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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historically, American public school teachers have been one of the more docile occupational groups in our society. Low social and economic status, lack of job security, and poor teaching conditions have been the lot of most teachers. While other workers, especially those in private industry, have been prone to react militantly to such conditions, teachers have done so rarely. Instead, many teachers have sought to improve their status by "moonlighting," or by leaving teaching altogether and going into some other occupation.

For the years prior to 1940, data on teacher strikes are not available. However, historical studies of American teachers do not contain any information which suggests that teachers have ever been anything but docile.\(^1\) The Bureau of Labor Statistics has collected and published data on work stoppages involving teachers from 1940 to the present. These data show that since World War II there has been an increasing amount of teacher militancy. There have been significant

---

\(^1\)For example, see Willard Elsbree, *The American Teacher* (New York, 1939).
waves of teacher strikes in the late 1940's, the early 1950's, and the 1960's. The greatest amount of strike activity has occurred in the past decade.

Strikes by teachers are usually of a different nature than contemporary stoppages by other workers. Since the implementation of the Wagner Act of 1935, employers in private industry have been under the legal obligation to negotiate with their employees concerning terms and conditions of employment. Consequently, most strikes in industry result from an impasse in negotiations. Their purpose is to win concessions from management. Teacher strikes, in contrast, frequently are of a protest nature, and, at least prior to the 1960's, rarely have been preceded by negotiations over terms and conditions of employment. Work stoppages in education generally serve as a means to dramatize teachers' grievances. Often times the strikes are referred to by the teachers as "recesses" or "professional holidays."

Strikes in public education usually occur only after extensive efforts by the teachers to rectify their grievances without formal negotiations. The typical course of action is for the teachers to petition local school boards and state

---

legislatures for redress. If these efforts fail, teachers become frustrated, and strike in protest.

A concomitant of increasing teacher militancy has been a movement toward bilateral negotiations in public education similar to those in private employment. Until recent years, terms and conditions of employment for public school teachers were virtually always determined unilaterally by school boards. Consultations and discussions between school boards and teachers did take place sometimes, but they were usually informal, frequently individual, and their results were seldom, if ever, embodied in a written agreement binding on both parties. Now, teachers are seeking formal procedures for bilateral negotiations concerning teacher-school board relations. The end result sought is a written agreement defining these relations and binding the teachers and the school boards to its terms. In essence, this represents the emergence of collective bargaining in public education.

Efforts to negotiate with school boards have become widespread and recently have achieved unprecedented success. Prior to the 1960's sporadic efforts were made in this regard with no substantial results. The first comprehensive

---

written agreement between teachers and a school board was negotiated in 1962 in New York City, the Nation's largest school system.

Most teachers in the United States are members of one of the two prevailing national teachers' organizations, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The NEA is by far the larger organization, enrolling over one million members, while the AFT reports a membership of approximately 142,000. The NEA was founded in 1857 and contains school administrators as well as classroom teachers in its membership. Since its founding the NEA has stressed "professional development" rather than the personal welfare of teachers.

The AFT is organized as a trade union and currently excludes from membership administrative personnel holding positions of principal or higher. The union was formed in 1916 and since 1935 has advocated the improvement of teacher welfare through the use of collective bargaining in teacher-school board relations. Even though the AFT is a trade union, it had, prior to the 1960's, an official policy against the use of the strike in public education. Historically, the NEA has been even more strongly opposed to strikes. Thus, until recently, local education associations affiliated with the NEA
and the local unions affiliated with the AFT frequently have acted without sanction by the national organizations when they struck.

While the AFT long has advocated the implementation of collective bargaining procedures in public education, the NEA has opposed it. Increasing teacher militancy and the development of teacher negotiations have intensified the organizational rivalry between the NEA and AFT. Under the stress of growing pedagogical unrest, the NEA has developed a program called "professional negotiations" as an alternative to the traditional collective bargaining advocated by the AFT.

Several studies of teacher strikes, teacher negotiations, and teacher organizations have been published since the late 1940's. Most of these studies were written in the 1960's in response to the wave of strike activity. Schiff's study of the causes of teacher strikes from 1945 through 1951 was completed in 1952. The purpose of the study "was to determine the causes of teacher strikes in the United States following World War II, and to evaluate their results and implications for teachers and society." Schiff concluded that the basic

---

and immediate causes of these strikes were economic. Other conclusions were that the strikes awakened public interest, that new revenues must be found to better support education, and that school boards need to re-examine their personnel policies and their relationships with employee groups. The author also pointed out that both union and nonunion teacher organizations participated in the strike activity.

Following the implementation of collective bargaining in New York City in 1962, Moskow undertook a study to determine "Is collective bargaining viable in the environment of public education?" Numerous aspects of collective bargaining as found in private industry, such as exclusive recognition, the appropriate bargaining unit, bargaining power, and the written agreement, were examined to determine their applicability to teacher-school board relations. The author's conclusion was that a modified form of collective bargaining is applicable for public school teachers. Moskow further noted that in the limited number of school districts involved in meaningful negotiations, no significant differences between the approaches of the NEA and AFT were found, even though there are broad ideological differences between the two

organizations. As a means to solve the semantics problem caused by the competition between the AFT and the NEA, Moskow proposed that the term "collective negotiations" be used to refer to both the NEA's "professional negotiations" and the AFT's "collective bargaining."

The increased success of teacher unionism in public education in the current decade has prompted several studies of the American Federation of Teachers. Browder completed a descriptive analysis of the structure, force, and membership of the AFT in 1965. The structure of the union was evaluated as being "democratic" in organization (for example, a representative assembly called the Annual Convention, a written constitution, and amendment procedures), but "oligarchic" in operation since the administrative group in power controls the internal lines of communication within the national organization. The union's goals were established as being heavily economic in nature with emphasis on "increasing economic benefits for its members, gaining equal power within the decision-making structure of public education with other groups currently holding such power, and assuring organizational self-perpetuation."

its goals were categorized as building a membership base, persuasion activities (molding public opinion), and coercion (the strike). Browder pointed out that the AFT has traditionally maintained a no-strike policy, but that in recent years the national body has given increasing support to striking locals.

Clarke investigated the origins and historical development of teacher unionism from 1870 to 1952. The formation of the AFT in 1916 was attributed to increasing teacher discontent in several large cities during the early years of the twentieth century. Clarke noted that throughout its history the union has spoken for but a small fraction of the teaching profession, that its membership has been concentrated in large cities, and that its goals have emphasized practical issues such as teachers' salaries, tenure, violations of teachers' rights, and working conditions. The Federation's affiliation with the American Federation of Labor (AFL) is credited with providing the union with a broader base of support, both numerical and financial. Clarke also pointed out that in its relationship with the AFL, the AFT has resolutely exercised its autonomy, and, in addition, has had an important part in determining the educational policies of the AFL.

---

All of the studies just cited were doctoral dissertations. In addition, there are other related works deserving of mention. Two books stand as the "official" histories of the NEA and the AFT. Edgar Wesley wrote The NEA: The First Hundred Years in 1957 commemorating the NEA's centennial year. In 1965, the story of the AFT was told in Organizing the Teaching Profession. Both books present the foundings, goals, philosophies, methods, and developments of the two organizations from their respective points of view.

Stimulated by the acceleration of the organizational rivalry between the NEA and the AFT in the 1960's, Stinnett has written two books expounding the NEA's position on teacher negotiations. The first, Professional Negotiation in Public Education, was published in 1966. Its purpose was "to provide basic information on all aspects of the professional negotiation process." In 1968, Stinnett's second work, Turmoil in Teaching, was released. Stinnett delineated the organizational rivalry between the NEA and AFT supporting the NEA as the proper organization for teachers. A rigorous attempt was made to differentiate "professional negotiations" from the AFT's "collective bargaining."

---

The present study has several purposes in mind. First, the increasing teacher militancy from January, 1940, to July, 1968, will be delineated. Second, possible causes of increasing militancy since World War II will be evaluated. Special emphasis will be given to the current period of teacher strikes. Third, the historical roles of the NEA and AFT, with emphasis on their respective positions with respect to the improvement of teacher welfare, will be surveyed. Fourth, the impact of increasing teacher militancy on the NEA and AFT will be investigated. With the exception of Schiff, none of the cited studies has made a significant analysis of the causes of teacher strikes. Since Schiff's study was completed in 1952, the causes of the current wave of teacher militancy, which is the largest yet recorded, are not covered. In addition, none of the above studies traced the impact of teacher militancy on the goals, philosophies, and methods of the NEA and AFT.

The first part of Chapter II will discuss the patterns of work stoppages involving teachers since World War II. Much of this discussion is based on data supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The remainder of Chapter II will be an examination of possible causes of teacher strikes with primary emphasis being given to the current unrest.
A historical description of the AFT and NEA will be presented in Chapter III. Their foundings, goals, methods, and organizational structures will be described. In Chapter IV, the organizational rivalry between the NEA and AFT will be investigated. Both the AFT charges that the NEA is dominated by administrators, and therefore fails to properly represent the interests of classroom teachers, and the NEA claims that the AFT's affiliation with organized labor is inconsistent with the professional status of teachers will be examined. As both organizations now favor some form of teacher negotiations, a comparison of their respective programs will be made. Finally, the results of representation elections where local affiliates of the NEA and AFT have opposed each other will be summarized.
CHAPTER II

PATTERNS AND CAUSES OF TEACHER MILITANCY

The Emergence of Patterns of Teacher Militancy

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has published annual data on work stoppages involving teachers since 1940. An examination of Table I shows that teacher strikes have been sporadic and infrequent, as compared to strikes in private industry, but also have increased dramatically since World War II. For all but 7 of the 29 years beginning in 1940, fewer than 10 strikes occurred in any given year. During this period the United States experienced about 305 teacher strikes involving approximately 276,146 teachers.

TABLE I

TEACHER STRIKES, 1940 to 1968*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Strikes</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Man-days Idle During Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number of Strikes</td>
<td>Number of Teachers Involved</td>
<td>Man-days Idle During Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>7,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>37,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>21,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>60,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>7,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>4,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>5,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE I --Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Strikes</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Man-days Idle During Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>30,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>8,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>88,451</td>
<td>937,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968**</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82,685</td>
<td>520,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>276,146</td>
<td>1,823,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Data is for January through June only.

The preponderance of the strike activity just cited occurred in three waves, as shown in Table II. Together these three periods account for well over 75 per cent of all strike activity during the 29-year period. The relative importance of each period can be measured in terms of the number of strikes which occurred and the number of teachers involved in the strikes.
TABLE II
SIGNIFICANT PERIODS OF TEACHER STRIKES, 1940 to 1968*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Teacher Strikes</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Percent of Total Number of Strikes</th>
<th>Percent of Total Number of Teachers Involved in Strikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1948</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11,990</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1952</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1968**</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>208,536</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1968**</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>276,146</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Based on data presented in Table I.

**Data for 1968 includes January through June only.

The first recorded wave of teacher militancy took place immediately following World War II, from 1945 to 1948. This strike activity accounts for 15.7 per cent of all strikes recorded from January, 1940 to July, 1968 and for 4.3 per cent of all teachers involved in strikes for the 29 years. The second period of militancy, which coincided with the outbreak of the Korean conflict, from 1951 to 1952, was shorter and of less magnitude than the first period. The last period of unrest
began in 1966, and is still in progress. Over 57 per cent of all strikes and over 75 per cent of all the teachers involved in strikes from 1940 to 1968 occurred in the two and one-half years beginning with January, 1966. Thus, the United States is currently experiencing the most intensive period of teacher militancy yet recorded.

Little strike activity occurred in the decade immediately preceding 1966. Only 35 strikes were recorded in this decade as compared to the 33 strikes which took place in 1966 alone. Two of these 35 strikes, however, are especially significant. In 1960 over 5,000 New York City teachers struck in order to force the school board to recognize and negotiate with the teacher representatives. In 1962, after negotiations had begun, over 20,000 of the teachers struck in order to force a settlement on the school board. These two strikes are significant because they crippled the nation's largest school system, employing over 50,000 teachers and enrolling over one million students, and to a large extent presaged the large increase in strike activity which began in 1966.

Teacher strikes have been of shorter duration than most work stoppages which have occurred in industry. The average duration of the 90 teacher strikes recorded from 1940 to 1952 was 9.1 days, as compared to 16.9 days for strikes in private
industry.\textsuperscript{1} Available statistics indicate that the relationship is unchanged with respect to the current teacher strikes. In 1966, the average time lost per teacher was 1.8 days as contrasted to 14.1 days per employee in private industry.\textsuperscript{2}

There are two considerations which tend to explain the relatively short duration of teacher strikes. First, they tend to be of a protest nature. They are usually called in order to dramatize teacher grievances, whereas most strikes in industry occur as the result of the failure of labor and management to agree on the terms of a collective bargaining agreement. Only 2 of the 33 teacher strikes in 1966 involved the negotiation of an agreement. Second, since teacher strikes interrupt the educational process, they are viewed as being more serious than most strikes in private industry. A rapid cessation of the strike, therefore, is usually of prime importance to all persons concerned.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' classification of work stoppages according to the major issue, or issues, which precipitated the strike, is presented in Table III. From 1940


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salaries or Hours or Both</th>
<th>Major Issue</th>
<th>Other Working Conditions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III
NUMBER OF WORK STOPPAGES INVOLVING TEACHERS BY MAJOR ISSUE, 1940-1966*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major Issues</th>
<th>Other Working Conditions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salaries or Hours or Both</td>
<td>Organization**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Includes strikes to gain recognition of an organization and to protest discrimination against union membership or participation in activity of an organization.

***Includes strikes over job security, physical and administrative conditions and policies, and related problems.
to 1966 salaries and hours of employment have been the major issues in about half of all teacher strikes. Issues concerning job security, administrative policies, and physical conditions have been next in importance. Finally, at issue in twenty-nine of the strikes was recognition of a teacher organization or discrimination against teachers for activities in such groups.

The information just cited suggests that teacher salaries have been a major factor in teacher unrest. This view is further supported by the fact that the three periods of increased strike activity outlined above are correlated with inflation.

Teacher strikes in this decade have been concentrated geographically, as indicated by Table IV. Of the 188 work stoppages summarized in the table, over 70 per cent occurred in six states. Michigan led all states with 58 strikes, almost one-third of all those for school years 1960-1961 through 1967-1968. All of these six states are highly industrialized, and they are states in which trade unionism and collective bargaining are relatively strong. Few teacher strikes have occurred in the Southern and Western states.

The larger school systems in the nation have accounted for a large and disproportionate number of work stoppages by
### TABLE IV

**TEACHER STRIKES BY SELECTED STATES, SCHOOL YEARS**  
**1960-61 THROUGH 1967-68**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Strikes</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from data presented in NEA, Teacher Strikes and Work Stoppages, January 1940 to July 1968.*
teachers. In 1967, for example, 6 per cent of all school systems had enrollments of 6,000 or more. These relatively few school systems, however, accounted for almost half of the teacher strikes for the year, as indicated in Table V. This suggests that the size of the school system may be an important factor in teacher unrest.

### TABLE V

**TEACHER STRIKES BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1967***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils Enrolled</th>
<th>Teacher Strikes</th>
<th>School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 to 11,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 to 5,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,800 to 2,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200 to 1,799</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 to 1,199</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 599</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 to 299</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 149</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 49</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 14</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involved in most strikes is one of two teacher organizations, the National Education Association (NEA) or the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). As previously noted, NEA labels itself a professional association while the AFT is a trade union affiliated with the AFL-CIO. The organizational affiliation of striking teachers is shown in Table VI. Despite the disproportionate size of the former, NEA and AFT affiliates have contributed about equally to strike activity, both in terms of the number of strikes and the number of teachers involved. However, NEA affiliates engaged in no strike activity during the decade prior to 1964. During 1966, the year in which the current period of teacher militancy began, about 31,200 of the striking teachers were affiliated with the NEA, whereas only 6,050 were affiliated with the AFT. Thus, it seems evident that organizational restraints of the NEA, so effective in the fifties, have broken down in recent years.

Another indication of teacher militancy besides the work stoppages discussed above is the use of "sanctions." Sanctions as applied by teacher organizations have a short history, as their use evolved out of the intense competition between the NEA and the AFT which began in 1960. More specifically, the NEA has developed sanctions as an alternative
### TABLE VI

**TEACHER STRIKES BY ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION, 1940 to 1968***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Professional Association*** No. Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Independent No. Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Unorganized No. Teachers Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>.. ..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI --Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AFL-CIO** Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Professional Association*** Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Independent Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Unorganized Teachers Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67,476</td>
<td>22,119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968***</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>74,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>130,421</td>
<td>144,979</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Refers primarily to local unions affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers.

***Refers primarily to local educational associations affiliated with the National Education Association.

****Includes data for January through June only.
to strikes, which it labels a trade-union tactic. Sanctions involve an expression of disapproval by the NEA, or one of its affiliates, of the actions of a local school board, or in some cases state legislatures. As an extreme measure, sanctions can lead to a mass refusal by teachers to sign contracts for the ensuing school year.

For the five-year period from 1962 through 1966, 35 sanctions were applied by the educational associations. In two instances, Utah in 1964 and Oklahoma in 1965, they were applied to the entire state school system. Compared to strikes, sanctions require longer to become effective. Therefore, most of them last for several months, even up to a year.

Causes of Teacher Militancy

Contemporary observers attribute teacher unrest to many factors. Some generalize in sweeping terms, as in the following statement:

... like any fundamental change in social phenomena, the factors that have produced this militancy are many and variable. They evolve from history, economics, demography, current events, and government attitudes.

---


4 Ibid., pp. 146-147.

Similarly, another has written that

Teacher militancy undoubtedly is a product of the times, which are characterized by exploration of space, emphasis on human rights, new developments in automation, and re-evaluation of moral standards in an increasingly permissive society. 6

Some observers are more specific as in the following case

Teachers are on the march—for higher salaries, for better working conditions, for improvements in the schools, and for a voice in determining school policy. And, like the Negroes who recently marched on Washington to dramatize their determination to win a redress of their grievances, the teachers are not in a mood to tolerate official indifference or delay. They believe that the time for patience has long since passed. 7

These comments are illustrative of the many observations being made concerning the causes of teacher militancy. Teacher salaries and related economic issues are most often mentioned. Other factors often cited are the improved market position of teachers, adverse working conditions, changes in the composition and characteristics of the teaching force, the acceleration of the Civil Rights Movement, the issuance of Federal Executive Order 10988, 8 and the stimulus of dramatic teacher strikes in New York City. These and other possible


8This order was issued by President Kennedy in 1962, conferring organizational and bargaining rights similar to those in private industry on Federal employees.
causes of teacher unrest are evaluated in the following sections.

Teacher Salaries and Related Issues

As mentioned previously, there have been three waves of teacher strikes since 1940. An examination of Table VII shows that during this time there have been four periods in which inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, accelerated. These are 1940-1943, 1945-1948, 1951-1952, and 1965 to the present. Except for the first, each of these periods of inflation has been accompanied by a wave of strikes. The absence of strikes during the inflation which accompanied World War II is understandable in that such activity would have been considered highly unpatriotic. During each of the three succeeding periods of inflation the number of teacher strikes increased, as can be seen in Columns (1) and (3) of Table VII.

Thus, a parallelism between periods of inflation and teacher militancy is established. Although this does not prove causation, simple economic analysis does suggest that inflation contributed to teacher unrest. Teacher salaries are slow to change because their level is determined by one

---

9 Each of these inflationary periods is identifiable with United States involvement in war and heavy military expenditures by the Federal government.
### TABLE VII

**COMPARISON OF TEACHER STRIKES AND THE REAL INCOME OF TEACHERS AND ALL PERSONS WORKING FOR WAGES AND SALARIES, 1940 to 1967**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teacher Strikes Teachers Involved</th>
<th>Consumer Price Index (1957-59=100)</th>
<th>Average Annual Salary of Teachers**</th>
<th>Average Annual Salary of All Workers**</th>
<th>Index of Teacher Salaries Relative to Salaries of all Workers***</th>
<th>Index of Teacher Salaries (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>2953</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>110.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>2865</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>101.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>2819</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>2897</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>3149</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>3592</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>3454</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>101.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>3813</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Strike Cost</td>
<td>Strike Duration</td>
<td>Strike Frequency</td>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>Income Adjusted Strike Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>4087</td>
<td>3921</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>4234</td>
<td>4123</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>4389</td>
<td>4262</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>4439</td>
<td>4291</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>4669</td>
<td>4315</td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>4866</td>
<td>4491</td>
<td>104.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>5018</td>
<td>4566</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>5229</td>
<td>4648</td>
<td>112.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>5408</td>
<td>4806</td>
<td>116.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>5549</td>
<td>4914</td>
<td>119.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>5772</td>
<td>5091</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>5883</td>
<td>5196</td>
<td>126.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>5264</td>
<td>128.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>88,451</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>6130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Data on teacher strikes for 1940 through 1966 taken from Business Week, October 21, 1967, p. 76. Strike data for 1967 taken from NEA, Teacher Strikes and Work Stoppages, January 1940 to July 1968. Data on the Consumer Price Index taken from 1967 Supplement to Economic Indicators, p. 95. Data on salaries of teachers and all workers adapted from NEA, Economic Status of the Teaching Profession, 1967-68, p. 9. All salary data has been converted into real dollars using the Consumer Price Index with 1957-59 as base period. The items for each year in Column (4) were divided by the average of the data for 1957 through 1959. Each item in Column (4) was divided by the item for the corresponding year in Column (5).
or more agencies of government which are slow to react. Consequently, during periods of a rising price level, the real income of teachers would be expected to fall.

Inflation may also be expected to adversely affect the relationship between the salaries of teachers and workers in private industry. In industry, workers are often given "cost of living" increases in salary. This is especially true in areas where employees receive the benefits of wage escalator clauses in collective bargaining agreements. During an inflationary period, therefore, the real income of teachers would be expected to decline relative to the real income of employees in private industry. This hypothesis, as well as that stated in the previous paragraph, will now be examined.

The real income of teachers, as measured in Column (4) of Table VII, declined absolutely during the first three of the four periods of inflation discussed above. The data further show that the real income of teachers has improved the most markedly during periods when the price level has been relatively stable. Such was the case during most of the 1950's.

The current period of inflation is not associated with an absolute decline in the real income of teachers. However, further analysis indicates that what has happened is a
slowdown in the rate of improvement. During the 1950's, the real income of teachers was improving not only absolutely but also relative to the average annual real income of all persons working for wages and salaries, as can be seen in Columns (6) and (7) of Table VII. Since 1961, this improvement has virtually stopped. Thus, inflation has impaired the relative rate of improvement of the real income of teachers during the current period of militancy even though there has been no absolute decline in teachers' real income.

While the relative economic position of teachers has stabilized during the current period of inflation, this position deteriorated during two of the earlier inflationary periods. The most severe deterioration occurred during the early years of World War II. Before the War began, the index of the annual real income of teachers as compared to that of all wage and salary employees stood at 110.8. By 1943, this index had dropped to 82.4, indicating a severe decline in the real income of teachers as compared to other workers. No similar deterioration in this relationship occurred during the inflation of 1945-1948 since the real income of teachers and other workers was falling simultaneously. But, during the inflation of 1951-1952 another decline took place.
In summary, periods of increased strike activity by teachers are strongly related to inflation. The effect of inflation on teacher salaries has been two-pronged. First, inflation adversely affects teachers' real income. Second, during inflation the income of teachers as compared to that of other workers deteriorates.

As mentioned above, the real income of teachers improved during 1953 to 1965 but, in spite of this improvement, beginning teacher salaries continued to lag behind those of other occupations. The beginning average annual salary for teachers is significantly lower than that for other occupations requiring college training, as can be seen in Table VIII. In fact, based on available data, a young man leaving college can expect to earn at least 20 per cent a year more by entering any occupation other than teaching. Since many young teachers do not come to a full realization of the economic status of their chosen profession until they actually begin teaching, low beginning salaries become a significant source of discontent.

Another area where teachers are significantly behind workers in private industry is "fringe benefits." Since World War II such benefits as employer-paid health and life insurance, retirement plans, and paid holidays have become
### TABLE VIII

AVERAGE ANNUAL STARTING SALARIES OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS COMPARED WITH THOSE IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY, 1967-1968*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning teachers with bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Starting Salary</th>
<th>Index Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male college graduates with bachelor's degrees</td>
<td>$5,142</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8,772</td>
<td>158.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>7,776</td>
<td>140.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales marketing</td>
<td>7,044</td>
<td>127.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business administration</td>
<td>7,140</td>
<td>129.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts</td>
<td>6,780</td>
<td>122.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production management</td>
<td>7,584</td>
<td>137.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>8,064</td>
<td>146.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>153.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics-statistics</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td>143.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics-finance</td>
<td>7,416</td>
<td>134.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fields</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>138.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average-all fields**</td>
<td>7,836</td>
<td>142.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women college graduates with bachelor's degrees</td>
<td>$5,142</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics-statistics</td>
<td>7,776</td>
<td>140.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General business</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>7,716</td>
<td>139.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home economics</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>120.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8,904</td>
<td>161.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Weighted mean of the above categories.
increasingly important. Such payments currently amount to about twenty per cent of payrolls for workers in private indus
try but only thirteen per cent for teachers.  

The time-off teachers receive as a result of school holidays and summer vacations is often pointed to as compensating for the deficiencies just cited. However, the summer time-off may be regarded as seasonal unemployment or at least an unpaid vacation. Consequently, many teachers find additional employment, frequently in menial work, after school, on weekends, and during the summers. Others adjust by cutting expenses and standards of living within their nine or ten-month incomes.

"Moonlighting" by teachers, especially married men, has become more widespread in recent years. One study found that as of May, 1965, 20 per cent of all men teachers held second jobs. Another survey conducted by the NEA reported that fifty-one per cent of married men teachers find it necessary to hold second jobs.

---


12 Doherty and Oberer, op. cit., p. 16.
The information presented above shows that inflation more adversely affected teachers' salaries during the first two periods of militancy than in the present. During these two periods a clear pattern of a rise in the price level, a decline in the real income of teachers, and an increase in strike activity by teachers has been established. It is the opinion of this writer as well as another student, Albert Schiff, writing in 1952, that inflation was a major factor in this militancy. The current teacher militancy is much more intense than that of the previous periods even though inflation has not as adversely affected teachers' salaries as in the past. This suggests that there are factors other than inflation to be considered as causes of the present wave of teacher strikes.

**Market Position of Teachers**

Throughout the history of trade unionism in the United States, workers have been more militant during periods of economic expansion and full employment. Therefore, the suggestion that recent improvements in the bargaining position of teachers has contributed to their militant activity seems

valid. The implication is that a strong demand for teachers encourages militancy by increasing the job security and bargaining power of teachers.

A major element in the current market position of teachers is the "baby boom" of the mid-1940's. These increased birth rates have generated a huge public school enrollment. "Estimated total public school enrollment in 1964-1965 was 42,784,717, which represented an increase of more than 40 percent over 1954-1955."\(^{14}\) As a result of these huge enrollments there has been a persistent shortage of qualified teachers since World War II.\(^{15}\) Maxine Stewart of the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that the increased birth rates of the mid-1940's had their maximum effect during the 1964-1965 school year. The author predicts that the current teacher shortage will continue through 1975.\(^{16}\)

The shortage of teachers which has occurred in recent years is evidenced by the employment of "uncertified" teachers. When local school districts are unable to hire a sufficient number of people holding teaching certificates,


\(^{16}\)Ibid.
additional non-certified personnel are allowed to teach on a temporary basis. The U. S. Office of Education conducted a survey in the fall of 1966 which estimated that there are over 90,500 full-time classroom teachers in the United States who do not meet the state regular certification requirements. Of this number, 56,500 are in the elementary schools and 34,000 in the secondary schools.

Thus the "baby boom" of the mid-1940's has enhanced the market position of teachers by creating a persistent shortage of qualified teachers which should continue through 1975. The maximum effect of the "baby boom" was in the 1964-1965 school year, the year immediately preceding the outbreak of the current period of unrest. Coupled with the huge increase in school enrollments since World War II has been a greater emphasis on education in the United States. This increased awareness of the importance of education has been produced by the acceleration of technology in our industrial society and the development of the "cold war."

The "cold war" competition between the United States and the Soviet Union was highlighted by the Soviets' launching of Sputnik in October of 1957. The ability of the Russians to

---

achieve this feat in technology dramatized the superior scientific quality of the Soviet schools. In an issue which characterized the Russian "sputnik" as the "beep heard round the world," the Nation magazine also carried an article comparing U. S. and Russian school systems. It reported that the Russian schools produced 126,000 scientists in 1955 as compared to 59,000 in the United States. Russian secondary schools were reported to be staffed by over 350,000 mathematics and science teachers as compared with only 140,000 in the United States. In addition, the pay and status of teachers in the Soviet Union were found to be better than that of American teachers. 18

Attributing the Russian technical success to the Soviet explosion in technical education, the United States has in the last decade attempted to revitalize American education, especially in the areas of science and mathematics. In September of 1958 the United States Congress passed the first substantial federal program designed to improve American education since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. Previous to this, various groups in Congress had been successful in blocking attempts to pass any federal aid-to-education programs.

---

18 Joshua Kunitz, "The Training of Scientists," The Nation, CXXCV (October 19, 1957), 262.
Spurred by the Soviet feat in space, the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, justifying it as a measure necessary to the maintenance of the national security. Originally designed as a measure for improving education in the areas of science, engineering, and mathematics, the scope of the NDEA was extended in numerous amendments toward an all-purpose national education act. As of September, 1968, total federal expenditures on NDEA programs stood at $3 billion.

The increasing United States expenditure on education is illustrated in Table IX. Since World War II we not only have increased our expenditures twelve-fold but also have contributed an increasing proportion of our national resources to education. Total national expenditures on education both public and private at all levels when expressed as a percentage of gross national product has more than tripled since 1945.

The emphasis on education just cited has improved the bargaining power of teachers. At the same time, the post World War II "baby boom" has produced a persistent teacher shortage, which is expected to continue through 1975. These circumstances not only have placed teachers in a favorable

market position, but have improved the prestige of education and teachers, as many Americans came to recognize the essential role of education in technical progress.

**TABLE IX**

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT RELATED TO TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR EDUCATION: UNITED STATES, 1945-67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gross national product (millions)</th>
<th>Expenditures for education</th>
<th>Total (000's)</th>
<th>As a per cent of gross national product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>$212,010</td>
<td>$4,167,597</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>231,323</td>
<td>6,574,379</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>256,484</td>
<td>8,795,635</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>328,404</td>
<td>11,312,446</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>364,593</td>
<td>13,949,876</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>397,960</td>
<td>16,811,651</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>441,134</td>
<td>21,119,565</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>483,650</td>
<td>24,722,464</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>520,409</td>
<td>29,366,305</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>590,503</td>
<td>36,010,210</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>684,900</td>
<td>45,500,000</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>789,700</td>
<td>54,600,000</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working Conditions

The huge enrollments described in the previous section not only have had an effect on the market position of teachers but are also advanced as a major factor in the current deterioration of teachers' working conditions. Even though the national expenditure on education has increased in recent years, there is still overcrowding in the schools, especially in the slum areas of the large school systems. For teachers, this has meant teaching conditions which are not only unpleasant but in many instances physically unsafe.

Increased enrollments and a decrease in the number of school districts have placed the majority of the Nation's pupils in a relatively few school districts. There are presently some 34,678 operating school districts in the United States. This is 50 per cent fewer than there were ten years ago and 70 per cent fewer than there were twenty years ago. For the 1966-1967 school year the largest 1,400 school districts, those enrolling 6,000 pupils or more, accounted for only six per cent of the total number of school districts, but enrolled in excess of 58 per cent of the total number of

20Moskow, op. cit., p. 4.
pupils. For the 1961-1962 school year this percentage was 52 per cent.\footnote{21}

Class size increases with the size of the school system. A survey conducted by the NEA in March 1965 of school systems enrolling 3,000 or more pupils reported that the mean class size ranged from 28.4 pupils per class in the smallest systems surveyed to 31.6 pupils per class in the largest systems.\footnote{22} Class size in the systems enrolling fewer than 3,000 pupils is significantly lower than either figure just cited.

Large class sizes and more permissive parental attitudes toward child behavior have had an adverse effect on teacher control of students. The problems created range from unruly behavior to violent conduct on the part of the pupils. Increased problems with student discipline were reflected in an NEA poll in 1964 in which several questions concerning student behavior were asked.\footnote{23} Teachers agreed that the "blackboard jungle" is not typical of American schools. However, 

the opinions of the teachers did support the widely held view that severe behavior problems are on the increase and are more prevalent in the Nation's larger school systems. One question asked the teachers if they believed that maintaining student discipline had become more difficult than when they first started teaching. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-19</th>
<th>20 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More difficult</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficult</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the older teachers, those with the most years of experience, felt that maintaining proper discipline is more difficult now than it has been in the past.

Violence in the public schools has become an acute problem in the school districts of the major cities. Violent conduct on the part of pupils tends to occur mostly in the slum areas where the student body is composed of minority groups such as Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

It was reported in Chicago that during the early part of 1966 on the average of six students a day were arrested for school offenses which ranged from loitering to aggravated battery.\(^24\) In New York City in 1960 a grand jury was

\(^{24}\)Doherty and Oberer, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.
empaneled in Brooklyn to investigate crime and juvenile delinquency in the Brooklyn public schools. This action was taken after a student in Thomas Jefferson High School had thrown liquid lye in a classroom. One student was partially blinded. As a result police officers were assigned to the school for a while. Among the recommendations of the grand jury were that special schools for problem children be expanded and that bonuses be paid teachers handling problem children.

On numerous occasions, violence in New York City schools has prompted threats of teacher walkouts. Illustrative is the case of Junior High School 98 in March of 1967. Teachers there demanded that additional staff be provided to cope with overcrowded conditions and to provide protection against student assaults. The school is located in the East Bronx and has a student body comprised mostly of Negroes and Puerto Ricans. From September through March of the 1966-1967 school year, thirteen assaults by pupils on teachers occurred.

The teachers claimed that the Board of Education was indifferent to the needs of the schools in the area. Overcrowded conditions and lack of special facilities for handling

problem children were cited as the main circumstances aggravating the situation. Teachers at the school threatened to stay home if conditions were not improved, and on March 15 of the year, eighty-five of the ninety teachers in the school did stay home. The walkout lasted for only two days. As a result of the teacher action, monitors were placed in the halls of schools.

Although the teachers questioned in the NEA poll cited above did not believe the "blackboard jungle" atmosphere to be characteristic of American schools, many New York City teachers have characterized teaching in the city as a "hazardous occupation." Certainly, the circumstances just cited are exacerbating to teachers already plagued by low salaries, overcrowded conditions, and burdensome clerical duties.

Discipline problems are not the only source of frustration for teachers. As has been true in the past, duties apart from teaching are still irritating to teachers. Bel Kaufman, a former teacher in New York City, remarks that today's teacher has no time to teach. "He is strangulated by red tape or overwhelmed by clerical work or buried under an avalanche of paper and overwhelmed by five classes, overcrowded

27 Doherty and Oberer, op. cit., p. 19.
rooms, lunchroom patrol, and hall duty." Her observation is that teachers want fewer classes, fewer students, and no nonsense to do outside of teaching.

Growth in the size of school districts has also affected teacher-school board relations. As school systems become larger administrative units, the operation of the school becomes more bureaucratic and impersonal. The premise advanced by many observers is that teachers in the large school districts of today individually have little or no control over the terms and conditions of their employment.

The premise just stated is especially relevant to the derivation of teacher salaries. Historically, these were set by the local school board or its agent in private meetings with individual teachers. Today, the single-salary schedule is used almost universally. The school board sets up a series of salaries which reflect years of experience and academic preparation. Thus all teachers with three years' experience and a bachelor's degree may receive the same salary regardless of the subject taught or the degree of competency possessed by each teacher. Under these conditions the public school teacher finds his economic relations with respect

---

to his employment almost identical to those of the mass of workers in private industry and far removed from those of the fee-taking professions. Therefore, some form of collective bargaining as practiced by industrial workers has become more applicable to teacher-school board relations.

Deterioration in the rapport between teachers and administrators is another problem attributable to the growth of bureaucratic, impersonal administrations. As the size of the school system increases, the communications between teachers and administrators, especially boards of education, become more formal and inadequate. Allan West of the NEA Urban Services Division states that teachers become disgruntled over weak grievance procedures and poor communications with educational hierarchies with the result that teachers turn to collective action and negotiations in order to have a more vigorous and articulate voice in dealing with impersonal boards of education.29 Another observer has commented that "at the heart of the new and aggressive climate among teachers is the hunger to be a real part of a creative enterprise, not cogs in a well-oiled machine."30


30Stinnett, op. cit., p. 34.
The importance of the conditions mentioned above as sources of discontent among teachers is reflected by a recent NEA poll. One question asked of teachers was, "What elements in your present situation as a teacher discourage or hinder you most in rendering the best service of which you are capable?" The items mentioned most often in descending order were: lack of time to teach; insufficient materials, staff and funds; discipline problems; and poor administration. Lack of time to teach included complaints about excessive clerical chores and patrolling duties. Insufficient materials, staff and funds referred to such problems as overcrowding, no provision for disturbed pupils, and lack of guidance or library services. Poor communications with the school central office or the school board were listed under poor administration.

**Composition and Characteristics of the Teaching Force**

The changing composition and characteristics of the teaching force are considered an important element in teacher unrest as they affect the attitudes and conduct of teachers. Since the Civil War women teachers have been the mainstay of

---

the teaching force. Most of these enter teaching and then leave it to be married or start families. Once their children reach school age, many of these return to teaching in order to supplement their husbands' income. This situation establishes teaching as an almost casual occupation. It is suggested that such a change in the composition of the teaching force as a greater proportion of married men would reduce the casual nature of teaching and thereby contribute to greater teacher militancy. Other characteristics often mentioned in this respect are changes in the level of training, the age and sex composition, and the turnover rate among teachers.

The basic trends in our teaching force are that it is becoming younger, better trained, more masculine and less casual.\(^{32}\) Between 1956 and 1961 the median age of the teaching staff was reduced by two years as the result of an influx of large numbers of young beginning teachers. These young teachers are more prone to be militant than the older teachers, for two reasons. First, being largely from blue-collar households,\(^{33}\) they are philosophically less resistant to collective bargaining. Second, since they enter at the lower

---

\(^{32}\) West, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 148.

\(^{33}\) Doherty and Oberer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 8.
end of the salary schedule, their salaries are significantly lower than those of teachers with several years experience. For example, assuming a salary schedule based on $150 annual increments for experience, a teacher with ten years' experience would receive $1500 a year more than a beginning teacher, who often feels that such a wide differential is unjustified.

Another positive factor in teacher militancy is that each year a greater percentage of the college graduates entering teaching are men. Men represented 15.3 per cent of the teaching force in 1943-1944, 24.4 per cent in 1951-1952, and 31.1 per cent in 1965-1966. Most men teachers are found in the secondary schools. In the elementary schools only 10 per cent of the teachers are men whereas in the secondary schools 55 per cent are men. At least 80 per cent of all men teachers are married and supporting households.

The level of training also closely relates to the bargaining power of teachers. Between 1947 and 1963 the per cent of teachers holding bachelor's degrees increased from 60 per cent to 90 per cent. During the same period, the percentage holding master's degrees rose from 15 per cent to 25 per cent.

35 Ibid., p. 58.
36 Ibid., p. 91.
37 West, op. cit., p. 148.
The teaching force is becoming more stable as the turnover rate among teachers is decreasing. Even so, the rate is still nearly four times as high as that for all manufacturing employees. This decline is attributable to the facts that more men are entering teaching and that the mature married women are more stable than young single women.

Of special significance for teacher militancy is the increasing number of young married men who enter teaching with the expectation of making it a career. Today's militant in education has been described as the "angry young man" teacher. This type of teacher is anxious to receive higher salaries, better fringe benefits, and improved teaching conditions. And, since he is often from a blue-collar background, he is likely to be militant in his demands and inclined toward collective bargaining.

Other Factors

In addition to the factors listed above, many writers are of the opinion that teacher militancy must be considered within the context of current events. For example, there was no strike activity by teachers during the inflation of the early 1940's because the war effort was underway. Therefore,

---

it is felt that circumstances, such as those just cited, can either promote or retard activism by teachers. The Civil Rights Movement, which has accelerated in the 1960's, Federal Executive Order 10988, which conferred modified collective bargaining rights on Federal employees, and the stimulus of the New York City teacher strike of 1960 are advanced as recent events which have encouraged teacher militancy.

The acceleration of the Civil Rights Movement in this decade represents an increased determination on the part of the American Negro to improve his social and economic status. The March on Washington in August of 1963 and the subsequent passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 have demonstrated that activism and militancy can achieve results.

Several writers contend that the activism of this movement has been communicated to teachers. Stinnett makes the following observation:

The dramatic push of American Negroes for human and civil rights, for elevation to first class citizenship has had great impact everywhere, especially upon the people of the United States. It is not far-fetched to assume that there has been a psychological effect on teachers. Teachers, too, have often viewed themselves as oppressed; they have viewed their treatment by society as being far less than commensurate with the importance of their contribution to the general welfare. Apparently, the activism of the civil rights movement and the effectiveness of that activism has
had a significant impact upon the behavior patterns of teachers who have aspired to improve their status.  

Although workers in private industry have been entitled to collective bargaining rights since the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935, public employees generally have not had similar rights. In 1962 President Kennedy conferred modified collective bargaining rights on Federal employees through Federal Executive Order 10988. Lowell McGinnis, Assistant Superintendent of Schools in charge of Personnel Staff Relations for the Los Angeles Unified School District, holds that this executive order, by example, has encouraged state and local employees, including teachers, to seek similar employment rights.

As public employees, teachers have been forbidden to engage in collective bargaining and striking by many state laws. However, between 1962 and 1965, eight states enacted legislation which permits teacher negotiations in school districts. These are California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, Washington, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin.

---


40 Federal employees do not have the right to strike.

41 McGinnis, op. cit., p. 78.
The short-run effect of some of this legislation seems to be increased activism and strike activity on the part of teachers. The state of Michigan passed a very comprehensive act in 1965, which conferred collective bargaining rights on all public employees. In 1966 ten of the thirty-three teachers' strikes which occurred across the nation were in Michigan, and over forty of the approximately seventy-five teachers' strikes in 1967 were in Michigan. Michigan represents a special case in that the courts there have refused to enjoin striking teachers. However, the circumstances there do indicate that given the absence of overly restrictive legislation concerning strikes by teachers and the presence of positive legislation concerning negotiating rights for teachers, strike activity is much more likely to take place.

A final event which seems to have initiated the current period of teacher militancy is the teachers' strike in New York City in November of 1960, provoked by the refusal of the school board to negotiate with the teachers. This event and the subsequent comprehensive agreement negotiated in 1962 tended to serve as an infectious example to other teachers across the country. Like the Civil Rights March on Washington, it illustrates that teachers can through determined and

militant action, even in defiance of law, achieve their goals of higher pay, better working conditions, and a greater voice in decision-making in the schools.

**Examples of Teacher Militancy**

The pervasiveness of teacher militancy as evidenced by statistics on strikes and sanctions was discussed earlier. Now, instances of militancy in Utah, Oklahoma, and New York City will be discussed in order to illustrate some of the circumstances associated with outbreaks of militant conduct on the part of teachers.

In Oklahoma, the financial support of the state's school system had been deteriorating since World War II, when sanctions were imposed there in 1965. The teachers had tried repeatedly to obtain better support for the schools but had been continually rebuffed by indifferent political leaders and an apathetic public.

In the spring of 1963 the minimum annual starting salary for teachers was $3,800 and the average annual salary for all teachers was $5,257. This average salary in Oklahoma was nearly $1,000 below the national average and nearly $400 below

---

43Ibid., pp. 278-280.
the regional average. As a result of the "baby boom" following World War II, overcrowded conditions existed in the state's schools.

At the time sanctions were applied against Oklahoma schools, the governor was a conservative Republican named Henry Bellmon, who, like many of the state's governors before him, had campaigned on a "no new taxes" platform. Under such leadership as this, the state had had no state-wide general tax increase since 1937. The state's schools had suffered accordingly, and in 1963, after an investigation of the schools, the NEA described the deterioration as having reached a "critical plane."

The situation became explosive in 1963. In that year the legislature passed a $10.4 million program to aid the schools, which provided for a salary increase of $1,000 per teacher over six years. Governor Bellmon vetoed the bill. The teachers then directed their appeals to the public. Through referendum procedures they succeeded in getting a proposed one-cent increase in the state's two per cent sales tax presented to the electorate. Most of the increased revenue was to be used to improve the schools. The proposal

---

failed to pass, and the state's teachers gave up in exasperation.

In March of 1965 the Oklahoma Education Association imposed sanctions against the state's school system. In May the NEA followed with like action. The teachers felt that they had been provoked and thus had no choice but to take militant action. Officially, the sanctions meant that the teachers would not sign their contracts for the coming school year unless conditions, including salaries, were improved, and also that teachers would not come from outside the state to accept positions.

In July following the March vote of sanctions, an educational bill was passed which provided for a 25 per cent or $28.7 million increase in the state's educational budget. This included a $500 average increase in teachers' salaries in one year. In September the sanctions were lifted.

The circumstances in Utah that led to the application of sanctions to that state's schools from May of 1964 to March of 1965 were very similar to those in Oklahoma. Before the sanctions were applied, Utah teachers also declared a two-day "recess" May 18-19, 1964.

There had been steady deterioration in the state's schools since 1947, when a massive infusion of new funds had revitalized the state's education program. Since 1947 the state's governors had been fiscal conservatives and indifferent to the needs of the schools. As early as 1953 the teachers had threatened to refuse to sign their contracts.

The teachers became incensed again in 1963, when a $24.5 million program for improving the schools was cut to $11.6 million. They were further incensed by Governor Clyde's refusal to meet with teacher representatives to discuss the issues and problems confronting the schools. Finally, a study committee of the teachers obtained an audience with the Governor and proposed that a special session be called for the purpose of appropriating an additional $6 million per biennium to the schools. The Governor flatly rejected the recommendation and refused to take further action. Subsequently, the teachers declared a two-day "recess" in order to hold a special assembly of the state's teachers. Of the 10,000 teachers in the state, 7,500 convened and voted to withhold their contracts for the 1964-1965 school year.

In addition to the threat of withholding their contracts, the teachers formed a political organization, the Utah

Council for the Improvement of Education. Apparently this organization was of some benefit, as a friendly governor was elected in November of 1964, and eleven teachers or former teachers were elected to the legislature. In March of 1965 the legislature increased biennial expenditures for education by over $16 million. This included a provision for increasing teachers' salaries by $800 a year. Following the passage of this legislation sanctions were lifted.

Teacher militancy in New York City has been the most dramatic in the country. Since 1960 there have been four district-wide strikes which crippled a system employing over 50,000 teachers and enrolling over one million children. In addition, there have been numerous walkouts involving particular schools. The first strike, in 1960, was to force the Board of Education to bargain with the teachers. The second strike, in 1962, illustrates further why the teachers became militant.

The salary dispute triggered the strike, but an inadequate salary schedule was not the sole complaint of the teachers. Other factors were:

... frustration with the difficulties of teaching in a system that sometimes seems to have more than its share of problems; dissatisfaction with the obstacles standing

Ibid., p. 271.
in the way of effective teaching; bitterness over working conditions—including, for some teachers, no duty-free lunch periods; resentment over the feeling that the New York City teacher is a nameless cog in an impersonal bureaucracy; unhappiness with citizenry and its elected officials who, while they talk often enough about the importance of good schools and well-paid teachers, are apparently unwilling to provide the means to achieve these goals; anger over the necessity, in many instances, of holding after-school jobs in order to make financial ends meet.\textsuperscript{48}

Teachers complained about overcrowded conditions, inadequate facilities—including rat-infested buildings, low salaries, and the indifference of the city's political and civic leaders. To them militant action seemed to be the only means for improving teacher welfare and the conditions of the schools in general.

A major factor aggravating the situation was the matter of student violence in the schools. The main difficulties were in the slum areas, where the student body consisted of low-income minority groups. The difficulties centering around Junior High School 98 discussed above illustrate the circumstances with which many teachers in New York City were confronted.

The third strike in New York City occurred in September of 1967 as a result of the failure of the school board to agree to the teachers' demands. Salaries and working conditions were the main issues.

The fourth strike was in September of 1968. This strike 
occurred as the result of an attempt to decentralize control of 
the city's schools. A local governing board was established in 
the Ocean Hill-Brownsville ghetto area of the city and given ad-
ministrative control of the schools in the area. The purpose was 
to give the local community a larger voice in the operation of the 
schools. As the school term closed in May of 1968 the local gov-
erning board dismissed ten teachers who the local board charged 
were doing unsatisfactory work or trying to sabotage the decentral-
ization experiment. The Ocean Hill-Brownsville area is comprised 
mostly of Negroes and Puerto Ricans. The ten ousted teachers 
were all white and predominantly of Jewish background.

When the local board refused to allow the ten teachers to 
return to their duties in the fall, a city-wide strike was called 
in protest. At issue was job security for teachers and local con-
trol of the schools. After a drawn-out controversy which crippled 
the school system for several weeks, the ten teachers were rein-
stated, but the experiment in decentralization is in temporary 
abatement. 49

In the above examples, teachers' salaries as well as the 
financial support of the schools in general was at issue. Also 
involved was an apathetic response from political leaders and the 

electorate to the needs of the school system. In each instance, teachers were frustrated in their efforts to obtain increased support for the schools and, consequently, became militant in their demands that conditions be improved.
CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
AND THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

National Education Association

Of the two organizations under discussion, the National Education Association (NEA) is by far the older, since its origins go back to 1857. The founding principles of the NEA are important because its goals and philosophy have changed very little until recently. In the mid-1800's, teaching was very much a casual occupation, and formal education was subordinated to matters of a more practical nature. The teaching force then was much smaller, both absolutely and relatively, than it is today. In 1860, there were only 100,000 teachers comprising less than .3 of one per cent of the population whereas there are now over 1,800,000 teachers comprising almost one per cent of the population.

The status of teachers and teaching during this period has been aptly characterized in the following statement.
"The majority of teachers were immature, inexperienced, untrained, and lacking in professional interest."¹ Wesley, the

NBA centennial historian, states that in 1857 "the vast majority of American teachers were working in isolated one-room schools. They taught only a few months at starvation wages and devoted much of the year to earning a living by farming or in industry." Clarke describes the situation in these words:

The average teacher usually fell into one of three groups. The poorly trained young girl who used the teaching profession as a temporary occupation until she married was the most typical. Little else was open to her. Those in that group who remained unmarried and stayed in the teaching profession as a means of livelihood made up the second group. Men made up the third group, but most of them considered teaching a stopgap profession, and the best frequently became administrators. For most, however, teaching was a useful means of temporary employment until they could obtain a more permanent job.

Economically, teachers fared worse then than today. Salaries of journeymen, shoemakers, carpenters, blacksmiths, painters, carriage-makers, wheelwrights, harness-makers, and others were fifty per cent to one hundred per cent more than those of teachers. Only men teachers in city schools received pay adequate for subsistence.

---


4 Elsbree, op. cit., p. 283.
Turnover among teachers was high. Teachers often remained in one position but a single year, especially in rural districts. For example, the situation in the state of Pennsylvania in 1856 is taken to be typical of conditions throughout the country. The number of teachers in thirty-four counties, together with amount of experience, is reported as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who have taught less 1</td>
<td>1,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who have taught 1-3</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who have taught 3-6</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who have taught over 6</td>
<td>1,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other aspects of teaching were no more encouraging. School buildings were inadequate. "In 1857, in Erie County, Pennsylvania there were 276 school buildings. Of these, only four had more than one room, and the county school superintendent estimated that 149 of these were unfit for use." The school term in Pennsylvania averaged slightly over five months, making teaching primarily a winter occupation. Examinations for certification were perfunctory and farcical. The training of teachers as such was not yet a serious business in the Nation, although under the leadership of Horace Mann, the first normal school had been instituted in 1839. As late

---


6 *Wesley, op. cit.*, p. 10.
as 1870, the superintendent was usually the only professionally trained staff member in a school system.  

In short, education and teaching had not yet become a dynamic and stable force in American society. As a society we still were given to the practical and immediate task of making a living. As Elsbree has pointed out, in spite of the vocal support given to it by statesmen, education was considered secondary in importance to the business of political reorganization, the expansion of American trade, and the improvement of agriculture. Inasmuch as immediate utility was the criterion by which citizens rated the value of one's occupation, and because so many imminent problems required solution, schoolteaching fell rather low on the scale. It was against this background that the National Education Association came into existence.

The National Education Association began with a meeting of delegates from ten state teachers' associations who met in Philadelphia in 1857 to create a national organization, which initially was called the National Teachers' Association. Slowly, other state associations, including those already in existence and newly formed ones, joined the new national

---

7Clarke, op. cit., p. 22.

8Elsbree, op. cit., p. 271.
organization. Other national organizations that affiliated with the National Teachers' Association included the American Normal School Association, the National Association of School Superintendents, and the Central College Association, which became departments of the National Teachers' Association at its annual meeting in Cleveland in 1870. A Department of Elementary Education was created at the same meeting. As a result of these additions, the national organization changed its name to the National Education Association. 9

The preamble of the constitution of the National Teachers' Association still stands today in the constitution of the National Education Association (NEA). It establishes as the goal of the national organization "to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching, and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States." 10 Since teaching was very much a casual occupation during this period, the early leaders placed emphasis on the professional development rather than the personal welfare of teachers.

Unfortunately, the NEA during its formative years failed to reflect broad-based participation of all educators including

---

9 Wesley, op. cit., p. 44.

10 Ibid., p. 23.
classroom teachers. One reason for this was the inadequacy of transportation in these years. The national organization's business was conducted at annual meetings which were open to all members. During these formative years of development, only those who lived close to the meeting site or had the time and money for traveling could become active in the Association. Consequently, professors, college presidents, and superintendents dominated convention programs even more than in later years.\footnote{Ibid., p. 334.}

An analysis of "who spoke about what" at the NEA conventions clearly indicated who controlled the NEA and what the interests of the leadership were. Wesley indicated that at the 94 conventions held between 1857 and 1956, an average of about 200 papers were delivered at each convention, making a total for the period of approximately 19,000 papers. The speakers were superintendents of city and state school systems; presidents of normal schools, teachers' colleges, universities and various other kinds of educational institutions; professors, research scholars, and specialists of diverse kinds; principals and teachers from schools of every grade level; public officials; and invited guests of varying
degrees of prominence.  

12 Wesley further states that the leadership of the NEA in its early years was predominantly in the hands of superintendents and college presidents.  

Speeches at these conventions reflected the NEA's founding principle—that is, that the organization's desire was to aid in and help shape the development of a better system of national education. Papers, according to topic, delivered at NEA meetings from 1858 to 1890 are as follows:

**Speeches Delivered at NEA Meetings, 1858-1890**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Papers</th>
<th>Topics Treated in Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Theory and psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>High schools and colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Normal schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Manual training and technical schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Courses of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kindergartens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Primary grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Music education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Moral and religious instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Philosophy of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Federal aid to education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Graded and ungraded schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Foreign educational systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education for Indians, Chinese, Negroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Examinations for teachers and pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Criticism of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Statistical records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Building, heating, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compulsory attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crime and education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wesley, p. 49.

Assuming these papers delivered at the annual meetings indicate the interests of the national organization, it seems clear that the NEA was not very concerned with teacher welfare. None of the topics listed relate to salaries, tenure, or other working conditions.

A similar list of speeches made at NEA department meetings from 1930 to 1939 indicates the NEA's concern for the salaries and rights of teachers had not changed much by 1939.

Speeches Delivered at NEA Department Meetings, 1930-1939

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of papers</th>
<th>Topics Treated in Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Rural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Teachers' colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Business education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Health and physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Adult education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Home economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Vocational education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Science teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Social studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kindergarten and primary grades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wesley, p. 53.

The above discussion is not intended to convey the idea that the NEA completely failed because it did not devote the majority of its efforts to improving teacher salaries and other benefits. The NEA did contribute in its early years to raising standards in teaching and to increasing public support.

\[15\] Ibid., p. 53.
for education. But, the leaders of the NEA failed to realize that improvements in teacher benefits were essential to the realization of its primary goal.

This discussion of the beginning and formative years of the NEA was intended to demonstrate that the Association during its early years was controlled by school administrators and college educators who were interested in seeing education and teaching become a more stable and dynamic force in society rather than let it continue to be the casual, nonchalant force it was in the mid 1800's. The Association continued to be predominantly an association of school administrators until shortly after World War I. In fact, not until after the Civil War and a large influx of women into the teaching force, were women admitted to membership.

Two other important changes in NEA policy and structure have tended to increase classroom teacher participation in the organization.

In order to give classroom teachers a more important role in the NEA, a Department of Classroom Teachers was created in 1913. In 1967 the name was changed to the Association


17 Wesley, op. cit., p. 325.
of Classroom Teachers. Its program "is designed to strengthen education and the teaching profession; to promote the work of local, state, and national professional organizations; and to help classroom teachers improve their status and welfare and thereby enhance their service to children."\textsuperscript{18}

Unlike many other departments in the NEA, such as the American Association of School Administrators, the Department of Classroom Teachers (DCT) has no official roll of membership or separate dues assessment. Anyone who is a member of the NEA and is a classroom teacher is automatically a member of the Department of Classroom Teachers. The DCT is by far the largest department in the NEA, as it currently accounts for about eighty-five per cent of NEA membership.\textsuperscript{19}

Another important change was the creation of the Representative Assembly in 1920. This change was brought about by criticism from within the NEA. Wesley, official historian of NEA, admits that

\begin{quote}
The older members who had built the Association and established its procedures and traditions naturally assumed a possessive and proprietary attitude. Newcomers . . . became impatient . . . and resented the control of the Association by a small . . . group. It was said that
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{19}Myron Lieberman, \textit{Education As A Profession} (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1956), p. 263.
the NEA was run by a self-perpetuating clique and . . . that a small circle of administrators and professors made all decisions and determined all policies.\textsuperscript{20}

Consequently, the annual "meetings\textsuperscript{21} of the NEA were replaced by the Representative Assembly. The Assembly, consisting of delegates from state and local educational associations, was designated as the NEA's legislative and policy making body. Part of its duties include the election of officers, adoption of the annual budget, and approval of resolutions and platforms.\textsuperscript{22}

The part of the above discussion on teacher welfare has been negative in nature, emphasizing that during its early years the interests of the NEA were on professional development instead of personal welfare. However, with the admission of women to membership, the creation of the Representative Assembly and the Department of Classroom Teachers, and growth in membership, the NEA did turn some attention to the occupational welfare of teachers. The traditional approach of the NEA to enhancing teacher salaries has revolved around

\textsuperscript{20}Wesley, op. cit., pp. 328-329.

\textsuperscript{21}Prior to 1920, the NEA's business was conducted at annual meetings which were open to all members, as discussed above.

\textsuperscript{22}National Education Association, NEA Handbook, 1966-1967 (Washington, 1966), pp. 48-49
the influencing of public opinion and state legislatures.

This approach is summarized as follows:

Since two out of every three dollars appropriated to the schools go into the salary budget, the theory is that if legislatures can be persuaded to appropriate more dollars to the schools a good share of them will go into the salary budget. Thus, the chief task of the state associations (NEA) has been to promote legislation which would improve the financing of the schools.23

NEA's attempts to influence public opinion and legislation are supported by research on teachers' salaries, tenure, and other matters of importance to teacher welfare. In 1905 the NEA published its pioneer study of teachers' salaries. In 1922 the Research Division of the NEA was created and has since published biennial surveys of teachers' salaries.24 The reports and investigations of the Research Division are considered to be among the most outstanding contributions of the NEA.25 For the school year 1967-1968, the expenditures of the Research Division of the NEA approached $600,000.26


24 Wesley, op. cit., p. 335.


The relative contribution of the NEA and the state associations to the improvement of teacher welfare through lobbying activities is controversial. The state associations are usually quite active in their attempts to secure favorable legislation. Consequently, the NEA and its affiliates are considered presumptuous in assuming credit for the passage of all bills which improve teacher welfare. However, authoritative opinions vary concerning the allocation of credit between state and national associations.

Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee describe the work of the state associations as follows:

Each legislative session in each state finds state association lobbyists working feverishly for passage of teacher welfare bills. Elaborate mechanisms for enlisting grass roots support for all kinds of educational legislation have been perfected. Local associations and individual members are kept well informed on activities of legislatures and legislators. Score cards and progress charts are maintained and success is measured in terms of bills passed or bills defeated.27

These authors believe that there is a surprising concentration of power in the state education associations.

The most notable critic of the education associations is Myron Lieberman. His opinion is that "the NEA does work for teacher welfare, but its programs are low in aim and weak in

execution." Lieberman's analysis emphasizes what has not been done rather than what has been done.

The lack of professional control over admission to teaching, the low standards for teaching certificates, the existence of substandard programs for teacher education, the declining professional and economic status of teachers, the superficial attention to professional ethics—all these and other indications of professional failure constitute a reflection upon the state education associations as well as the NEA.

In essence, Lieberman believes that since the education associations enroll the majority of the nation's teachers, then they necessarily must bear the brunt of the blame for inadequacies in the professional status and occupational welfare of teachers.

Inasmuch as there are fifty state education associations trying to influence fifty different legislatures, it is somewhat inappropriate to try to ascertain their aggregate effects. Studies of specific state associations do indicate that some are relatively effective in voicing the views of teachers and securing favorable results. In the late 1930's, McKean found the teachers' lobby in New Jersey to be very powerful. Blanke found in 1961 that chief state school

officers in the states studied judged education interest
groups as having more than average influence with legisla-
tors. 31 Also, as explained earlier, teacher associations in
Utah and Oklahoma were effective in their militant dealings
with the respective legislatures, even though the situations
did deteriorate considerably before the associations were
prompted to act.

As discussed earlier, NEA membership consisted primarily
of school administrators and college educators during the
early years of development. Consequently, the Association
was small relative to the size of the teaching force. In
1918, sixty-one years after its founding, the NEA enrolled
only 10,000 members or about five per cent of the Nation's
teachers, as shown in Table X. This situation persisted un-
til shortly after World War I, when a concerted drive was made
to enroll classroom teachers in the NEA. 32 This drive was
prompted in part by the formation of the American Federation
of Teachers and also stimulated by the anti-union mood of the
1920's. The NEA experienced rapid growth throughout the
1920's and by 1932 had a membership of over 180,000. The
trough years of the depression witnessed a decline in NEA

31 Ibid., citing Virgil Blanks, "Educational Policy Formu-
lation at the State Level by Chief State School Officers," un-
published doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Uni-

32 Peterson, op. cit., p. 17.
### TABLE X

**NEA MEMBERSHIP, 1857-1967**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>220,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>207,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>189,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>187,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>190,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>165,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>181,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>195,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>201,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>203,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>211,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>5,261</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>217,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>219,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>5,044</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>271,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>331,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>6,030</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>340,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>386,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>7,036</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>441,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>427,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>7,582</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>453,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>7,063</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>465,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>7,441</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>490,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>516,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>8,466</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>561,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>10,104</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>612,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>659,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>52,850</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>703,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>87,414</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>616,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>118,032</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>667,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>133,566</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>713,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>138,856</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>765,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>158,103</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>812,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>170,053</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>859,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>181,350</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>903,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>4,778</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>193,145</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>943,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>205,678</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>986,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>216,188</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1,028,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Data for 1857 through 1956 taken from Wesley, **NEA: The First Hundred Years**, p. 377.
membership, but by the late 1930's membership was once again on the rise. However, the biggest gains in membership have come in recent years. Since 1953, with the exception of 1958, annual increases in members have exceeded 40,000 each year. From 1953 to 1967, membership grew from 516,463, to 1,038,456; an increase for the period of 521,993 or nearly a hundred percent improvement.

When membership is expressed as a percentage of public school employees, the NEA is the most pervasive teachers' organization in existence. In 1967 NEA membership accounted for fifty-two percent of all public school personnel. In contrast with the NEA, the American Federation of Teachers, as late as 1966, enrolled less than seven percent of the Nation's teachers in its membership.

The NEA is a much larger and more complicated organization than its rival, the American Federation of Teachers. The NEA has thirty-three departments, twenty-five commissions and committees, seventeen headquarters divisions, and a staff of over nine hundred persons to carry out its policies. It has a research division staffed by twenty professional and


administrative personnel and about thirty-five skilled clerical, secretarial and statistical workers. The annual budget of the NEA is said to be larger than that of any other professional association. Its budget for the school year 1966-1967 was $10,699,095. The major source of revenue for the NEA is membership dues.

The thirty-three departments are usually subject-matter groups. Most of the departments, the Department of Classroom Teachers being a major exception, have their own membership rolls and dues, do research in their area of interest, and publish journals, research studies, and other literature. Many of the departments were originally separate national organizations which affiliated with the NEA, such as the American Association of School Administrators. Consequently, many of these departments still maintain separate membership rolls and are quite autonomous. "The 17 Headquarters divisions provide basic NEA services under the direct supervision of the executive secretary and assistant

---

35 Moskow, op. cit., p. 94.


executive secretaries." The committees and commissions operate in large areas of professional interest under the general supervision of the Executive Committee.

This brief overview is sufficient to indicate that the NEA is an elaborately organized body as broad in scope and interest as the field of education. Consequently, Wesley described it as "an animated, functioning definition of education" and claimed that the sum total of its organizational structure is a "mirror of American Education."  

The official policy-making body of the NEA is the Representative Assembly, which was mentioned earlier. The Board of Directors, a rather large group of ninety-four members, is charged with carrying on the business of the NEA between the annual conventions of the Representative Assembly. The Directors have the responsibility for executing the policies established by the Representative Assembly. However, the Directors are elected by the affiliated state associations. Thus the Assembly's power of discipline over the Directors is somewhat diminished.

Since the Board of Directors is such a large group, its powers between meetings are delegated to a smaller group.

---


39 Wesley, op. cit., p. 381.
of eleven members called the Executive Committee. All but two of these members are selected by the Representative Assembly. The other two are selected by the Board of Directors. The Executive Committee in turn selects an Executive Secretary who is the chief administrative officer of the NEA.

Since the Representative Assembly is the policy making body of the NEA, the actual implementation of policy might be made more responsive to the wishes of the Assembly if the Board of Directors were eliminated, and the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary alone charged with the administration of the national organization.

The national body is complemented by affiliated state and local education associations. The NEA claims to have affiliated state associations in all fifty states, which enroll almost eighty-seven per cent of the Nation's teachers. Many teachers join their state education association but do not join the NEA or its affiliated local organization.

Since education is mainly a function of the state governments rather than the federal government, the importance of effective organization on the state level cannot be overemphasized. Certification standards, minimum salary schedules, the length of the school term, and other matters of vital concern to teachers are determined by state legislatures.
Consequently, the most important work of the state associations involved lobbying for teachers' interests. These efforts are supported by the research services provided by the national body.

At the school district level there are local education associations. The greatest potential for teacher participation in decision making exists at the local level, as it is at this level that teachers are hired and dismissed, working conditions are set, course curriculum is established, and other vital policy affecting teachers is determined. However, the tendency has been for local associations to be very inactive. Lieberman describes the average local association as giving "teas for new teachers in the fall and retiring teachers in the spring, and perhaps listening to a few travelogues in between." 40

The low level of activity of local education associations is due in part to the fact that few have an adequate dues structure. As late as 1965, the average teacher paid only two dollars in local dues. 41 Most local associations

are not able to maintain a headquarters and employ any full-
time or part-time staff. As a result, the level of services
provided is very minimal.

Evidence of inactivity by the local education asso-
ciations is given by their infrequent contacts with school
authorities. A NEA survey in 1959 showed that most of these
were in communication with their school boards less than three
times a year. Over seventy-five per cent of the associations
reported that they spent the majority of their time partici-
pating in social activities. 42

In contrast to the NEA and its affiliates, the Ameri-
can Federation of Teachers has emphasized concerted activ-
ity at the local school district level. Therefore, part of
the success of the AFT has been attributed to the vacuum
created by the inactivity of the local education associations.

American Federation of Teachers

The American Federation of Teachers and the National
Education Association have been in competition for the alle-
giance of classroom teachers for over half a century. Es-
sential differences between the two organizations stem from
three things. The founding goals and philosophy of the AFT

42 Ibid., pp. 245-246.
are significantly different from those of the NEA; the AFT is a trade union affiliated with organized labor, and the AFT is a much younger and smaller organization than the NEA.

The AFT was founded in 1916 during the First World War. Teaching and education were out of the embryo stage described as existing at the time of the founding of the NEA. Schools for the training of teachers were well established and the teaching force was much larger and more stable than was true in the mid-1800's.

Writings on the history of the union suggest several factors which provoked discontent among classroom teachers after the turn of the twentieth century. Community pressures severely restricted the social conduct of teachers. Such social practices as smoking and occasional drinking were totally unacceptable for teachers. Teachers were also restricted when it came to the expression of their political views. They were not expected to become involved in supporting candidates for public office. These restrictions had the effect of making teachers "second-class citizens." Freedom of expression and conduct considered normal for most of the population was denied to the Nation's teachers.

The source of this denial necessarily emanated from school boards, that frequently reflected the more conservative
values in the community. The AFT charges that "state legislatures, local school boards, and administrators were frequently dominated by large tax-paying interests who were primarily concerned with keeping the cost of public education low and with maintaining obedient and submissive attitudes on the part of teachers." 43

The fact that teachers were dominated by school boards in both school life and social life is adequately documented. "As late as 1929 a Kansas board of education dropped eleven high-school teachers because they had attended a dance at a local country club." 44 This domination of the school boards by special interests intent on keeping costs low and "morals" high meant that teacher salaries were likewise kept low and that the schools were operated on scant budgets.

These conditions produced pockets of intense teacher discontent across the country, mainly in urban areas. This discontent contributed to the formation of the American Federation of Teachers. After the turn of the century, teachers made sporadic and usually ephemeral attempts to organize and affiliate with organized labor. In 1902, a group of teachers

43 Commission on Educational Reconstruction, Organizing the Teaching Profession (Glencoe, Illinois, 1965), pp. 11-12.
44 Elsbree, op. cit., p. 536.
in San Antonio, Texas organized and obtained a charter from the American Federation of Labor. However, as was to be the case with some attempts by teachers to organize in other localities, the union of teachers, being unable to survive, relinquished its charter in 1910.

During the first dozen or so years of the twentieth century, no less than twenty groups of teachers joined the American Federation of Labor. The movement that finally led to the formation of a national teachers' union had its roots and greatest impetus in Chicago, where teaching conditions were perhaps the worst in the country. James Earl Clarke in his dissertation on the history and origins of the AFT describes these conditions as follows:

Chicago was a place dominated by corrupt politics, unscrupulous big business, racketeering labor, and outright gangsterism. There was a constant struggle among the power groups for the control of the city's institutions, its sources of revenue, and its agencies for the disbursement of revenue. Board of education members made it a practice to divide the spoils of their trust. The schools of the city could not help but be caught up in the power politics of the city. The ugly fact was that the Chicago school teacher often paid regular assessments to the party machine, and a part of his increase usually went to the political boss who, more likely than not, obtained the increase for him through his "pull" on the board of education.

45 "At the Turn of the Century," Changing Education, I (Summer, 1966), 5.

46 Clarke, op. cit., p. 68.

47 Ibid., pp. 69-70.
Under the leadership of two militant spinster school teachers named Catherine Goggin and Margaret Haley, the women teachers in Chicago organized for the purpose of obtaining better support for the schools. They studied the records of the State Board of Equalization and found that numerous corporations were not listed and thus not paying taxes to the schools. The assessments of other corporations were very much out of line with the assessment of other property. As a result of their efforts, the income of the city's school system doubled. However, the new teachers' organization aroused the intense animosity of the special interests in the city. As a result of power politics in the city, none of the increased revenue was used to raise teacher salaries or to better support the schools.

Clarke noted that the teachers alone did not have the power to contend with the special interests in the city. Thus, the teachers sought an alliance with the Chicago Federation of Labor. The need for this support was twofold. First, the teachers needed support for the candidates for public office who were friendly to the needs of the teachers. Second, the teachers needed financial and moral support in order to maintain the very existence of the teachers' organization.

48 Ibid., p. 76.
The Chicago teachers gained additional support from the American Federation of Labor (AFL). Samuel Gompers, founder of the AFL, was sympathetic to the needs of the Chicago teachers and was active in supporting their efforts to organize. Gompers met with the teachers in Chicago often, and praised and defended them editorially in the *American Federationist*, the official publication of the American Federation of Labor. ⁴⁹

All accounts read by this writer indicate that the activities of these union minded teachers took the form of making the needs of the teachers and the schools known to the public, airing these needs in public meetings, including the meetings of the school board, and actively supporting candidates and policies beneficial to these needs. Such active participation by teachers was not generally acceptable to the civic leaders of this period. The teachers met with much hostility and spent a good portion of their time maintaining their right to belong to a trade union. Evidence indicates that collective bargaining, including recognition of a bargaining agent and the negotiation of written agreements, is a recent development among teachers' unions, although they have always favored the concept.

The imposition of the "Loeb Rule" in Chicago illustrates the nature of the problems most teachers' unions faced during the years immediately following World War II. Jacob M. Loeb was a member of the board of education in Chicago. Through his efforts, the board established the policy that teachers belonging to a union must either disaffiliate with the union or lose their teaching positions. Under such policies as this, teachers' unions across the country fought to maintain their membership and right to exist.

The imposition of this rule prompted the Chicago teachers to issue a nation-wide call for the purpose of forming a national teachers' union. The Chicago teachers felt that as a lone unit they stood little chance of achieving their goals. Those who founded the AFT saw American society as "involving the push and pull of conflicting power groups." Therefore, these teachers desired affiliation with organized labor.

A second powerful group of teachers responding to the call sent forth by the Chicago teachers was the group from New York City. The Chicago group and the New York group formed the nucleus of the American Federation of Teachers, which was formed at the meeting in Chicago in 1916.

---

50 Committee on Educational Reconstruction, op. cit., p.12.
The newly formed union is described in the following manner in the official history of the AFT:

From the beginning, it was considered an organization of, by, and for classroom teachers devoted to the protection and advancement of their interests; it was designed deliberately to carry on its struggle in cooperation with other workers' groups through organized labor; and it was dedicated to developing the cause of democratic public education.  

The AFT claims that three basic considerations prompted teachers to unite with other workers in the labor movement:

(1) Substandard economic conditions
(2) Weakness of existing teacher organizations
(3) Faith in education and belief in the crucial role it should play in the preservation and development of our democratic way of life.

Early leaders of teacher trade unionism were very critical of the role of administrators in the NEA, charging that administrators dominated the affairs of the Association. In addition, union teachers held that school boards and superintendents reflected the more conservative views in the community, and, therefore, were not disposed to work for higher teacher salaries and better working conditions. Consequently, at the Chicago meeting superintendents were excluded from membership in the AFT. In recent years the membership ban has been extended to principals and assistant principals.

51 Ibid., p. 19.
52 Ibid.
Since its founding in 1916, the organizational structure of the AFT has been that of a national trade union affiliated with what is now the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization (AFL-CIO). The AFL-CIO is an affiliation of national autonomous trade unions, which retain the right to manage their own internal affairs. Through affiliation the individual national unions seek the cooperation of other unions on matters of mutual concern.

Like the NEA, the AFT has affiliates at the state and local levels. The efforts of the state federations of the AFT generally involve lobbying for favorable teacher legislation and trying to coordinate the activities of the local unions. Because they have not been well financed and adequately staffed, the state federations have been the weak link in the AFT structure. 53 Unlike the local affiliates of the NEA, AFT locals have been very active. The primary purpose of the local union is to implement the bargaining process at the school district level. A local can be formed whenever ten or more teachers apply for a charter from the national Executive Council and pay a twenty-five-dollar fee.

The national level of the AFT works closely with the affiliated locals by providing them with information and by lending them staff assistance in the form of organizers and negotiators. The Annual Convention is the policy making body of the national union corresponding to the Representative Assembly of the NEA. Delegates to the convention are allotted to the local unions and state federations. Between conventions, the Executive Council, consisting of the AFT President and sixteen Vice Presidents, is the administrative arm of the AFT.

The President of the AFT is the most important officer as he is the primary coordinator and "image" of the national union. He travels extensively and is often the only tangible link between the national headquarters and the dues-paying local member. Also, he is the liaison between the AFT and the AFL-CIO. Through him the AFL-CIO aids the AFT in organizational and collective bargaining drives.  

The basic source of revenue for the AFT is the per capita tax levied on affiliated locals. As of January 1, 1967, each local was required to pay directly to the National Office, a per capita tax of one dollar.  

---

54 Ibid., p. 83.

Two cents of this tax was to be set aside for the Defense Fund. The Defense Fund was established to defend teachers who might be dismissed or otherwise discriminated against for their union activity or in violation of their rights to tenure or academic freedom.

In 1967, the AFT was fifty years old. Its success in enlarging its membership has been greatest late in its history. AFT membership for certain years since 1917 is listed in Table XI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>46,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>9,808</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>13,705</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>29,907</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>31,089</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>125,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>41,415</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At its founding, the union enlisted eight charter locals with a total membership of about 2,800. The union received an immediate setback when the Chicago local was forced to withdraw due to the imposition of the Loeb Rule discussed previously. Nevertheless, the AFT enlisted almost 10,000 members by 1920. Union literature claimed that by 1919 the AFT actually had more members than the NEA, which at that time had a history of over sixty years. The data in Table X and Table XI show that the two organizations were of nearly equal size by 1920.

The year 1920 ushered in the "era of normalcy," which usually is agreed to have been a period hostile to the growth of trade unions. The AFT was no exception. In addition to the general "anti-union" climate of the 1920's, the NEA launched a major drive to deter further AFT success. "The NEA established a Commission on the National Emergency in Education, which soon spawned forth a major membership drive--100 per cent enrollment drives with the planned direction and control placed in the hands of state, county, and city

---

56 Clarke, op. cit., p. 122.
superintendents of education." By 1927, the AFT had shrunk to about 2,500 members.

The New Deal era of the 1930's saw a revival of AFT growth and a decline in NEA membership. By 1940, AFT membership increased to over 30,000. During this period NEA membership declined from 216,188 to 203,429. Thus, while NEA membership was increasing rapidly during the prosperous 1920's, AFT membership was declining; during the depression years of the 1930's, AFT membership increased steadily while NEA membership declined.

The 1920's contrasted with the 1930's in other ways. "Economic depression curtailed improvements in education and contributed to new tensions in the teaching profession." Teachers not only found their economic security gone, but found themselves bedeviled on all sides. Their freedom of expression, their conduct, their role in school policy, even their approach to subject matter, all became subjected to school and community pressures.


58 Clarke, op. cit., p. 161.

59 Ibid., p. 209. 60 Ibid., p. 219.
The contention advanced by the AFT and some authorities in the field of education is that teachers turned to unions during the lean years of the 1930's in order to protect their salaries, tenure, and academic freedom. In addition, the NEA is charged with being incapable and uninclined to fight for teacher welfare. However, the AFT and the NEA both came out in favor of federal aid to education during the depression in order to offset declining state and local revenues for support of the schools.

The essence of the AFT's efforts to improve teacher welfare during the 1930's was that teachers should be afforded the same social and political rights as the rest of the community. Therefore, the AFT established a "defense fund" at the national level for defending teachers who might be dismissed for expressing their views and pursuing their interests. 61 This was the beginning of the fund to which two cents of the present per capita tax is paid.

During the 1940's, under the impetus of World War II, teacher salaries and academic freedom again were threatened. AFT membership advanced steadily through the 1940's and 1950's, yet by 1960 the AFT enrolled only 59,000 members.

Then on December 15, 1961, the AFT made a major breakthrough. The United Federation of Teachers, an AFT affiliate, defeated the Teachers Bargaining Organization, an NEA affiliate, in an election to certify a bargaining agent for New York City's 40,000 teachers. This was the first major election confrontation between affiliates of the AFT and the NEA. Since that election, AFT membership has advanced at least 10,000 and as much as 18,000 each year. In 1967, the AFT reported a membership of 142,000.

A major obstacle to AFT growth has been the problem of turnover among its locals. A report issued in 1952 summarized the problem as follows:

... for each of the some 400 locals in the AFT at the present time, two locals have organized and passed out of existence. In the thirty-six years of the existence of the AFT some 800 locals have come and gone. 62

The rate of mortality for newly formed locals has been the greatest in the rural areas, where opposition to unions is most pronounced. Since 1952 the problem of turnover seems to have been considerably mitigated. 63 From 1952 to 1964 the AFT chartered some 250 locals and lost only 50. As of 1966 the AFT had 700 active locals.

62 Solomon, op. cit., p. 2.
63 Ibid., p. 8.
AFT membership has had in the past and does currently have an urban concentration. In its early history the bulk of AFT membership was in the large cities in the North and Midwest—New York City, Chicago, Washington, D.C., St. Paul, Minnesota, and to a lesser extent, Atlanta and Memphis in the South.\textsuperscript{64} At present, almost one-third of the 142,000 members in the AFT are concentrated in one local; the United Federation of Teachers in New York City, which has a membership of over 40,000 teachers.

Table XII lists the nine states with the largest AFT membership.

\textbf{TABLE XII}

\textbf{AFT MEMBERSHIP BY CERTAIN STATES, 1965-1966}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>41,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>17,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>8,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>6,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>104,911</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: \textit{Turmoil in Teaching}, pp. 372-373

\textsuperscript{64}Ibid.
These nine states account for 104,911, or 84 per cent of the AFT's total 1965-1966 membership of 124,937. These are states which are characterized by a high degree of industrialization and urbanization, as well as being states in which organized labor is very strong. In the state of New York AFT membership is actually larger than that of the NEA.

The fact that the NEA is over seven times as large as the AFT in membership size is of great significance. The AFT simply does not command the financial and human resources that the NEA has at its disposal. Therefore, the AFT cannot engage in research and publications to the extent that the NEA does. As pointed out earlier, the expenditures of the NEA's Research Division is approaching $600,000, and additional research is carried on by the departments within the NEA which assess dues and have their own budgets.

To date this writer has not been able to get a breakdown of the AFT budget. However, certain comparisons can be made which indicate the limited financial capacity of the AFT in comparison to the NEA. The estimated NEA budget for 1967-1968, exclusive of the autonomous departments in the NEA, is $11,223,000. Over $10 million of this is from membership dues.65 The AFT Constitution, correct as of October, 1967,  

claims 142,000 dues-paying members. The per capita tax on affiliated locals is one dollar per member per month. Since this tax is the major source of revenue for the national union, the annual budget of the AFT should be approximately $1,700,000, which is little more than fifteen per cent of the NEA budget.
ORGANIZATIONAL RIVALRY BETWEEN THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

**Issues Between the NEA and the AFT**

Two major issues are involved in the organizational rivalry between the NEA and the AFT. The first is the role of administrators in the two organizations. The second is the AFT's affiliation with organized labor. These are not new issues but have been points of contention since the formation of the AFT during the First World War.

As previously indicated, the AFT has always been opposed to the inclusion of administrators in the organization. The union charges that administrators, mainly superintendents, have dominated the NEA, and, consequently, the NEA has failed to give sufficient emphasis to teacher welfare. Therefore, the AFT has excluded superintendents from membership, on the grounds that they are the executive agents of school boards.\(^1\) Furthermore, a recent change in the AFT Constitution has extended the membership bar to principals. Classroom teachers

---

having supervisory authority may be admitted to membership if the constitution of the local union permits it. 2

Membership in the NEA is open to all educational staff from classroom teachers to superintendents, the rationale being "that teachers and administrators are members of the same profession, with common objectives and interests; that the superintendent is both a member of the teaching staff and a professional advisor to the school board." 3

In addition to the charge of administrative domination, the AFT contends that the NEA and its affiliates rely upon administrative recruitment in order to retain and increase membership in the educational associations. 4 AFT literature suggests that the motivation behind this recruitment is the desire to keep teachers from joining unions rather than an honest desire on the part of administrators for their teaching staffs to be professionally active. A few brief comparisons can be made which should indicate whether the union's charges have any validity.

---

2 Constitution of the AFT. Correct as of October 1967, Article II, Section 2 and 9.


4 Carl J. Megel, "Teacher Conscription--Basis of Association Membership," Teachers College Record, LXVI (October, 1964), 7-17.
The description of the NEA given earlier indicated that there are numerous departments contained in the NEA structure. Of these three are important for our analysis. These are the Association of Classroom Teachers, the Association of School Administrators, and the Association of Secondary School Principals. The Association of Classroom Teachers comprises about eighty-five per cent of NEA membership. Any classroom teacher who belongs to the NEA is automatically a member of this department, which derives its revenues from the NEA budget. Unlike the Classroom Teachers, the School Administrators and the Secondary School Principals levy their own dues and have their own membership rolls. In a word, these two groups are autonomous with respect to the rest of the NEA structure, even though membership in the NEA is a prerequisite for membership in either group.

The Association of School Administrators is comprised of school superintendents. For the 1967-1968 school year this group enrolled approximately 18,000 members and had total revenue for the year ending December 31, 1965 of almost $750,000. In comparison, the total funds allotted to the Association of Classroom Teachers for this same period were about $280,000.

5AASA Yearbook, 231.
The autonomy of the superintendents, and their larger budget, with fewer members, suggest that they are more cohesive and command more independence and influence in the NEA than classroom teachers. This is also the situation with respect to the Association of Secondary School Principals.

Another criterion for estimating the influence of classroom teachers is to determine in what proportion they are represented in the Representative Assembly and the major administrative units of the NEA. As discussed in Chapter III, the annual conventions and affairs of the NEA in the past have been dominated by administrators. At the 1965 NEA Convention classroom teachers comprised seventy per cent of the delegates, while superintendents, principals, and other supervisors comprised twenty-three per cent. Teachers, both college and public school, accounted for seven of the eleven members of the Executive Committee, while superintendents and principals accounted for the other four. With regard to the Board of Directors, teachers, both college and public school, accounted for 37 members, or about 45 per cent, while superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, and assistant principals accounted for 30 members, or 36 per cent.

__Stinnett, op. cit., p. 220.__
Recalling that the classroom teachers account for eighty-five per cent of NEA membership, the evidence indicates that classroom teachers still are not represented in the NEA structure in proportion to their numbers. Other evidence suggests that classroom teachers are attempting to rectify this situation and to assume a greater voice in the affairs of the NEA.

Given the current NEA structure, the best way for classroom teachers to exert influence is to set policy in the Representative Assembly and then make the administrative units responsive to this policy. Thus, the following resolution was passed at the 1965 convention:

In selecting persons to serve on the appointive boards, committees, and commissions of the NEA, the Executive Committee should move to raise classroom teacher representation as rapidly as practicable to majority status on all such appointive agencies which are intended to be generally representative of the interests of educators.7

This same resolution was passed again, word for word, at the 1967 NEA convention, indicating that action had not been taken. In addition, the following resolution was also passed:

The Representative Assembly of the National Education Association hereby reaffirms its role as the policy-making body designated by the Charter and By-Laws and hereby also reminds all executive units of the Association that their basic responsibility is to implement the policy and directives of the membership as expressed through the Representative Assembly.

It further admonishes all the executive units of the NEA to be sensitive to the direction of the Representative Assembly and to carry out its directives.

The current trend as to the locus of power in the NEA, as evidenced by the passage of the professional negotiations and sanctions resolutions in 1962, as well as the resolutions just cited, is for classroom teachers to assume more power and influence, and for greater emphasis to be given to teacher welfare.

In addition to the charge that the national organization is dominated by administrators, the AFT charges that affiliated state and local associations are likewise dominated and that administrators, namely superintendents, force teachers to join the educational associations. The history of this charge goes back to the 1920's, when the educational associations instituted "100 per cent membership" campaigns. Stinnett, NEA proponent and author of Professional Negotiations in Education and Turmoil in Education, states that

---

8Ibid., p. 82.
"to be honest about it, superintendents are a major force in state association and NEA membership." Unfortunately, only a few statistical studies on this matter are available.

A study done in Montana in 1950 asked administrators if they (1) insisted upon, (2) encouraged, or (3) remained neutral about membership by their teachers in the educational associations. The results were:

- 29 insisted
- 106 encouraged
- 38 left the decision to the individual teacher

Moskow, as part of his doctoral dissertation on teachers and unions, conducted a study in the state of Pennsylvania. Of over one hundred and fifty public school teachers interviewed, more than fifty per cent claimed that their local educational associations were dominated by administrators.

By admission and by what statistical evidence is available, it can be concluded that administrators do influence teachers in the direction of the educational associations. Furthermore, it would be excessively naive to think that the sole motivation of the administrators is that they want their staffs to be professionally active.

9Stinnett, op. cit., p. 221.

10Megel, op. cit., p. 15.

The second major issue involved in the competition between the AFT and the NEA is the affiliation of the AFT with the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization (AFL-CIO). As pointed out earlier, the AFT developed as a trade union organized by classroom teachers. Clarke, in his doctoral dissertation on the history and origins of the AFT, indicates why teachers sought the affiliation of organized labor. "Before the AFT joined the AFL, organized labor had begun to demonstrate to militant teachers in several large cities that it was their ally. It showed a willingness to take forthright positions on teachers' salaries, organizational rights, and academic freedom."\(^{12}\)

In addition to the willingness of organized labor to support teachers' interests, the founders of the AFT saw additional reason for seeking affiliation with labor. The founders of the AFT viewed our society as composed of power groups, with teachers being a weak group in society. The AFL was looked upon as a powerful group, and the early leaders thus thought affiliation would enhance the power status of teachers.

Another important factor influencing the founders of the AFT to affiliate with the AFL was the previously mentioned friendly attitude of Samuel Gompers. Gompers attended organizational meetings of teachers in Chicago, and through his editorials urged teachers across the Nation to organize and affiliate with the AFL.

The NEA position is that affiliation with organized labor is "unprofessional" for teachers, and also that it places teachers in a position of having to support policies and actions of the AFL which may not be in the best interests of education. The issue of affiliation sometimes develops into an issue of what is a "profession," are teachers "professionals," and if so, is it "unprofessional" for teachers to be affiliated with organized labor. This latter issue is a nebulous one at best, probably an irresolvable one, and even if resolvable, one of little logical consequence, but psychologically powerful nevertheless.

The NEA's view that it is not professional for teachers to be affiliated with organized labor is as follows. First, teachers are college-trained and therefore possess interests in their chosen field and community beyond those of industrial workers. The AFL-CIO is a pragmatic organization whose goal is the advancement of the economic well-being of its
members. Such a narrow scope of interest is not sufficient
to warrant teacher affiliation. Teachers are also concerned
with services to their field, such as research and publications,
and therefore should remain independent of any organization
which fails to meet this need. In addition, teachers, unlike
industrial workers, are dedicated in a special way to the
public interest. In essence, teachers are the guardians of
the minds of the Nation's children and therefore should re-
main aloof of pragmatic groups such as the AFL-CIO.

The AFT's rebuttal is that teachers are like industrial
workers with respect to their employment relationship. Carl
Megel, President of the AFT, has pointed out that teachers
are not fee-takers as are doctors and lawyers. He has even
gone so far as to refer to teachers as "day laborers." 13
It is with respect to their work relationship that teachers
are like industrial workers, and for this reason affiliation
with organized labor is proper.

The discussion thus far indicates that the differences
between the NEA and the AFT are in fact differences of em-
phasis. The NEA has always viewed itself as a professional
association, and for a long time held the view that

13Stinnett, op. cit., p. 159.
professional associations should not be concerned with material things like teacher salaries. According to the NEA, the AFT has failed with respect to the professional needs of teachers.

"... the American Federation of Teachers, is seriously deficient ... as a professional organization ... The AFT has no real program in certification, accreditation, or professional ethics. Its journal is nothing but a house organ, and most of its publications are propagandistic in nature ..."

The NEA also charges that affiliation with organized labor can force teachers to support policies and actions which might not be in the best interests of education. For example, school districts rely primarily on property taxes to finance the schools. Organized labor has traditionally fought this kind of tax as being regressive in nature and therefore unfair to the laboring class.

However, the AFL-CIO is an affiliation of autonomous national labor unions. Each national union voluntarily joins the Federation and retains its right to manage its own internal affairs. "The Federation can be described as a coordinator, advisor, helper, and at times an exhorter."

---

14 Lieberman, op. cit., p. 311.
15 Lieberman, "Teachers Choose a Union," The Nation, CXCIII (December 2, 1961), 447 and 460.
16 Sanford Cohen, Labor (Columbus, Ohio, 1960), p. 100.
The AFL-CIO cannot force any affiliated union to assume any position on a matter which the union does not choose to assume. 17

If the other unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO are under no compulsion to support AFT policies, then the question that arises is, why affiliate at all. The answer is somewhat historical in nature. As mentioned above, organized labor has supported most of the goals sought by teachers—such as universal, tax-supported education and free textbooks. Also, the affiliation has its roots in Chicago, where Gompers supported the teachers in their efforts to achieve organizational rights.

The best reason for continued affiliation of the AFT with the AFL-CIO is that the AFT has received considerable financial support for its organizational activities from the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO. This support took on considerable significance in New York City in the early 1960's, as will be explained later.

NEA and AFT Positions on Teacher Negotiations

As a result of the increasing teacher militancy discussed earlier, organizational efforts to improve teacher welfare

have accelerated. In the current decade both the NEA and the AFT have been more successful than at any time in their history at winning for teachers increased participation in decision making at the school district level.

These organizational efforts to improve teacher status have proved to be markedly similar in view of the fact that the AFT and the NEA are very different in origin, structure, and basic philosophies. Several studies of these efforts have been made. One study done by Robert E. Doherty and Walter E. Oberer, of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, makes the following observations:

It is rare that two organizations markedly dissimilar in origin, structure, and style should come to pursue identical objectives in similar fashion. Yet as one looks at recent activities of affiliates of the NEA and the AFT, organizations which over the years have held widely differing views on the proper role of teacher associations, one is impressed more by similarities than differences. The catalyst has been the movement to formalize the employment relationship in public schools, and the organization that has done most of the reacting has been the NEA. The circumstances created by collective bargaining have forced a great many NEA affiliates to adopt functions and even an outlook more typical of trade unions than of profession organizations.

Another study done by Michael Moskow reaches a similar conclusion:

---

In the 20 school districts which were studied, no significant difference between the approaches of the NEA and the AFT affiliates was found. Although it might appear that there are broad ideological differences between the two organizations, the practical impact of their policies was almost identical.

These comments are representative of other studies and comments made by authorities on the subject. From the two sources just cited it is important to note that in spite of philosophical or ideological differences between the NEA and the AFT, their current approaches to the problem of improving teacher welfare are remarkably similar, and as a result of the current teacher militancy, which Doherty and Oberer describe as "the movement to formalize the employment relationship in public schools," it is the NEA rather than the AFT whose policies and approaches have done the most changing.

Historically, the AFT has put more emphasis on teacher welfare than the NEA. The emphasis has been at the school district level. Prior to 1935 the AFT had advocated teachers' councils and more participation in policy making by teachers. Since 1935, the AFT has advocated traditional collective bargaining as the means which teachers should use to improve salaries and working conditions.

19 Moskow, op. cit., p. 182.
The NEA has emphasized professional development, assuming that as professional growth occurred, teachers would find their status improved automatically and without overt effort on the part of the NEA.21 The approach of the NEA and its affiliated state organizations has been lobbying activities at the state level. As explained previously, the local affiliates of the NEA have been relatively inactive in the past.

The current trend toward formal negotiations between teachers and school boards is primarily a product of the 1960's. In December, 1961 the United Federation of Teachers, a local affiliate of the AFT, defeated the Teachers Bargaining Organization, a local affiliate of the NEA, in a struggle for representation rights for New York City public school teachers. This confrontation between the two affiliates in New York marked the intensification of the organizational struggle between the AFT and the NEA and ushered in a new era in teacher-school board relations--an era in which teachers are seeking the right to negotiate formal written agreements with their school boards.

Any discussion of the current approaches to teacher negotiations involves a problem of semantics. The NEA advocates speak in terms of "professional negotiations" and the AFT

21Clarke, op. cit., p. 35.
advocates speak in terms of "collective bargaining." Whichever terminology is used, both processes, as advocated by the respective organizations, entail a situation whereby teachers collectively, through chosen representatives, seek to negotiate written agreements with their school boards. In an attempt to solve the semantics problem, Moskow and Lieberman have chosen "collective negotiations" as the terminology to describe the current trends in teacher-school board relations.

The current dialogue which pits "collective bargaining" against "professional negotiations" is a major part of the propaganda coming out of the organizational struggle between the NEA and the AFT. The semantics controversy is not as important as the attention it receives. Thus, this paper frequently will use the term "collective negotiations" to generalize the terms "collective bargaining" and "professional negotiations" being advanced by the AFT and the NEA. However, in the following discussion on the development of collective negotiations by each organization the terms of the AFT and the NEA also will be used.

As previously mentioned, the AFT has advocated collective bargaining for teachers since 1935. The union "favors

the same sort of relationship between teachers and their school boards as that which has been established for employees in the private sector through the National Labor Relations Act. The AFT claims that collective bargaining recognizes the rights of the employer, the board of education; the agent of the board, the superintendent; and the employee, the teacher. It provides democratic procedures whereby the groups meet, in orderly fashion, to resolve the issues which confront them. The AFT believes the end result of this process should be a written agreement containing a salary schedule, a grievance procedure, and other matters of concern to teachers.

The process of collective bargaining advocated by the AFT is defined in Section 8 (d) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 as being

... the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representatives of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of any agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of any concession.


During the 1960's, under the stress of teacher militancy and intense organizational rivalry between the AFT and the NEA, the AFT has veered little if any from its position that teachers should join trade unions affiliated with organized labor and that traditional collective bargaining is the only legitimate process for ordering teacher-school board relations.

As indicated in the quote from Doherty and Oberer, the NEA is the organization which has done the most changing in recent years. Traditionally, the NEA has opposed or at least not encouraged collective negotiations by teachers.

As discussed in Chapter II, there was an increase in teacher militancy and strikes in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. During this period, the NEA made its first pronouncement on group action by teachers. The pronouncement as stated in the NEA Journal is as follows:

Group action is essential today. The former practice where teachers individually bargained with the superintendent of schools or the board of education for their salaries is largely past. For years there has been a steady movement in the direction of salary schedules applying to all teachers.

In the present crisis, it is especially important that there be professional group action on salary proposals. A salary committee composed of capable and trusted members of the group is necessary. This committee should be chosen by the entire teaching group and should have authority to represent and act for the local education association. This committee should be selected as early as possible each year.
It is essential that the teaching group give this committee full authority to act, and then stand back of it.\textsuperscript{26}

The NEA described this plan as "democratic persuasion."\textsuperscript{27}

Vera Shlakman in an article in 1950 describes this shift in NEA policy as a movement by the NEA toward collective bargaining, indicating that the shift in policy was prompted by the teacher militancy and strikes which occurred after World War II. The writer further noted that the policy so publicly announced later was dropped, stating at the time that "the reason seems to lie in the temporary abatement of the teachers' movement."

Further moves to change NEA stated policy came after the NEA's defeat by the AFT in New York City. In 1960, at the annual convention, an attempt was made to pass a resolution entitled "Representative Negotiation." The resolution failed on the floor of the Representative Assembly, and was referred to the Board of Directors for further study.

\textsuperscript{26}\textit{The Professional Way to Meet the Educational Crisis}, \textit{NEA Journal}, XXXVI (February, 1947), 79.


\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Vera Shlakman, "White Collar Unions and Professional Organizations," Science and Society, (Summer-Fall, 1950), 214-236.}
This resolution reappeared at the 1961 convention titled "Teacher-Board of Education Relationships." Part of the resolution as passed reads as follows:

The National Education Association believes, therefore, that professional education associations should be accorded the right, through democratically selected representatives using appropriate professional channels, to participate in the determination of policies of common concern including salary and other conditions for professional service.

The seeking of consensus and mutual agreement on a professional basis should preclude the arbitrary exercise of unilateral authority by boards of education and the use of the strike by teachers as a means for enforcing economic demands.

The resolution made no use of the term "negotiation."

In 1962, the NEA Representative Assembly officially adopted the term "professional negotiation." The resolution reads as follows:

The teaching profession has the ultimate aim of providing the best possible education for all the people. It is a professional calling and a public trust. Boards of education have the same calling and share this trust. The National Education Association calls upon boards of education in all school districts to recognize this identity of interest with the teaching profession.

Recognizing both the legal authority of boards of education and the educational competencies of the teaching profession, the two groups must view the consideration of matters of mutual concern as a joint responsibility.

---

The National Education Association insists on the right of professional education associations, through democratically selected representatives using professional channels, to participate with boards of education in the cooperative determination of policies of common concern, including salary and other conditions for professional service.

The resolution of differences between professional associations and boards of education must be provided for in such a manner as to preclude the arbitrary exercise of unilateral authority by boards of education and the use of the strike by teachers.

The Association believes that procedures must be established which provide an orderly method for professional education associations and boards of education to reach mutually satisfactory agreements. These procedures must include provisions for appeal and settlement through designated educational channels when agreement cannot be reached.

The National Education Association calls upon its members and boards of education to join in seeking local board action and state legislation which firmly and effectively establishes such professional negotiation rights and machinery for the teaching profession under education law.30

Since 1962, the NEA has continued to make pronouncements, pass resolutions, and produce literature on "professional negotiation." In the Fall of 1963, the NEA issued its Guidelines for Professional Negotiations, which Moskow believes to be a clear attempt to distinguish its efforts at bargaining from the traditional collective bargaining procedures of the labor movement.31

31Moskow, op. cit., p. 104.
T. M. Stinnett, a strong proponent of the NEA, has written two exhaustive books on the subject of professional negotiation. His first work, *Professional Negotiations in Public Education*, defines and acts as a guide to professional negotiations. His second work, *Turmoil in Teaching* is an all-out effort to distinguish professional negotiation from collective bargaining and to vindicate the educational associations as the only legitimate representatives of teachers.

Stinnett defines the professional negotiation as follows:

... a set of procedures, written and officially adopted by the local staff organization and the school board, which provides an orderly method for the school board and the staff organization to negotiate on matters of mutual concern, to reach agreement on these matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of an impasse.32

The substance of this definition is very much the same as that given for collective bargaining.

As was stated at the beginning of the present discussion, there are marked similarities in the approaches of the NEA and the AFT. First, both organizations agree that teachers should have meaningful participation in decision making.

concerning salaries and other matters of teacher concern. Second, group action is favored whereby the teachers choose some representative to speak for them. Third, this group action is to result in negotiations between the teachers' representative and the board of education. Fourth, the negotiation process is to culminate in a written agreement. Both approaches can be referred to as collective negotiations.

With respect to specific aspects of collective negotiations, differences as well as similarities are found in NEA and AFT positions. Since the NEA holds that it is "unprofessional" for teachers to be affiliated with organized labor, the Association is also opposed to placing teacher-school board relations under traditional labor law and labor agencies, whereas the AFT supports this. For the purpose of recognition, mediation, or arbitration, the NEA favors the establishment of separate educational channels.

The situation in Wisconsin is one which the NEA finds most repugnant. In this state, local education associations must prove that they are "labor organizations" within the meaning of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Act in order to qualify for inclusion on representation ballots.\(^\text{33}\)

The NEA and the AFT agree on the concept of exclusive recognition. The NEA believes that the "organization which has the support of the majority of the professional staff should be their exclusive representative." The AFT also advocates exclusive recognition.

Although both organizations advocate exclusive recognition, actual negotiations by teachers are not always so characterized. For example, the statute in California covering teacher-school board relations calls for a negotiating council composed of representatives of all organizations representing the teachers. However, in spite of such legislation, there is widespread agreement that exclusive recognition brings about more responsible behavior of the teacher organization, whereas proportional systems encourage organizational rivalry.

As to the scope of negotiations, there is no disparity between NEA and AFT positions. Traditionally, American trade unions have limited collective bargaining to wages, hours, and other conditions of employment. The AFT has broadened this scope with respect to negotiations in public school systems. The union's position is that no limit should be placed on the scope of negotiations. "Anything to do with the operation of


35 Moscow, op. cit., p. 130.
the school is a matter for professional concern and should thus be subject to collective bargaining. "36

The NEA position is similar. "A professional group has responsibilities beyond self-interest, including a responsibility for the general welfare of the school system. Negotiations should include all matters which affect the quality of the educational system."37

The NEA and the AFT are in substantial disagreement as to the appropriate unit for negotiation purposes. The NEA would include in the negotiating unit "all persons holding professional certificates or permits issued by the state agency, with the possible exception of the superintendent, even though they may perform supervisory or administrative functions."38 However, the NEA condones separate units for classroom teachers and administrators if teachers feel that their active participation in organization affairs is restricted in the all-inclusive unit.39

The AFT takes a more restrictive position on the negotiating unit. "A basic labor relations tenet is that

37 Ibid., p. 225.
38 West, op. cit., p. 155.
39 Ibid., p. 156.
management employees should not be in the same bargaining units as non-supervisory employees." The AFT would thus exclude superintendents automatically. As to other school administrators, two questions are important: how much discretionary power does he have and with whom does he identify? On this basis, the union holds that principals and assistant principals should be excluded, and teaching department heads should be included in the bargaining unit. These positions on the composition of the bargaining unit are basically the same as the positions of the two organizations on membership eligibility previously discussed.

Closely related to the composition of the negotiating unit is the role the superintendent of schools should play in the negotiating process. This is another area where the AFT and the NBA hold widely diverging views. The AFT holds the traditional trade union view that managerial personnel do not identify with the interests of the employees. The AFT views the superintendent as the executive agent of the school board, and holds that he should therefore represent the board in the negotiations process, as his views and interests are primarily those of the board and not the teachers.

---

40 Cogen, op. cit., p. 165.

41 Ibid., p. 165.
The NEA sees the superintendent as having "a dual role as a member of the professional staff and as the executive officer of the board of education." However, the NEA concedes that the superintendent should not be in the negotiating unit. Further delineation of his role is defined by the NEA as follows:

The superintendent has the responsibility in the negotiating process to provide information to both teachers and the board, to help clarify issues, and otherwise stimulate both groups to put forth their best efforts to achieve agreements which are in the best interests of the total school program.

Such a role places the superintendent on both sides of the negotiating table.

The role of the superintendent is discounted in significance by the fact that school boards appear to be unwilling to delegate full authority to the superintendent to make binding agreements. In a 1965 study of twenty school districts found to be engaging in meaningful negotiations, the teachers negotiated directly with the school boards in eleven of the districts. However, in all eleven of these school districts fewer than 1,000 teachers were employed in each district. In three of these districts, the superintendent was advisor to

---

42 Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware, _op. cit._, p. 2.

43 Ibid., p. 103.
the school board, and in the remaining eight served as advisor to both parties.

The study further found that in large school districts, the board almost always allowed the superintendent and his staff to represent them in negotiations. The trend was for the superintendent to make informal agreements with the teachers, and then submit this agreement to the board for final approval. With respect to salaries and other economic items, the superintendent's authority was severely limited, with negotiations over these items often being done by the school board itself.44

If the patterns established in the study cited continue, the role of the superintendent should become increasingly important as the representative of the school board in negotiations in large school districts. Assuming that school districts continue to decrease in number and increase in size and that consequently, superintendents come to play more important roles in representing the school boards in negotiations, the NEA's position on the role superintendents should play can be expected to become more like that of the AFT.

In the past, the view seems to have been widely held that the AFT, since it is a trade union affiliated with the AFL-CIO, is in favor of the use of strikes in teacher-school board relations, and that the NEA opposes the use of strikes by teachers. However, such a view is incorrect.

As Lieberman states, it comes as a surprise to many teachers to learn that until 1962, the NEA had no official policy concerning strikes by teachers. In 1962, the resolution passed by the NEA endorsing professional negotiations contained the following statement:

The seeking of consensus and mutual agreement on a professional basis should preclude the arbitrary exercise of unilateral authority by boards of education and the use of the strike by teachers.

This mild statement opposing the use of strikes by teachers was changed in a 1965 resolution.

The seeking of consensus and mutual agreement on a professional basis should preclude the arbitrary exercise of unilateral action by boards of education, administrators, or teachers.

---


Although the argument could be advanced that this second statement represents no real change in position since a strike is surely an unilateral action, a more realistic premise is that the phrase "the use of strikes by teachers" was conveniently deleted so that the NEA could avoid or evade the charge that some of its local affiliates were striking in defiance of national policy opposing such action. Thus, as of now the NEA has no clear-cut national policy opposing the use of strikes by teachers.

Until 1964, the AFT officials adhered to a no-strike policy. Such policy was never incorporated into its constitution, but was adopted at early conventions and reaffirmed on numerous occasions. One such statement issued by the Executive Council is as follows:

The American Federation of Teachers does not assert (and hereby expressly disclaims) the right to strike against the Government of the United States or any agency thereof.

The use of the strike is rejected as an instrument of policy of the American Federation of Teachers. The Executive Council and its national officers will not call a strike either nationally or in any local area or jurisdiction, nor in any way advise a local to strike. The funds and facilities of the National Organization will not be used to support a strike.\(^{48}\)

The NEA has at no time had such a strong statement of national policy opposing the use of strikes by teachers.

The AFT openly changed its position on the use of strikes by teachers at the 1964 convention. The new policy was stated in an address by Charles Cogen, President of the AFT, as recognizing that "work stoppages by teachers are morally justified under certain circumstances."  The AFT calls for the support of these strikes by the AFL-CIO and its affiliated international unions. In addition, the AFT supports the repeal of legislation prohibiting strikes by teachers.

In summary, currently, the AFT officially accepts the use of strikes by teachers and the NEA at least passively accepts their use. Before 1964, the AFT had an official no-strike policy. Before 1962, the NEA had no official policy on strikes. From 1962 to 1965, the NEA had a weak statement opposing the use of strikes by teachers.

Actual experience with teachers' strikes in the United States reveals that the actions of local teachers' organizations have been at variance with the stated policies of both national organizations. As was explained in Chapter II, teachers have made use of the strike in teacher-school board relations, and the strike has been used by both NEA and AFT affiliates. A

---

49 Cogen, op. cit., p. 169.
recent publication of the NEA Research Division shows that there were more teachers' strikes in the 1967-68 school year than in any previous year on record. Furthermore, professional associations were involved in fifty-four per cent of the strikes while teachers' unions were involved in forty per cent of the strikes. The decision to strike is that of local affiliates of the two national organizations. The evidence indicates that these decisions have not been controlled by the written positions of the respective national organizations.

Agreements negotiated by NEA affiliates are classified as Levels 1, 2, and 3. Level 1 is a recognition agreement; Level 2 contains the features of a Level 1 agreement and in addition contains an outline of the procedures to be followed in the negotiation process; Level 3 contains the features of a Level 2 agreement and in addition contains a written appeals procedure providing for impartial, third-party mediation or fact-finding in the event of impasse. 50

According to these definitions, a local affiliate does not have to have an agreement covering salaries and other conditions of employment to be involved in professional negotiations. The AFT similarly classifies locals as engaging

50 Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware, op. cit., pp. 17-18.
in collective bargaining even though there is no written agreement covering salaries and working conditions.

Few studies have been done to determine the extent to which the AFT and the NEA are engaging in meaningful negotiations. Moskow, in 1965, sought to determine the extent to which affiliates of both organizations were involved in joint decision-making, which he defines as a relationship whereby the school board or its representative meets with the representative of the teachers' organization and jointly determine salaries and possibly other working conditions. While the NEA claimed to have 346 affiliates engaging in professional negotiations, Moskow estimated that no more than 80 of these should actually be classified in the category of joint decision-making. The AFT claimed to have between forty and fifty of their locals covered by written agreements, but the author estimated that only 25 were engaging in effective collective bargaining. 51

Results of Representation Elections

As already mentioned the competition between the NEA and the AFT gained renewed impetus in 1960. In that year teachers in New York City began agitating for a representation

election in order to select an agent to represent them in negotiations with the school board. The election was held in December of 1961. The AFT affiliate defeated the NEA affiliate by almost 11,000 votes, thus gaining representation rights for the over 40,000 teachers then in the New York City school system.

Subsequently, the NEA created an Urban Services Division in order to fight union growth among teachers. The basic purpose of this division is to strengthen the programs of the local educational associations. The Urban Services Division was created in March of 1962 following the NEA's defeat in New York City in December of 1961. Stinnet estimates that this division was responsible for over $5 million in expenditures for the school years 1962 through 1966.  

Although there is reason to believe that the AFT received some financial aid from the AFL before 1960, it was not until the AFT victory in New York City that this aid gained real significance. During the New York City campaign the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO made funds and personnel available to the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the local AFT affiliate. Moskow estimates that in 1960, $16,000

---

was made available to the UFT. In addition, Moskow supplies the following information:

From October 1960 to July 1961, the UFT received $7,871.95 from the AFT headquarters in Chicago and $14,530.85 from AFT locals throughout the country. Grants of $5,000 from the United Auto Workers, $2,000 each from the International Ladies Garment Workers of America and the Machinists Union, $1,000 each from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Steel Workers Union, and $500 from the Hatters Union were received along with $38,500 from the IUD. Beginning February 1961 and each month thereafter for the next five months, $10,000 was received from the IUD for organizing purposes. This $50,000 loan was to be interest free, and when repaid it would be used for organizing other areas of the Country.53

Following the contest in New York City numerous instances have occurred in which the NEA and the AFT both appeared on the ballot in elections held to determine a negotiating agent for teachers. Forty such representation elections were held in thirty-six different school districts from January 1961 to September 1965. The NEA won 26 of these elections winning representation rights for 21,000 teachers while the AFT won 14 elections and representation rights for 74,000 teachers.54 The fact that the AFT won fewer elections but gained representation rights for more teachers indicates that the AFT has had its greatest success in the large systems.

53 Moskow, op. cit., pp. 99-100

54 Ibid., p. 107.
The AFT victory in New York City distorts the data just cited, for in that election alone the AFT won bargaining rights for over 40,000 teachers. From January 1963 through June 1965, 37 elections were held in 34 different school districts. The NEA won 23 of these covering 21,483 teachers while the AFT won 13 of elections covering 30,749 teachers. 55

The second set of data, which excludes the New York City election, indicates that despite the disproportionate size of the former, the NEA and the AFT have been about equally successful at winning representation elections. Both sets of data show that the AFT has been more successful in the large school districts.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Historically, teachers have been a relatively docile occupational group in spite of their low social, economic, and professional status. However, since World War II the United States has experienced three waves of teacher strikes of increasing magnitude, indicating that the reluctance of teachers to be militant in demands for higher salary, job tenure, and better working conditions has broken down considerably. These waves occurred from 1945 to 1948, 1951 to 1952, and 1966 to the present. One purpose of this study has been to investigate patterns and possible causes of this increasing teacher militancy.

Teacher strikes have been concentrated in large school districts\(^1\) in the urban areas of the East,\(^2\) as was shown in Chapter II. For the school years 1961-1962 through 1967-1968, almost 75 per cent of all work stoppages by teachers occurred in six states north of the Mason-Dixon Line and east of the Mississippi River. Few strikes, consequently, have occurred

\(^1\)School districts enrolling 6,000 or more pupils.

\(^2\)Major exceptions to this statement are state-wide sanctions applied to Oklahoma in 1965 and Utah in 1964. Utah teachers also declared a two-day "recess" of the state's schools in May of 1964.
in the small school districts in the small towns and rural areas of the Nation.

Numerous factors were discussed in Chapter II as causes of this growing teacher militancy since World War II. Because periods of increased strike activity correspond closely with periods of rapid price increases which reduce the purchasing power of teacher salaries, inflation can be considered a probable factor in teacher strikes. There have been four periods of rapid price increases since 1940. With the exception of the first inflationary period, which occurred during the early years of World War II, each of the other periods has been accompanied by an increase in strike activity by teachers.

Data presented in Chapter II show that rapid price increases adversely affect the economic well-being of teachers. During the inflationary periods of the late forties and early fifties, the real income of teachers declined both absolutely and relative to other wage and salary workers. The economic position of teachers also has deteriorated during the current inflation, even though there has not been an absolute decline in teachers' real income. During most of the 1950's, the real income of teachers markedly was improving absolutely and relative to other workers as the price level was
relatively stable during this time. However, the rate of improvement in the economic position of teachers virtually halted during the 1960's when the price level once again began to rise rapidly.

As previously suggested, the strong relationship between inflation, teachers' real income, and increases in teacher strikes suggests that deterioration in the economic status of teachers has been a major cause of teacher unrest. While workers in private industry often are protected from inflation by "cost of living" increases in pay, teachers are not. Teacher salaries are slow to change since they are set by school boards and state legislatures, which are slow to react to changing economic conditions. Therefore, during periods of rapid price increases, teachers fare worse economically than most workers in private industry and become militant in their demands for higher salaries.

Of the three waves of teacher strikes which have occurred since World War II, the current wave is by far the largest. The adverse effect of inflation on teacher salaries, however, was more pronounced in the late forties and early fifties than currently. Therefore, additional factors need to be considered as contributing to the current wave of teacher strikes.
One of the more important factors is recent improvements in the market position of teachers. Huge public school enrollments generated by the "baby boom" of the late 1940's have created a persistent shortage of qualified teachers, which should continue through the mid-1970's. At the same time, the "cold war" competition between the United States and the Soviet Union and rapid advances in space technology following the orbiting of Sputnik have caused Americans to attach increased importance to education; the result being that teachers now find their job security and bargaining power greatly improved. Therefore, they are in a position to be more aggressive in their demands now than in previous years. Furthermore, growing public concern for the quality of American education and a continuing shortage of qualified teachers into the middle of the next decade can be expected to sustain teacher militancy in the next few years.

The huge enrollments produced by the "baby boom" also have adversely affected teachers' working conditions, which traditionally have been poor anyway. However, in recent years, increased overcrowding in the schools has produced teaching conditions which are not only unpleasant but in some cases physically unsafe. In the slum areas of the large cities, student assaults on teachers have become commonplace. Teachers
in several schools in New York City, for example, have threatened to strike unless steps are taken to insure the safety of the teachers from such assaults.

Still another factor contributing to the current teacher unrest is the developing bureaucratic structure of the Nation's large school systems. In these systems, teachers find their relations with administrators more formal and impersonal. These circumstances diminish the voice of individual teachers in the operation of the schools and thereby add to teacher frustration.

Finally, the current militancy is to some extent a product of the general unrest characteristic of the times. In the 1960's, the Civil Rights Movement has shown that militant behavior can achieve results. The extension of collective bargaining rights to federal employees has made state and local employees, including teachers, desirous of rights possessed by organized workers in private industry. Furthermore, the dramatic teacher strikes and the successful implementation of collective bargaining in New York City, the Nation's largest school system, have served as an infectious example to other teachers across the United States.

As a final observation, the growing willingness of teachers to be militant in their demands for higher salaries and
better working conditions can be attributed partially to the relative abundance of the American economy. Like other groups in our society, teachers are desirous of a larger share of this increasing abundance, feeling that the economic rewards associated with teaching are less than commensurate with the importance of education to the national well-being. Although the national expenditure on public education has risen sharply in recent years, teacher salaries continue to lag behind those of most other occupations requiring college preparation. Therefore, until educational expenditures, especially on teacher salaries, are increased even more, the economic rewards going to teaching should continue to be a major source of pedagogical unrest.

Another purpose of this study has been to survey the historical roles of the two prevailing national teachers' organizations and their efforts to improve teacher benefits. The National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) differ significantly in founding goals and philosophy, longevity, membership size, and organizational structures. The NEA was founded in 1857 and until 1916 was the only national teachers' organization. The Association was founded by a small group of school administrators and college presidents. During the mid-1800's, formal
education received little national emphasis and teaching was very much a casual occupation. Consequently, the goal of the early leaders was "to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching, and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States." This same statement of purpose is contained in the NEA Constitution today.

Throughout its history, the NEA has been dominated by school administrators who placed the personal welfare of teachers a distant second to "professional" development. From its founding to the early 1920's, NEA membership consisted primarily of school administrators with relatively few classroom teachers. Wesley's analysis of speeches delivered at NEA annual conventions from 1858 to 1890 and from 1930 to 1939 shows that the administrators dominated convention programs and that little attention was given to such items as salaries, teaching conditions, and tenure.

As the number of classroom teachers enrolled in the NEA increased, the Association did show some concern for improving the occupational status of teachers. The traditional efforts in this regard have been to lobby for greater teacher benefits at the state level. In 1905, the Association published its first study of teacher salaries. The Research
Division of the NEA was created in 1922 and has since published biennial surveys of teacher salaries. The findings of these and other studies are used by the state educational associations affiliated with the NEA to sponsor legislation providing for such things as higher teacher salaries, better retirement plans, and job tenure. The fact that the occupational benefits associated with teaching are still low reflects that these efforts to improve the economic status of teachers have not been fully successful.

As noted above, the NEA was the only national teachers' organization prior to 1916. However, after the turn of the twentieth century, teacher unrest developed in several large cities across the country, notably in Chicago. The unrest arose not only from low teaching salaries, lack of job security, and poor working conditions, but also from school administrator and community restrictions on the social conduct of teachers. Consequently, many teachers, feeling that the NEA was not inclined to work sufficiently for teacher rights and benefits, formed local unions and affiliated directly with the American Federation of Labor (AFL). In 1916, as the result of a nation-wide call issued by union teachers in Chicago, a meeting was held at which the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) was formed. The AFT was organized as
a national trade union and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Unlike the NEA, the union excluded administrators from membership and placed first emphasis on improving the occupational welfare of teachers.

The AFT experienced significant growth during its first several years of existence. By 1920, the union had a membership of nearly 10,000 teachers making it of nearly equal size with the NEA, which had been formed over 50 years earlier. Alarmed over the union's success, NEA leaders, primarily local school superintendents, initiated "100 per cent membership" drives in order to bring more classroom teachers into the NEA and to deter further AFT growth. These campaigns were relatively effective as the NEA expanded its membership to over 200,000 by the close of the decade and the AFT's membership shrank to less than 2,500.

The 1920's, characterized by stable prices and relative prosperity, were not conducive to trade union growth. The decade of the 1930's, in contrast, was characterized by depression, erosion of government revenues, and general retrenchment in educational expenditures. Faced with threats to their economic security, teachers turned from the NEA to the AFT as the union placed greater emphasis on teacher welfare. During these years the NEA, therefore, shrank in membership
while the AFT grew. The union's approach to improving teacher benefits emphasized action at the level of the local school district. In 1935, the AFT officially adopted the use of collective bargaining, as practiced in private industry, as the proper means for establishing the terms and conditions of employment for teachers.

The historical description of the NEA and AFT illustrates that teachers have often turned to trade unionism in attempts to improve their occupational welfare. Such was the case when the AFT was founded and again during the depression years of the 1930's. And, as will be discussed later, teachers have increasingly turned to collective bargaining since World War II in order to improve the terms and conditions of their employment. The growth of trade unionism among teachers, furthermore, can be attributed in part to the domination of the NEA by administrators and, consequently, to the NEA's failure to place sufficient emphasis on improving teacher benefits.

A third purpose of this study has been to examine the impact of increasing teacher militancy since World War II on the NEA and the AFT. Militant behavior by teachers during this period has been accompanied by significant changes in teacher-school board relations. Each of the three waves of
teacher strikes discussed earlier has been associated with increasing efforts by teachers to negotiate written agreements with local school boards covering salaries and other conditions of employment. As previously mentioned, the AFT has long favored such activity while the NEA has not. This determination by teachers to implement collective bargaining procedures in public education, therefore, has intensified the organizational rivalry between the two organizations and has forced the NEA to alter its traditional goals and methods with regard to the improvement of teacher benefits.

Throughout the history of the rivalry between the NEA and the AFT, the NEA has been the larger and more complex organization. Except for a brief period after the First World War when the two groups were of nearly equal size, the NEA has maintained a wide margin in membership. In recent years, the efforts of teachers to negotiate with local school boards has stimulated the union's growth. Still, however, the NEA enrolls about fifty-two per cent of the Nation's teachers as compared to only seven per cent for the AFT.

The rivalry between the NEA and AFT gained new momentum in the early 1960's. In June, 1961, New York City teachers voted for collective bargaining in the city's school system. The following December, the United Federation of Teachers, a
local affiliate of the AFT, defeated the NEA local affiliate in a representation election to determine which group would represent the teachers in negotiations with the school board. These events in New York City represent the union's first major threat to the NEA since the few years immediately following World War I.

Involved in this organizational competition are two major issues. First, the AFT charges that the NEA is dominated by administrators and that local administrators, namely superintendents, coerce classroom teachers into joining the educational associations affiliated with the NEA. Second, the NEA charges that the AFT's affiliation with organized labor is "unprofessional."

The historical analysis of the NEA indicates that the union's charges have validity. From 1857 until the First World War the Association consisted primarily of public school administrators and college educators. Then in the 1920's, the "100 per cent membership" drives led by superintendents of local school districts resulted in an influx of a large number of classroom teachers into the NEA. Also, the reality of pressures placed on classroom teachers to join the educational associations in recent years has been documented by formal studies of practices in several states.
Classroom teacher representation in the Representative Assembly and other governing units of the NEA indicates that administrators still have disproportionate control of the Association's affairs. While classroom teachers comprise about eighty-five per cent of NEA membership, the proportion of teachers contained in the NEA governing structure is significantly less. There is evidence, however, which indicates that teachers are trying to correct this situation. Resolutions were passed by the Representative Assembly at the 1965 and 1967 conventions reaffirming the Assembly's role as the policy-making body and instructing all administrative units to raise the number of classroom teachers to majority status on these units. Should these efforts prove effective, classroom teacher control of NEA affairs can be expected to improve in the next few years.

The NEA's criticism of the AFT is that it is "unprofessional" for teachers to join trade unions and that the AFT's affiliation with organized labor can force teachers to support AFL-CIO policies which might not be in the best interests of teachers and public education. The "professionalism" charge long has been a device used by NEA proponents to dissuade teachers from joining trade unions. The willingness of teachers in recent years to become militant and to join
unions, however, indicates that this charge is losing its emotional appeal to teachers. As for the rest of the NEA's charge, it must be noted that the AFL-CIO is a federation of autonomous national unions, which retain the right to formulate their own policies and to govern themselves. Therefore, the AFT is under no compulsion to accept and support unpalatable policy and programs established by AFL-CIO leadership.

As previously noted, NEA efforts to improve teacher benefits have undergone significant change in recent years in response to increasing teacher militancy. In spite of the Association's traditional opposition to the use of "trade union tactics," it now has a program of teacher negotiations at the local school district level markedly similar in goals and methods to collective bargaining advocated by the AFT. In fact, recent studies of organizational policies and actual negotiations conclude that there are more similarities than differences in the roles played by the local NEA and AFT affiliates studied.

The first official pronouncement of the NEA relating to collective bargaining procedures accompanied the increase in teacher strikes at the close of World War II. The NEA endorsed the policy of teachers electing salary committees for the purpose of negotiating with school boards. The
announcement stated that the practice of teachers' individually bargaining with school officials for their salaries was outmoded and that professional "group action" on salary proposals was necessary. The NEA referred to these procedures as "democratic persuasion" rather than collective bargaining.

This initial movement of the NEA toward collective bargaining in education was short-lived. The pronouncement was made in 1947 amidst the strike activity of 1945 to 1948. As Shlakman pointed out, with the abatement of teacher strikes after 1948, the NEA quietly dropped the matter.

Not until the early 1960's did the NBA again begin to move in this direction. Following the successful and dramatic implementation of collective bargaining in New York City by a local union affiliated with the AFT, the NEA reevaluated its stand on teacher negotiations. In 1962 at its Denver convention a resolution was passed advocating "professional negotiations" in public education. Subsequently, a booklet entitled Guidelines for Professional Negotiations was published, outlining the NEA's program. The purpose of the NEA's move was twofold. First, the Association realized that it was going to have to develop a program in this area or suffer further defeats by the AFT. Second, the NEA hoped to develop a program of negotiations which would avoid placing teachers under traditional labor law and agencies.
Since 1962, the NEA has developed a detailed program of "professional negotiations" while the AFT has continued to advocate collective bargaining as practiced in private industry. In spite of broad ideological differences between the two organizations, their respective programs have become even more similar with the passage of time. The ultimate goal of both programs is written agreements broad enough in scope to cover any matter with respect to the operation of the schools which might concern teachers. Both the AFT and the NEA hold that the majority teacher organization should have exclusive representation rights. With regard to the use of the strike, both organizations now accept its use under extreme circumstances.

The significant differences in the two programs involve the role of administrators and the channels for handling teacher-school board relations. The NEA favors the inclusion of administrators, with the exception of the superintendent, in the same negotiating unit with classroom teachers while the AFT supports negotiating units comprised of classroom teachers only. The role of the superintendent in negotiations, as defined by the NEA, should be that of advisor to both the school board and the teachers' representative. The AFT holds that the superintendent is the executive agent of the school board and that he should therefore represent the board in negotiations.
Another area of disagreement concerns the proper channels for handling teacher-school board relations. The AFT wants these relations to fall under traditional labor law and the governmental agencies established for handling collective bargaining in private industry. The NEA is strongly opposed to this, and consequently has fostered separate legislation covering negotiations in public education.
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