Furthermore, a NEA survey in 1966 showed that 73.2% of the surveyed teachers were unsatisfied with their salaries. [25]

Those who have examined teacher militancy typically point out low salaries as a primary cause. As Timothy M. Stinnett and others put it:

> The mounting impatience of teachers with what they consider to be economic injustice is a factor of considerable significance. The point of view here is that teacher salaries have historically lagged behind the returns to other comparable groups, and often behind the pay of unskilled workers.... It is obvious that teachers have increasingly taken the position that they will no longer rely solely upon boards and legislatures for adequate remuneration, but will themselves become vigorously involved in the search for economic justice. [26]

Stephen Cole agrees with this analysis. In The Unionization of Teachers, he documents the diminished purchasing power of urban teachers' wages in New York City as a major factor in the UFT's success. [27] A comprehensive analysis of the development of teacher union's by William J. Moore and Ray Marshall also identifies salary lags as a major reason for teacher militancy. [28] A high school teacher confirms these analyses this way:

> In a country where people are judged in terms of dollars and cents and where pleasure is equated with consumption, teachers can be expected to join in the gold rush. We will aspire upward in pursuit of the American Dreams and we will support labor and professional organizations who fight for higher salaries and budget-stretching benefits. [29]

Thomas Q. Gilson and Elias T. Ramos studied unionized teachers and found that, of a range of possible union functions, teachers ranked "better pay" and "improved working conditions" highest. [30]

Thus, it may safely be said that a) militant union policies and tactics attracted teachers who had been dissatisfied with their economic condition and that b) the money issue is one of the major complaints of teachers. Although longstanding economic injustices to teachers may be a necessary factor facilitating militancy, it is not, however, a sufficient factor to explain the rapid development of teacher militancy. The ratio of average annual salary of public school teachers to per capita income payments was, for example, significantly higher in the 1960s than that in the 1940s and 1950s. If the teachers' low salary was the sole cause of the rapid militancy, we should have seen teacher militancy in the 1940s or 1950s, rather than in the 1960s. In other words, the economic deprivation of teachers, while not the only cause, is a leading cause of teacher militancy. Therefore, we should examine other factors which were highlighted after 1960.

It has been said that one factor which has prevented teacher unions from becoming militant is that teaching has been dominated by women. Many researchers have found differences between men and women in terms of union membership and participation in militant activities. William T. Lowe found that male teachers were more likely to join the AFT as a militant union and that women were more likely to join the NEA as a less militant "professional" association. [31] Stephen Cole found that men were more dissatisfied with their salaries than women and that there was a significant difference between men and women in supporting the New York City strike in 1962. [32] William S. Fox

and Michael H. Wince explain the significant difference between men and women teachers in terms of militancy this way:

> For more men than women, teaching is the sole or principal source of support for spouse and children. Thus, different role demands are made upon male and female teachers such that a given income is likely to seem less adequate to a male than a female teacher. Similarly, with respect to prestige, married women tend to assume the prestige conferred by the husband's occupation, thus easing the demands placed upon female teachers as opposed to males. This potential for greater male dissatisfaction with the economic and status rewards of teaching is increased by the more lucrative and prestigious alternative occupations open to men. In contrast, the alternative occupations traditionally available to female teachers are relatively few and rarely have greater prestige or income than teaching. [33]

Age is another personal characteristic of teachers which would influence the attitudes of teachers towards the militant activities. Conventional wisdom indicates that people become more conservative with age, and the results of research confirm that this is the case with teacher militancy. Cole discovered that younger teachers were more likely to hold favorable attitudes towards strikes and that the younger the teacher was, the more likely he / she was to have positive attitudes towards unions. [34] In their research on militancy among nurses and teachers, Joseph A. Alutto and James A. Belasco found that "age was the single best predicator of attitudinal militancy." [35] They state:

> Apparently younger teachers and nurses evaluate strikes and unions more favorably than do their older colleagues.... Furthermore, age accounts for substantially more of the variation of attitudes toward collective bargaining and professional associations than it does toward strikes and unions, indicating that other factors intervene in the relationship between age and attitudes toward the more militant activities of joining unions and striking.

As has been mentioned, sex and age are certainly important variables which contribute to the development of teacher militancy. Male teachers, rather than female, and younger teachers, rather than older ones, can be seen as progressive factors in support of militant action. Here, it is important to note that the composition of the teaching force in terms of sex and age has been shifting in recent years toward a larger percentage of male and younger teachers. Table-5 shows the portion of male teachers in the country. The percentage of men in elementary schools increased more than twice from 7.1 % in

1947-48 to 14.6 % in 1967-68 and 17.0 in 1978. The majority of teachers in secondary schools has been men since the end of 1950s and the percentage of men has been growing. Table-6 shows the portion of younger teachers in New York City; there was a significant increase in the number of young teachers betweesn 1940 and 1960 in the city's school system. As Cole states:

> The percentage of teachers on the first five salary steps climbed from seven percent in 1940 to 31 percent in 1960, the year in which the UFT had its first strike. The increase in the number of young teachers provided the UFT with a larger potential base of support. [37]

Another factor influencing the development of teacher militancy is the changing structure of the school systems. In his study of white-collar unionization in Great Britain, George S. Bain concluded that "the more concentrated their employment the more likely employees are to feel the need to join trade unions because of bureaucratization, and the more easily trade unions can meet this need because of the economies of scale characteristic of union recruitment and administration." [38]

If we look at statistics of teachers and school systems, we could easily realize the dramatic expansion and concentration of the American teaching force in the last decades. In 1929-30, the nation had some 843,000 elementary and secondary school teachers in about 130,000 school districts; hence the average number of teachers in all school systems was 6.5. In 1959-60, the number of school teachers jumped to over 1.3 million, and the number of school districts decreased to about 40,000; this means that there were 32 teachers per school district. In the mid-1970s, the average number of teachers for all school systems in the county jumped to over 140. [39] Thus, these figures reveal that many more teachers are working in ever-fewer school systems and that bureaucratization of the school environment has been taking place. Many researchers have found that the bureaucratization of school systems has played an important role in the development of teacher militancy.

In his study, The Militant Professionalism, Ronald G. Corwin found that teacher militancy stems from conflicts between professional and bureaucratic principles of school organization. He concluded that "in the most professional schools, conflict increases as they become bureaucratized.... There is a corresponding tendency for bureaucratization of highly professional schools simply to aggravate conflict. Militant professionalism, then, is primarily characteristic of the most bureaucratic schools." [40]

With bureaucratization comes the integration of decision making power, and deci-

Table-5

Men Teachers as a Percent of All Classroom Teachers

School Year	Elementary Schools	Secondary Schools	All Schools
1947-48	7.1	40.0	18.8
1957-58	12.8	50.4	26.8
1967-68	14.6	52.9	31.5
Fall 1978	17.0	54.0	33.9

Source: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics 1980.

Table-6

Percent of New York City Teachers on Fifth Salary Step or Below, 1925-60

1925	21
1930	22
1940	7
1950	21
1960	31

Note: This table is from Stephen Cole, The Unionization of Teachers (New York: Praeger, 1969), p.97.

sions are further and further removed from teachers. Bruce S. Cooper speculates about the link between hierarchical control and unionization this way:

> Employees are treated as an employee group, not as individuals; decisions are made by school boards and superintendents for the entire work stratum; teachers react collectively, asserting their unitary power, fighting bigness with bigness; top school policy-makers react by asserting their authority, further hardening the lines between teachers and management, and, in some states and districts, unionization occurs.[41]

The last factor, more political and social involvement, was partly a result of the

influence of the labor union movement and the civil rights movement as well as the social climate in the 1960s at large. As James Cass and Max Birnbaum put it:

> So dramatic a shift in teacher attitudes was made possible only by the radical change in the etiquette of social protest that has been so visible a part of the national experience in the 1960s. The wide acceptance of civil disobedience as an appropriate means for protesting social wrongs heralded a profound change in national perspectives which were reflected in teacher attitudes. [42]

As for labor unions, a decrease in number of blue-collar workers by changes in industrial structure caused a decreased membership in unions. President John F. Kennedy's Executive Order in 1962 approved organization's representing federal employees. Accordingly, it became an urgent matter for labor unions to organize white-collar workers. Besides policemen, firefighters, and social workers, teachers became an important group to organize. It was said that the UFT's success in New York City was the result of labor's political, financial, and manpower efforts. [43]

The civil rights movement by blacks had a psychological influence upon teachers. In spite of the importance of public education, teachers had long put up with unsatisfactory working conditions. Consequently, it is easy to assume that teachers were stimulated greatly by the civil rights movement's activism and its success. In fact, as one leader of the AFT stated, "the civil rights movement has given legitimacy to breaking the law when the law is immoral." [44] Thus, it can be said that the civil rights movement had an influential impact on teachers previous belief that strikes and demonstrations were not appropriate for the teaching profession.

Changes in the attitudes of society seemed to convince the teacher that he could affect the course of the development of his profession and of education by taking direct action. Thus, the efficacy of social protest, as seen in the non-violent civil rights activities and the anti-war and other social protest movements of the 1960s became obvious to teacher union leaders. It became apparent that if educational inadequancies and injustices were to be corrected they must be brought to the attention of the public — sometimes in an unconventional way.

As we have seen, it is clear that there was no single factor that facilitated the rapid and large-scale growth of teacher militancy in the last two decades. It is more likely that the causes of teacher militancy are multiple. Four of these basic factors we have examined are: (1) economic injustice to teachers over a long period of time; (2) changes

of personal characteristics of teachers; (3) corresponding growth in the size of schools and of the teaching force, and bureaucratization within school systems; and (4) social and political influences. These four causes grew not in isolation but together. A lack of any single factor might not have brought about the development of teacher militancy; these four factors jointly made it possible to encourage the rise of teacher militancy seen in the 1960s and 1970s.

Teacher militancy has thus been growing since the early 1960s. Although there had been some potential for teacher militancy to take place even before the 1960s, since teachers had been working under poor economic conditions, the actual number of strikes as well as several instances of collective bargaining during the decades of the 1940s and 1950s were merely scattered and isolated events. The relatively low salaries of teachers had been adequate — if not much more than that — for women who dominated the teaching force. As a larger number of younger men entered teaching after the 1950s, poor salaries were perceived as an economic injustice to teachers. Male teachers desired more adequate salaries since they were the primary source of family income. Meanwhile, the increasing size and bureaucratization of school systems led teachers to take organizational and collective action easily. The concentration of the teaching force facilitated the organization of teachers and organizational activities. In addition, by the mid-1960s the social climate was ripe for direct action by teachers. The labor union movement and civil rights movements of the 1960s encouraged teachers to become militant in protesting educational inadequacies and injustuces.

In concluding this paper, let me examine the ideologies underlying teacher militancy. An assertion by a former AFT president eloquently symbolizes one of the implications of teacher militancy:

> Teachers certainly are employees of the board of education, regardless of their professional status or the lack of it. [45]

Teacher militancy implies a rising need to look at teachers as employees. This also means an escape from identification with other professions such as doctors and lawyers. Corwin points out that teachers need an active approach to the improvement and maintainance of their employment because teachers have no inherent control over their work. He states that:

> If physicians seldom strike, it is not because striking is "unprofessional." It is because physicians have not needed to strike since they

> already have relatively effective forms of political control over major facets of their work.[46]

In other words, teacher militancy implies teacher awareness of their characteristics as employees, and a critical view of the traditional outlook on the teaching profession. Despite its title as "a profession", teachers were merely employees.

Table-7

Leadership Attitudes Regarding Prescriptive Organizational Roles in Educational Policy-Making

Role of Teacher Organizations	Educational policy Generally	Salaries	Personnel	Curriculum and Instruction	School System Organization
They should have more to say than board and / or administration	18%	18%	11%	21%	16%
They should have a voice equal to that of the board and/or administration	59	63	63	45	55
They should be consulted, and the board and / or administration should weigh heavily their advice	23	18	26	32	29
They should be kept informed by the board and / or administration, but should not necessarily be called on for advice	00	00	00	00	00
They should not be involved	00	00	00	00	00

Note: This table is from Alan Rosenthal, "New Voice in Public Education," in Teacher College Record, October 1966, p.16.

Furthermore, it should be noticed that there was a strong demand for participatory decision-making processes by teachers. Table-7 shows attitudes of the UFT leaders regarding organizational roles in educational policy-making. It shows how teachers viewed the role of teachers' organizations in educational policy decisions. This survey indicates that teachers demand participation in the decision-making processes, not only

with respect to salaries and working conditions, but also in the processes which boards of education and superintendents have monopolized. In the case of the NEA, it asserted in the resolution on professional negotiations "the right of professional associations, through democratically selected representatives... to participate with boards of education in the determination of policies of common concern, including salary and other conditions of professional service." [47]

Collective bargaining and strikes are treated not only as weapons for protecting teachers' interests, but also as effective means toward participation in the process of educational policy-making. Demand for participation, which calls for stronger influence in the decision and policy-making process, can be interpreted as the teachers' awareness of the necessity to have influence for the sake of fully exercising their ability. In other words, it spoke of the fact that despite the fact that teaching had been labelled "a profession", there had been no voice by teachers in professional matters such as curriculum decisions, textbook selection, class formation, and so forth. Actually, the demand for participation in educaitonal policy-making processes is deeply rooted in teachers' desire for professionalization of teaching.

As we have seen, we can find strong professionalism among teachers as well as strong unionism. The idea that direct effort by teachers to improve their salaries and working conditions would hurt the image of teaching as a profession, and that therefore these direct efforts should be avoided to promote the professionalization of teaching, lost popular support among teachers. Instead, teachers began to notice compatibility between professionalism and unionism. In other words, teacher rights appeared to be emphasized more vigorously than their obligations. It is likely that as long as teachers identify themselves with professions as well as labor unions, they will continue demanding more control over educational policy through collective bargaining and strikes.

FOOTNOTES

* This was originally written in 1982 for partial fulfillment of the qualifying examinations for the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

1. Stephen Cole, The Unionization of Teachers: A Case Study of the UFT (New York: Praeger, 1969), p.3.

2. Ronald G. Corwin, Education in Crises (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1974), p.227.

3. Ronald W. Glass, "Work Stoppages and Teachers: History and Prospect," Monthly Labor Review 90:8 (August 1967), p.44.

4. Cole, The Unionization of Teachers, p.7.

5. "Teacher-Opinion Poll," Todays Education 60:2 (February 1971), p.27.

6. Michael H. Moskow, Teachers and Unions (Philadelphia: Industrial Research Unit, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, 1966), pp.108-113.

7. As of 1973, there were six states which had no teacher collective bargaining agreements: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and West Virginia. NEA, Negotiation Research Digest 7:5 (January 1974), p.16.

8. Raymond E. Callahan, "The History of the Fight to Control Policy in Public Education," In Frank W. Lutz and Joseph J. Azzarelli, eds., Struggle for Power in Education (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966), p.32.

9. Edgar B. Wasley, The NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp.23-24.

10. Marshall O. Donley, Jr., "The American Schoolteacher: From Obedient Servant to Militant Professional," Phi Delta Kappan 58:1 (September 1976), p.113.

11. Cole, The Unionization of Teachers, p.4.

12. Anthony M. Cresswell and Michael J. Murphy, Teachers, Unions, and Collective Bargaining in Public Education (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1980), p.69.

13. The Commission on Educational Reconstruction, Organizing the Teaching Profession (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955), p.28.

14. Moscow, Teachers and Unions, p.107.

15. The basic sources for most of the paragraphes dealing with the UFT are: Cole, op.

cit., Edward B. Shils and Taylor C. Whittier, Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968); Robert E. Doherty and Walter E. Oberer, Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining (Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Industrial Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1967); Celia L. Zitron, The New York City Teachers Union (New York: Humanities Press, 1968); and Marshall O. Donley, Jr., Power to the Teacher: How America's Educators Became Militant (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1976).

16. William G. Carr, "The Turning Point." NEA Journal 51:6 (September 1962), pp.8-10.

17. Allan M. West, "The NEA Tackles Urban Problems." Phi Delta Kappan 45:6 (March 1964), p.293.

18. Timothy M. Stinnett, Turmoil in Teaching (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p.68. and Doherty and Obere, Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining, p.36.

19. Stinnett, Turmoil in Teaching, p.153.

20. Myron Brenton, What's Happened to Teachers? (New York: Coward McCann, Inc., 1970), Chp. 4 "A Sorry History."

21. Robert Bendiner, The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self Government (New York: New American Library, Inc., 1969), p.87.

22. Brenton, What's Happened to Teachers?, p.70.

23. William E. Eaton, The American Federation of Teachers, 1916-61: A History of the Movement (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975), p.48.

24. Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiation for Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966), p.26.

25. "Teacher-Opinion Poll." NEA Journal 55:7 (October 1966), p.29.

26. Timothy M. Stinnett, Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware, Professional Negotiation in Public Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p.4.

27. Cole, The Unionization of Teachers, pp.22-35.

28. William J. Moore and Ray Marshall, "Growth of Teachers' Organizations: A Conceptual Framework," Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector 2:3 (Summer 1973), pp.271-297.

29. Ellen H. Steele, "A Teacher's View," Phi Delta Kappan 57:9 (May 1976), p.591.

30. Thomas Q. Gilson and Elias T. Ramos, "Public School Teacher Attitudes Toward Unionization," Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector 11:2 (1982), pp.145-154.

31. William T. Lowe, "Who Joins Which Teachers'Group ? " Teacher College Record 66:7 (April 1965), pp.614-619.

32. Cole, The Unionization of Teachers, pp.88-89, p.131.

33. William S. Fox and Michael H. Wince, "The Structure and Determinants of Occupational Militancy among Public School Teachers," Industrial and Labor Relations Review 30:1 (October 1976), pp.47-58.

34. Cole, The Unionization of Teachers, p.91, p.131.

35. Joseph A. Alutto and James A. Belasco, "Determinants of Attitudinal Militancy among Nurses and Teachers," Industrial and Labor Relations Review 27:2 (January 1974), p.223.

36. Ibid. p.223.

37. Stephen Cole, "The Unionization of Teachers: Determinants of Rank - and - File Support," Sociology of Education 41:2 (Winter 1968), p.87.

38. George S. Bain, The Growth of White-Collar Unionism (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), p.184.

39. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics 1981, pp.38, 64.

40. Ronald G. Corwin, Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools (New York: Appleton Crafts, 1970), p.314.

41. Bruce S. Cooper, Collective Bargaining, Strikes, and Financial Costs in Public Education: A Comparative Review (Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1982), p.201.

42. James Cass and Max Birnbaum, "What Makes Teachers Militant," Saturday Review (January 20, 1968), p.55.

43. Doherty and Obere, Teachers,School Board, and Collective Bargaining, pp.32-33.

44. Cole, The Unionization of Teachers (1969), p.74.

45. Charles Cogen, "The American Federation of Teachers and Collective Negotiations," In Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moskow, eds., Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1967), p.164.

46. Corwin, Education in Crises, p.244.

47. Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware, Professional Negotiation in Public Education, p.207.