

77
47

SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF EMPLOYEE
ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by ,

Freddie Lowe Mock

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

David J. Parks, Co-Chairman

Martha B. Harder, Co-Chairman

M. David Alexander

Glen I. Earthman

Sandra Gupton

July, 1986

Blacksburg, Virginia

146 8. 26-62

SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF EMPLOYEE
ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Freddie Lowe Mock

Committee Chairpersons: and

Educational Administration

(Abstract)

The purpose of this study was to determine if certain variables could discriminate between those school systems that do and those that do not have employee assistance programs. Using six variables identified in the literature, superintendents across the nation were surveyed to determine the status of these variables in their school systems. Discriminant analysis was used to test how well the variables predicted the existence of employee assistance programs.

The results of the analysis indicated that two variables can be used to predict EAP presence. These variables are the superintendent's perception of the benefits of employee assistance programs and the superintendent's perception of the popularity of employee assistance programs in other organizations in the community.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my wife, _____, and my son, _____.
Without their patience and support, this undertaking would not have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

and have been my advisors and committee co-chairpersons. They have provided constant support and guidance throughout this project. To them, I extend my sincere appreciation. Special acknowledgements are also extended to

, and . As members of my doctoral committee, each has provided me with valuable assistance and helpful suggestions without which this undertaking would not have been possible.

Special thanks go to and for their valuable assistance in the preparation of the manuscript. They have provided not only technical assistance, but also patience, concern, and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Abstract		ii
Dedication		iii
Acknowledgements		iv
List of Tables		viii
Chapter		
1	Introduction	1
	Problem	3
	Purpose	4
	Identification of Discriminant Variables	4
	Definition of Key Terms	5
	Overview of the Dissertation	6
2	Review of the Literature and Research	7
	Introduction	7
	Planning	14
	Staffing	16
	Implementation	18
	Evaluation	21
	Factors Impacting on the Implementation of EAPs in Public Schools	26
	Awareness of EAPs	26
	Benefits to School Systems	27
	Student Safety	29
	Impact of Teacher Organizations	29

Chapter	Page
Concern for Faculty Morale	30
Organizational Size and Structure	31
Superintendents' Perceptions of EAPs	32
Organizational Change	32
Summary	35
3 Methodology	37
Variables	37
Population and Sample	39
Measurement of the Variables	40
Change Factors	44
Field Test of Questionnaire	44
Scale Structure and Reliability	45
Data Collection Procedures	47
Data Analysis Procedures	47
4 Results	50
Summary	62
5 Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations, and Discussion	63
Summary	63
Conclusions	65
Discussion	66
Recommendations	68
References	70

Appendices	Page
A Letter to State Superintendents	74
B Questionnaire for State Superintendents . .	76
C Letter to Superintendents	78
D Questionnaire for Superintendents	80
E Follow-up Postcard	84
F Calculation of <u>Tau</u>	86
G List of School Systems Selected for Sample	88

Vita	113
----------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page	
1	Factor Structure of Questionnaire Items Related to Superintendents' Perceptions of the Benefits of Employee Assistance Programs, the Popularity of Employee Assistance Programs in Other Organizations in the Community, and the Ability of the School System to Evoke Change (Varimax Rotation)	46
2	Alpha Coefficients for Attitude, Environment, and Change Scales	48
3	Frequencies and Percentages for Variables Requiring Yes-No Responses and Chi-Square Values for Relationships Between Presence of EAP Programs and Selected Variables	51
4	Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Attitude and Environment Scales	53
5	Means and Standard Deviations for Size and Wealth Items	55
6	Pearson Product-Moment Biserial Correlation Coefficients for Relationships Between School Systems With and Without EAPs and the Variables of Wealth, Size, Superintendent's Attitude, Superintendent's Perception of Use of EAPs in the Environment, and Ability to Implement Change	56
7	Unstandardized Canonical Discriminant Coefficients and Structure Coefficients (N = 142)	58
8	Classification of EAP and Non-EAP School Systems Using the Split-Validation Procedure	59
9	Canonical Correlation, Lambda, Chi-Square, and Significance for the Function Discriminating EAP From Non-EAP Systems	61

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, management, particularly in the private sector, has begun to provide a variety of non-monetary collateral benefits for employees (Scanlon, 1983). One such collateral benefit is the employee assistance program (EAP), a service designed to assist employees in dealing with personal and social problems which may be serious enough to jeopardize job performance or personal welfare. Personal problems which commonly bring employees to use employee assistance programs include chemical abuse, job stress, burnout, career planning, family, legal, and financial problems (Wrich, 1980).

The popularity of employee assistance programs in the private sector is indicated by their widespread use. For example, 57% of the Fortune 500 Companies now provide some type of employee assistance program for their work force (Godwin, 1980). In addition, a 1979 survey conducted by the National Association of State Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Directors revealed that over 5,000 separate employee assistance programs were operating in the private sector and were serving over 10 million employees (Godwin, 1980).

Employee assistance programs have become a fairly common practice in the corporate world (Gaeta, Lynn, & Grey, 1983).

Companies would not invest the estimated 50 million dollars annually in employee assistance programs if the firms did not expect to profit from the programs in some fashion. It is noted by Wrich (1980) that the benefit-to-cost ratio for employee assistance programs functioning in the private sector is over 1000% in certain situations. If Wrich's estimate is correct, there is little wonder why the popularity of employee assistance programs is growing among managers and policy makers.

With the current documentation in professional literature noting the high degree of mental health problems encountered by teachers, the need for greater use of employee assistance programs in education seems apparent. Walsh (1979) notes that 56.6% of Chicago's teachers suffer from physical or mental illnesses directly related to their jobs. These illnesses include "colitis, ulcers, along with high blood pressure, depression, eye problems, headaches, heart disease, kidney problems, and stomach problems" (p. 253). Obviously, educators suffering from burnout or other serious psychological disorders cannot work as productively as they could without the disorder or problem (Moracco & McFadden, 1983). Willard McGuire (1979), former National Education Association president, has voiced the opinion that--

A major new malady has afflicted the teaching profession and threatens to reach epidemic proportions if it is not soon checked. It has stricken thousands of sensitive, thoughtful, and dedicated teachers It is burnout . . . , a condition that results from stress, tension, and anxiety in its victims The NEA is hopeful, however, that once the teacher burnout problem is articulated to the community, it will get the attention it deserves Teachers need support from parents; school administrators; school boards; and civic, business, labor, religious, and professional societies. If teachers don't get that support, the price may be more than society can afford to pay.
(p. 5)

Why do some school systems provide employee assistance program services to aid teachers in dealing with mental health concerns while the majority of school systems do not provide such a service? Specifically, are there certain characteristics present in those systems providing such programs which are not present in other systems? This research will attempt to answer these questions.

Problem

The problem was to determine if there are characteristics or variables which distinguish between school systems which provide employee assistance programs and those that do not provide employee assistance programs. The research will determine if certain variables can be used as predictors of the presence of employee assistance programs in school districts.

Purpose

The major purpose of this study was to gather current information which may assist educators and school boards in making decisions regarding the implementation of an employee assistance program. The literature reflects that some school systems nationwide have recently started employee assistance programs and other systems are considering the option. A limited amount of research exists on employee assistance programs which operate in public school systems.

Identification of Discriminant Variables

The variables identified in the survey to discriminate between school systems which do and school systems which do not provide employee assistance programs were selected because of the recognition afforded them in the current literature. Articles, books, and other publications, as well as unpublished reports and studies by educational agencies, were examined. In addition, several directors of existing successful employee assistance programs operating in school systems were interviewed and asked to identify variables which contributed to program development. These directors include James Ahern of the New York City Board of Education; Marion Cameron of the Rockville, Maryland, Public Schools; Liz Wagner of the Toledo, Ohio, Public Schools; and Jerome Boettcher of the Appleton, Wisconsin, Area School District.

From these sources, the discriminators used in the survey were identified.

Definition of Key Terms

Employee Assistance Program (EAP) - A program that provides professional assistance to employees to help them deal with personal, family, and work-related problems which could potentially, directly or indirectly, affect their job performance.

Bargaining - The presence of collective bargaining for employee contracts.

Wealth - The ability of school districts to support employee assistance programs; measured by the average teacher salary.

Size - The number of students attending a school system; measured by the average daily attendance.

Attitude - The superintendent's attitude toward the effectiveness of employee assistance programs.

Environment - Popularity of employee assistance programs; determined by the superintendent's perception of employee assistance programs in the community environment.

Change - The ability of the school system to implement planned change as perceived by the superintendent.

Program Effectiveness - The ability of the employee assistance program to effectively deal with substance abuse,

mental health, and personal and family problems of the employee.

Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter 2 includes a review of the current literature on employee assistance programs for teachers. Variables found to be associated with employee assistance programs are identified in Chapter 2.

Chapter 3 defines the methodology used to survey school systems to determine if the established variables are present in the selected systems and reports results of the factor analysis and the tests of reliability. Chapter 4 reports the analysis of data and findings of the survey. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings and draws conclusions about the study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Introduction

Recently, many reports have been generated by various commissions, interest groups, and authors concerning the evaluation of and/or recommendations for the public schools in the United States (Education Commission of the States, 1983). Most of these reports take the general position that the way to increase teacher productivity is to increase compensation, both pay and status, of the employee. This concept is as fundamental and traditional as the classic management thought of Fredrick Taylor (Hoy & Miskel, 1982).

Management theory and practice have evolved from this simplistic position to a position which recognizes that any motivational strategy for a work force must consider the unique life situations and positions of the individuals which comprise the work force (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1980). More recent motivation theories, such as the expectancy theory of motivation (Vroom, 1964), suggest that the organization must look at intrinsic rewards as well as extrinsic rewards and unique individual characteristics in motivating employees. One approach to including intrinsic rewards for employee

motivation has been the implementation of employee assistance programs (EAPs).

Much has been written about the success of employee assistance programs in the public sector (Wrich, 1980; Thorensen, Hosokawa, & Talcott, 1983; Muldoon & Bertie, 1980; Witte & Cannon, 1979; and Cahill, 1983). However, the literature reveals a limited amount of research on the identification of factors which discriminate between public school systems that provide employee assistance program services for professional employees and those systems that do not provide these services. The literature does, however, provide information from which one can develop a hypothesis about which factors may be important for the establishment and maintenance of a program. This chapter reviews articles and reports that describe the conditions and situations which spawned public school employee assistance programs, as well as some related background information on the evolution of employee assistance programs for professional employees.

An employee assistance program is a program of services to assist employees who have personal and social problems that may be negatively related to their job performance. These programs originated in the American industrial sector during the 1940s, with the primary focus being on the treatment of substance abuse problems (Scanlon, 1983). Since then, employee assistance programs have grown in size and

concept and are addressing a broad range of employee problems.

As acknowledgement that employee problems affect all levels of an organization became more prevalent, and as demands for a higher quality of counseling services increased, employee assistance programs became more professional in their design and operational format. The employment of properly trained and certified counselors who can establish and implement diagnostic and treatment services has been the growing trend in the past two decades.

Also evolving in recent years has been the concept commonly referred to as the "central diagnostic and referral (CDR) model" (Comstock, 1983, p. 46). This service center model allows clients the opportunity to discuss concerns in an environment where confidentiality is assured away from the worksite (Minter, 1983). Decentralized organizations like General Motors tend to subscribe to this model (Comstock, 1983).

Independent employee counseling centers have been costly and difficult to maintain. Many organizations still operate employee assistance counseling services in-house, but with precautions to assure confidentiality and professional treatment. Some labor unions, including the United Auto Workers, feel they can provide earlier and more confidential

treatment. These unions actually manage the treatment centers as a union benefit to their members (Comstock, 1983).

The traditional employee assistance program model was designed for the industrial labor force. Demands from management and groups of professional employees have caused a review of current program approaches to determine ways to provide assistance to professional employees and groups. The recent research conducted through the University of Missouri's Employee Assistance Program has provided the design of an employee assistance program model successful for professional staff (Comstock, 1983).

This design for professional employees is based upon the concept that deterioration in job performance is not easily observable among professional employees and, therefore, professional groups underutilize traditional program services. Deterioration in performance is "not as clearly observable because professional groups function primarily in an unstructured environment, are not able to be supervised as directly as hourly employees, and usually perceive confrontation as a personal attack upon their professional capabilities" (Comstock, 1983, p. 47).

Due to these differences, traditional industrial employee assistance programs have not worked for professional employees (Comstock, 1983). The approach that appears to be working for the professional is the developmental model or

the self- and peer-referral recommendation to an off-site counseling facility for diagnosis and treatment. "The developmental model is also versatile, making implementation easier, even in highly dispersed work groups" (Comstock, 1983, p. 47).

In the late 1970s, boards of education in the larger metropolitan areas adopted the employee assistance program concept. According to Ahern and Gay (1982), coordinators of the New York City Board of Education Employee Counseling Service, some school systems began to adopt the following basic premise:

Children have the right to mentally healthy teachers. Traditionally, teachers serve as role models, extended parents, and are often seen as heroes by the charges in their care. Children spend more time with their teachers than their parents. In this view, it is vital that we are certain our educators are mentally, physically, and emotionally functioning in the classroom at acceptable levels. (p. 190)

This researcher has reviewed employee assistance programs in several school districts in the United States. These program models can be categorized into three groups: (a) basic-industrial, (b) peer-counselor, and (c) developmental.

The Toledo, Ohio, school system operates a basic-industrial type employee assistance program. L. Wagner (personal communication, November 30, 1983) is the director of the employee assistance program in the Toledo Public Schools. She notes that the three unions representing

teachers, staff, and management pressed for a program similar to that used in industry. Wagner speculates that the employee assistance program in the Columbus, Ohio, Schools also operates from a similar model because of the union pressure.

It is important to mention here that each of the directors of the employee assistance programs mentioned the powerful influence of the unions in establishing a traditional employee assistance program. In Toledo, union representatives have the opportunity to refer clients. Over two-thirds of the referrals in the Toledo program are union or management referrals. All of the management referrals are considered disciplinary; the employee must see the counselor to maintain employment. It is not surprising that 60% of the referrals in the Toledo program are for alcohol abuse (L. Wagner, personal communication, November 30, 1983). This follows the industrial model where most of the emphasis is on alcohol abuse (Googins & Kurtz, 1983).

Appleton, Wisconsin, has a unique employee assistance program (Boettcher, 1983). As a small system of only 900 employees, the board of education endorsed a volunteer, peer-operated program. A designated teacher in each school is trained in basic counseling techniques and serves as a referral specialist, matching the client to the agency. While the program costs virtually nothing, since everyone

working is a volunteer, the success of the program is questionable. Only 13 employees have used the program in three years.

The public schools of Baltimore, Maryland (T. LoFaro, personal communication, November 17, 1983); Montgomery County, Maryland (Cameron, 1982); and New York City (Ahern, 1983) provide employee assistance programs that may be categorized as developmental in format and design. T. LoFaro (personal communication, November 17, 1983) directs the newly formed program in Baltimore, Maryland. Although the project is still in its early stages, the goals and objectives reflect the "developmental" design. Efforts are devoted to far more than disciplinary treatment for job-related incidents. The counselors market the program as a "counseling-referral program" to help employees deal with personal, work-related, and family problems. The fact that supervisors can make attendance mandatory is not advertised. All records are maintained in the strictest confidence. Board policy also assures that utilization cannot jeopardize "job, tenure, future, or reputation" (T. LoFaro, personal communication, November, 1983).

The employee assistance program in the Montgomery County, Maryland, Public Schools has served as the model "developmental" program for several newly formed programs, including the employee assistance program in the Baltimore

Public Schools (Cameron, 1982). Identified as a wide-range program, this model advertises that it can assist personnel with physical, emotional, mental, financial, legal, family, and chemical-abuse problems. The policy which governs the program states that the program is a "bridge between the troubled employee and public and private resources in the community, the metropolitan area, the state, and the nation" (Cameron, 1982, p. 3). Follow-up procedures are also identified as part of the comprehensive program package. Finally, crisis intervention counseling is made available to all employees on a 24-hour basis.

The literature on employee assistance programs in public schools tends to be divided into four topics: (a) planning, (b) staffing, (c) implementation, and (d) evaluation. In order to better understand why a school system would implement an EAP, it is important to review these topics briefly.

Planning

Cahill (1983) reported that it is irrational for an organization to simply accept and employ, without assessment, another organization's employee assistance program. Following a three-year study of employee assistance programs in both the public and private sectors, the author indicated that each organization has unique characteristics, and the

employee assistance program design and format must fit the particular organization.

Cahill (1983) pointed out that if an employee assistance program is to reach persons with personal problems, the firm must establish performance appraisal systems comprehensive enough so that supervisors can recognize a decrease in performance and can confront the employee with the circumstances. Effective evaluation techniques can be helpful to an employee assistance program.

A preprogram analysis, as mentioned by Sholette (1983), can assess the nature and influence of the factors which affect the organization, including the organization's purpose, goals, markets, organizational background, organizational characteristics, managerial practices, and workforce characteristics. This process includes a thorough understanding of the needs to be addressed by the program. With a preprogram analysis and assessment, an employee assistance program can be better designed and monitored, and operating strategies, impediments, and resources involved in the employee assistance effort can be predicted with greater ease and accuracy.

The second phase of the planning process, after a needs assessment is completed, is the actual design of the program. Earlier it was noted that professional employees--including doctors, lawyers, and teachers--tend to be more receptive to

employee assistance programs that follow the "developmental model" (Comstock, 1983). In this model, employees are not sent to the counselor for disciplinary reasons, but are encouraged to make self-referrals for assistance, whereas the traditional "industrial model" stresses job-based, supervisory referrals. Thorensen, Hosokawa, and Talcott (1983) indicated that for public schools and colleges a program which includes both supervisory referrals and self-referrals is desirable. The model they recommend also offers preventive counseling, including seminars and workshops on the enhancement of teacher self-concept, stress management, career redirection, and interpersonal relations training.

Staffing

As with program planning and design, the type of staff needed in an employee assistance program depends primarily on the particular needs of the organization and its personnel. Thorensen, Hosokawa, and Talcott (1983) implied that in an employee assistance program serving professional educators, and where the program is expected to meet a wide variety of personal needs, the counselor should have at least a graduate degree in counseling psychology and appropriate certification.

Birkland (1983) pointed out that traditional employee assistance programs, which were started in the industrial sector, employed persons trained almost solely in alcohol rehabilitation. More recently, "broad-brush" programs, meeting a host of employee needs, have employed psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, and specialty counselors for financial, legal, and marital problems. Birkland agreed with Thorensen, Hosokawa, and Talcott (1983) that employee assistance programs need to be staffed by a professional counselor or counseling psychologist who can respond as a generalist to a wide range of problems.

Cameron (1982) reported that the employee assistance program in the Montgomery County, Maryland, schools has three professional full-time counselors. These counselors hold graduate degrees in counseling psychology.

The employee assistance program in the Montgomery County Public Schools operates from the "broker" concept. The key function of the staff is to "define the problems, assess what is needed, clarify alternatives for meeting those needs, and refer employees to the appropriate community resource when necessary" (Montgomery County Public Schools, 1982, p. 1).

Ahern and Gay (1982) noted that the New York City Board of Education Employee Counseling Service employs certified and licensed counselors who hold graduate credentials in psychology and counseling. The authors stated that most

programs operating in public schools require counseling certification of the staff member.

According to Wrich (1980), education level of the counselor is important, but management must look beyond the degree to other qualifications. He recommended that the person should have some special training in chemical abuse and its etiology. Clinical experience, especially in the area of family therapy, is valuable to the program counselor. Experiences should have brought the counselor in contact with a variety of problems matching the scope of the employee assistance program. The author noted that the program cannot handle a greater range of problems than the counselor is capable of accurately identifying.

Implementation

Wrich (1980) states that "the most serious program problems as well as the majority of outright program failures for employee assistance programs can be traced to the first year of implementation when demands of program personnel are greatest because they have to both implement and manage a major new effort" (p. 79). This seems especially true in the public school setting, where the immediate profit motive to support the employee assistance program is not as prominent as in the private sector.

Wrich (1980) indicates that, logically, the first important step in the implementation of an employee assistance program is to gain the support of an important decision-maker in the organization. The literature indicates that key decision-makers of school systems which have established programs have been influential in a variety of ways. The New York City Board of Education Employee Counseling Service actually became established as a result of the United States Conference of Mayors in 1977 (Ahern & Gay, 1982). The group influenced urban governments to establish employee assistance programs for city employees. Shortly thereafter, recognizing that the time of employee assistance programs for teachers had come, the New York City Board of Education established a limited program in 1979. A study conducted at the time indicated one out of ten teachers in the system were substance abusers, supporting the establishment of the program. With the assistance of the teachers' union in 1981, the city established an employee assistance program and insurance coverage for personnel to receive treatment after being diagnosed by the EAP counselor.

Bohl, Brovanski, and O'Brien (1982) described the establishment of the employee assistance program of the Westchester School District of Westchester, New York. These authors explain that the local council on alcoholism joined forces with the local teachers' union to establish a

community education program and campaign to pressure the board of education to fund the employee assistance program.

Bohl, Brovarski, and O'Brien (1982) also outlined the marketing strategy they use on school boards and superintendents. This strategy provides the following reasons for an EAP in the public schools:

1. humanitarian concerns of the school community,
2. an immediate need within the district,
3. a comfortable procedure for dealing with tenured staff,
4. a positive means of bringing several contractual parties together for a common goal, and
5. cost effectiveness, proven in the private sector, which has community appeal. (p. 32)

Greenwood (1983) recognized that an understanding of communications techniques is vital to the successful employee assistance program. These include using the traditional school newsletter to employees and other internal media to define exactly what the program provides in the way of services. Brochures should describe the services, contacts, fees, and policies of confidentiality. Greenwood also suggested the use of audiovisuals, slides, tapes, and videotapes to market the program to employees.

Googins and Kurtz (1983) maintained that supervisors, or principals in the school setting, can receive instruction

in "first level" intervention techniques that can greatly promote the use of the employee assistance program. First, the supervisor can identify teachers who have noticeable changes in job performance, since deviation from the established norms is a clue to personal or social problems of the employee. The authors suggest that the supervisor should be trained in observing and establishing behavioral norms for both formal and informal behavior.

Googins and Kurtz (1983) noted that the second element in the implementation process is treatment. The employee assistance program counselor should establish a rapport with the client, identify the concern, and make the necessary referrals.

Evaluation

According to Foote and Erfurt (1983), there are three reasons why an employee assistance program should be evaluated: "first, to justify its existence to some external authority (usually the source of funds or support); second, to ascertain the extent to which it is meeting its objectives; and third, to improve its performance" (p. 46).

Some managers suggest that one success justifies the program, and since they can identify a number of success stories, they feel no need for further evaluation. Justification, however, is not the only reason for conducting

an evaluation, and in new programs that is probably not a very good reason. Since there is no commonly accepted format for conducting an employee assistance program, one cannot argue that just because a program has been implemented it will be successful. Two additional questions must be asked (Foote & Erfurt, 1983): "First, has the program in fact been implemented according to the plan . . . and second, is it meeting its objectives, or should the program plan be altered in order to improve performance" (p. 46)? Evaluation should help programs demonstrate their effectiveness and seek new ways to improve their effectiveness (Washousky & Kruger, 1984).

Foote and Erfurt (1983) maintained "the first step in evaluation is to specify the particular program objectives to be evaluated" (p. 47). They recognized that--

specific evaluation objectives will vary over time, depending upon the developmental state of the program, the particular problems being faced by the program at different times, and the availability of data. It is not expected that all aspects of a program will be measured all of the time. In a situation of limited resources, it is wiser to develop a plan of evaluation that will include routine monitoring of a few key items, and occasional monitoring of other program activities according to a schedule adjusted to the program's stage of development or immediate problems. (p. 47)

The focus of the Foote and Erfurt (1983) work is on the evaluation questions to be asked regarding casefinding; first, "are the casefinding procedures operating as they are supposed to operate, and second, is the program identifying

the numbers and types of employees expected" (p. 49)? The authors suggested several methods for identifying whether or not the program is contacting the targeted employees. The first technique described is that of frequent group interviews with supervisors to discuss the type and number of cases they are aware of in their division. This method can determine the extent to which the supervisors understand and implement their role. "At the same time, the supervisors receive training from each other, as well as a certain amount of peer pressure and peer support in conducting their part of the program" (Foote & Erfurt, 1983, p. 49). This method also takes in account employees who never actually enter into the program as a "case" because they are not referred to the counselors.

The second method of assessing casefindings requires the availability of work records. Principals in the school setting can be asked to identify all personnel under them who have "known" problems which should be referred to the EAP. This figure can be compared with the actual caseload. The above method is most commonly used with traditional, industrial model programs (Foote & Erfurt, 1983).

Most employee assistance programs for teachers and school system staff operate on a self-referral model the majority of the time. Foote and Erfurt (1983) found that the self-referral model can only operate if "(a) the target

population is aware of the services and (b) the program has a reputation of providing confidential and useful services" (p. 50). This can be evaluated by surveying a random sample of employees to find out how the program is received.

To assess the effectiveness of the treatment procedures of an employee assistance program, Burggrabe and Swift (1984) proposed that the process should be simple and easy to understand and explain. They suggested that the term evaluation applies to a number of current methods of assessing EAPs. Most programs keep records of employee visits and problems identified. As this information is compiled, data emerges on number of interviews, kinds of problems assessed, and referrals to treatment resources. Other data can be gathered, including the number of trained supervisors and the number of employees accepting EAP recommendations. This material is informative about the components, activities, and outcomes of the program and can be the basis of a status report on the program (Burggrabe & Swift, 1984).

To place a dollar amount on these data is to perform cost-effectiveness analysis; for example, a common technique is to calculate the cost of providing these services for each unit of outcome achieved, or simply the cost to refer one employee to treatment and have the individual recover. "More complex is the cost-benefit analysis, which assigns dollar

figures to both costs and outcomes and allows a monetary comparison of resources invested in an EAP and the benefits which the program returns to the organization; for example, for each dollar spent, X dollars are saved through reduced absenteeism" (Burggrabe & Swift, 1984, p. 14). Such analyses help assess the results of counseling compared with other management techniques for resolving the problem.

To Burggrabe and Swift (1984), the evaluation of the program should begin with the collection of data by the resource counselor. During interviews, the counselor should write descriptive notes. This material can be filed for later review and analysis to provide an idea of the types of problems and numbers seen. To assess program fit, management needs to know by age, sex, and length of employment within the organization who uses the program. To assess efficiency, administrators can consider the amount of time involved in processing and treating each employee. Each part of the program -- components, processes, and outcomes -- can be similarly assessed. The authors stated that each item collected should relate directly to one of the measurement criteria chosen or time and effort are wasted.

The organization should conduct cost-effectiveness studies to gain maximum benefit of an employee assistance program, especially if the EAP is provided by an outside agency. Evaluation is important due to the competition among

organizations providing EAP services. "Such competition is fine provided organizations do not promise more than they can deliver" (Myers, 1984, p. 22). Unless results are measured, this may occur.

Factors Impacting on the Implementation of EAPs in Public Schools

From the review of literature, it is possible to delineate factors which may be used to identify which school systems will implement EAPs as a part of a benefits package. The following is a specific review of studies and theories directly related to the identification of those factors.

Awareness of EAPs

Bohl, Brovarski, and O'Brien (1982) implied that the level of community awareness or "education" regarding employee assistance program services is a factor related to how much support may be acquired for a program. Stewart (1983) discussed the need of employee and employer groups in the community to have a clear understanding of employee assistance program services if support is to be gained for the concept. It is implied by this author that the ability of a school system to implement and maintain an employee assistance program is directly related to the community's awareness of employee assistance programs and services.

Thorensen, Hosokawa, and Talcott (1983) noted that professional personnel desire to seek help on their own, without the supervisor assisting. The authors suggested that a factor contributing to the successful implementation of an employee assistance program may be the attractiveness of the program to the target group. Traditional supervisor-referral models appear threatening to educators and other professional employees and, as a result, have tended not to be popular for teachers. Rather, developmental models, which include the concept of self-referral, appear to be more acceptable to educators.

Benefits to School Systems

School system programs, unlike industrial employee assistance programs, cannot be readily evaluated in terms of return on the invested dollar. A school system will not show a clear increase in the number of goods produced due to the program. Cameron (1982) suggested that school boards must assess the value of the employee assistance program to the school system, not by showing a monetary profit, but by demonstrating the program provides the best learning options for the students. Ahern (1983) maintained that the cost of the employee assistance program must be measured against the need to provide teachers for the classroom who are in a healthy mental state. If board members and other school

system decision makers can identify the need of the schools to maintain mentally healthy teachers, then they will be more inclined to support and provide employee assistance program services for the school system.

Wrich (1980) noted that organizations consider costs to be a factor in deciding on the establishment of an employee assistance program. A variety of formulas may be used to calculate the cost and the return on the investment in the employee assistance program. These normally account for the cost to the organization for absenteeism, treatment for emotional and mental illness, sick leave, and retraining or replacement, indicating the employee assistance programs may be a profitable venture for an organization.

The initial cost of implementing an employee assistance program may present problems for administrators. Wrich (1980), writing on cost factors, maintained that the programs are extremely cost effective and begin to pay for themselves within months after implementation. Yet because of the initial costs and because budgeting for noninstructional items in school systems is often a controversial task, the ability of the school system to budget the operational cost for the first year is certainly a factor in determining whether or not a system will establish a program.

Student Safety

Safety for students, according to Cameron (1982), is another crucial area on which employee assistance programs for educators impact and may be a factor in program development. While good mental health is desirable for all employees, it is essential for chemistry, physical education, driver's education, and shop teachers who are responsible for student welfare in hazardous situations. "Disabling medical or mental problems cannot be glossed over in these positions" (Cameron, 1982, p. 1). An employee assistance program, providing referrals to appropriate treatment facilities, helps to protect students from medically or mentally ill persons serving in responsible positions. The degree of concern by the school board for student safety may be a factor in employee assistance program development.

Impact of Teacher Organizations

Ahern and Gay (1982) stressed the influence teachers' and employees' unions have on the development of employee assistance programs. In the design of the New York City Board of Education Employee Counseling Service, the United Federation of Teachers played a major role. While specific concerns regarding employee assistance programs differ from local union to local union, Ahern and Gay reported that teachers' unions have a strong interest in employee

assistance programs. Corneil (1983) noted that unionization is a major factor often present in employee assistance program development.

The notion that all parties of the school community--including management, labor, parent groups, students, and other interest groups--profit from employee assistance programs is mentioned throughout the literature. Bohl, Brovarski, and O'Brien (1982) and Wolfe (1983) addressed the fact that employee assistance programs have gained in popularity because they are considered an asset to all of these groups. In labor negotiations, the employee assistance program topic is often considered common ground for both labor and management and represents a desirable and popular contract item.

Concern for Faculty Morale

The promotion of faculty morale, according to Heller (1984), may be a factor which promotes the decision by administrators to establish an employee assistance program. Wolfe (1983) also identified faculty morale and the need to build a support network for the professional employee as reasons managers use to justify the employee assistance program in school systems.

Organizational Size and Structure

Organizational size is considered a factor contributing to the implementation of employee assistance programs.

Bierman (1983) reported that Wisconsin organizations maintaining employee assistance program services tend to be larger organizations with "multiple locations of operation" (p. 86).

McClellan (1983) suggested that larger institutions with sizable numbers of professionals tend to use employee assistance program "service centers" or external programs rather than develop internal programs. Further, large school systems may use different program formats and designs from smaller school systems.

Scanlon (1983) stated in his analysis of employee assistance programs that many organizations are too small to support a program. Sholette (1983) suggested the number of employees to be served by the program is a factor in preprogram assessment.

The shape of the school organization, or pyramid, could be a factor determining employee assistance program needs of a school system. McClellan (1983) implied that many school systems have an organizational structure which provides little direct supervision or supervisory contact with the employee. Employee assistance program services could be viewed as a way to assist personnel with problems and

concerns which would be normally handled by the supervisors in an organization where the degree of supervision was more intense for each employee.

Superintendents' Perceptions of EAPs

In a report on a project involving the development of employee assistance programs in 48 school districts in southern New York State, the Westchester Council on Alcoholism found that school units which have employee assistance programs have superintendents who support and promote the service (Bohl, Brovarski, & O'Brien, 1982). Superintendents were a key part of the marketing strategy, and the authors concluded that a positive perception of the EAP by the superintendent is important to program implementation.

Organizational Change

A slightly different way of looking at the differences between school systems that do provide employee assistance program services and school systems that do not provide the services is to consider the ability of the two types of systems to initiate change within the organizational structure. The development and implementation of an employee assistance program within a school system represents a

planned educational change which can be associated with certain identified factors to promote such change.

Gross, Giacquinta, and Bernstein (1971) suggested that certain conditions exist in the organization to promote planned change. These conditions include:

1. early acceptance of the plan by faculty and staff,
2. anticipation of project difficulties and planning for those difficulties by management, and
3. the ability of top level management to supervise all project phases and treat them with a high degree of importance.

House (1981) noted that to examine a subject under the innovation or change perspective is somewhat different from simply reviewing the facts and figures associated with the subject. The approach House supported analyzes the innovation using three different perspectives: technical, political, and cultural. Each perspective requires a different underlying image upon which it draws to interpret events in the innovation or change process.

The political perspective is based on the concept of negotiation, according to House (1981), whereby power, authority, and competing interests are assessed. This perspective would look at the formal and informal political powers involved in the development of employee assistance programs.

The underlying image of the cultural perspective is the community. It deals with the cultural values and the relationships of groups through shared values that play in the development of the program.

The technological perspective is based on the "image of production" (House, 1981, p. 18). Innovation is conceived as a relatively mechanistic process. The concern here is for economy, productivity, and efficiency. This perspective would focus on the ability of an EAP to help employees overcome personnel problems that would otherwise result in absenteeism or a decline in performance.

Berman (1981) warned that educational change is a very complex issue and much more research is needed, looking especially at "contextual conditions" (p. 263). The author explained that change factors for one system may not apply to the same extent in other situations.

House (1981) and Berman (1981) made some very strong implications for the assessment of employee assistance programs. These include that the researcher must look beyond the "technological-experimental position" and assess other situational factors which may play a role. House's position suggests that the cultural and political circumstances must be included.

Summary

The literature identifies factors which may relate to the implementation and operation of employee assistance programs in public schools. For the purpose of this study, six of these factors will be used for further investigation. These six include:

1. Perceived mental health and related benefits to faculty members (Heller, 1984; Thorensen, Hosokawa, & Talcott, 1983).

2. Ability of the school system to pay the costs of program implementation and operation (Wrich, 1980).

3. Superintendent's perception of the local popularity of employee assistance program services (Bohl, Brovarski, & O'Brien, 1982; Cameron, 1982).

4. Influence of local teachers' unions regarding employee assistance program services (Bierman, 1983; Bohl, Brovarski, & O'Brien, 1982).

5. Organizational size (Scanlon, 1982; Bierman, 1983).

6. Ability of the school system to institute planned change (Gross, Giacquinta, & Bernstein, 1971).

Factors which were mentioned, either directly or indirectly in the literature, but which are not included in the group of factors to be part of this study were (1) the concern of administrators for student safety and (2) the bureaucratic shape of the organization. These factors were

not included because they were treated in the literature with far less emphasis than the other factors mentioned.

REFERENCES

1. ...

2. ...

3. ...

4. ...

5. ...

6. ...

7. ...

8. ...

9. ...

10. ...

11. ...

12. ...

13. ...

14. ...

15. ...

16. ...

17. ...

18. ...

19. ...

20. ...

21. ...

22. ...

23. ...

24. ...

25. ...

26. ...

27. ...

28. ...

29. ...

30. ...

31. ...

32. ...

33. ...

34. ...

35. ...

36. ...

37. ...

38. ...

39. ...

40. ...

41. ...

42. ...

43. ...

44. ...

45. ...

46. ...

47. ...

48. ...

49. ...

50. ...

51. ...

52. ...

53. ...

54. ...

55. ...

56. ...

57. ...

58. ...

59. ...

60. ...

61. ...

62. ...

63. ...

64. ...

65. ...

66. ...

67. ...

68. ...

69. ...

70. ...

71. ...

72. ...

73. ...

74. ...

75. ...

76. ...

77. ...

78. ...

79. ...

80. ...

81. ...

82. ...

83. ...

84. ...

85. ...

86. ...

87. ...

88. ...

89. ...

90. ...

91. ...

92. ...

93. ...

94. ...

95. ...

96. ...

97. ...

98. ...

99. ...

100. ...

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Variables associated with the provision of employee assistance services to professional employees by school systems were identified in Chapter 2. The methods, data collection procedures, and instrument used to test the utility of the identified variables in discriminating between systems which have EAPs and those which do not have EAPs are described in this chapter. Descriptions of the population and sample for the study are included.

Variables

The study has one criterion variable--whether or not a school system operates an employee assistance program--and the following six predictor variables:

1. The school superintendent's perception of benefits received from the implementation of an employee assistance program as measured by the superintendent's response to three questions regarding the ability of employee assistance program services to deal with specified personnel problems and concerns. This variable is referred to in the survey data as "attitude" toward employee assistance program effectiveness.

2. The popularity of employee assistance programs in the community as measured by three questions assessing the superintendent's perception of the extent to which employee assistance programs are employed in the community's agencies and organizations. This variable is referred to in the survey data as "environment."

3. The influence of teachers' unions on the development of employee assistance programs as measured by the presence or absence of collective bargaining.

4. The ability of the school system to pay for employee assistance program services as measured by the average annual salary of its classroom teachers. Average annual salary is a measure of the wealth of school systems (R. Salmon, personal communication, June, 1985).

5. The size of the school system as measured by the average daily attendance.

6. The ability of the school system to implement changes as measured by the presence of factors which assist planned change. These include (1) whether the system has someone responsible for comprehensive planning, (2) whether the superintendent is the chief innovator, and (3) whether resources are available to implement planned change.

Population and Sample

The two populations used in the study consisted of public school systems identified by state superintendents to have EAPs and public school systems identified by state superintendents not to have EAPs from the 48 contiguous states (excluding Alaska and Hawaii). Equal-sized samples were selected from each of the two populations. The total sample size was based on a minimum of 40 responses per independent variable. Since there were six independent variables in the study, a total of 240 responses were required. Based on a predicted return rate of 50%, the minimum required sample number was 480.

School systems were selected in the following manner. A letter and questionnaire were mailed on July 3, 1985, to the office of each state superintendent in the 48 contiguous states. The letter requested each state school official to identify eight school systems which had employee assistance programs and eight that did not have employee assistance programs. On August 14, 1985, state superintendents who had not responded by that day were mailed a second letter and questionnaire to complete. A copy of the letter and questionnaire are in Appendices A and B. State superintendents who had not responded by August 26 were then telephoned for a response.

From each list provided, five EAP and five non-EAP systems were randomly selected to participate in the survey. The superintendents of these 240 EAP and 240 non-EAP systems were mailed a letter and questionnaire on August 31, 1985 (Appendices C and D). On September 26, 210 responses had been returned. A postcard (Appendix E) was mailed to the remaining 270 superintendents requesting that they respond to the questionnaire. Two hundred eighty surveys (58.3%) were returned by October 25, 1985.

Measurement of the Variables

The Superintendents' Questionnaire was developed to measure the variables (Appendix D). Item selection was based on suggestions in the literature and from personal communications with resource persons.

Items 25-27, measuring perceived benefits (attitude), items 28-30, measuring popularity of programs (environment), and items 33-35, measuring the ability of the system to implement planned change were developed using the readings on these respective variables which are identified in Chapter 2. These items measured the superintendent's perceptions of the benefits of EAPs, the popularity of EAPs in the community, and the ability of the superintendent to bring about change. Items 31 and 32 are direct questions concerning union influence on program implementation. Items

6-11 are yes-no questions regarding EAP and collective bargaining status. Item 17-23 indicates school system size by securing an average daily attendance figure. Item 24 indicates whether systems reported population by average daily membership or average daily attendance, which allowed for comparison by decreasing by five percent the population figure when it was reported in average daily membership. Item 12-16 measures relative wealth of the unit by securing average teacher salary (R. Salmon, personal conversation, June, 1985). Items 25-27 on the questionnaire, measuring perceived benefits, are Likert items. Items 28-30 measure the popularity of programs in the community.

Items 25-30 required the superintendent to respond by giving one of five answers on a continuum with respect to the factor in question (see Appendix D). Each item was equal in value, and the sum of the item scores for each scale represented the degree of expression. Each statement was of such nature that the superintendents, describing different situations, could respond to it differently. The five possible responses and their scoring weights were given on the questionnaire. With items 25-27, the survey provided these responses: strongly agree (1), agree (2), undecided (3), disagree (4), and strongly disagree (5). With items 28-30, the survey provided these responses: many (1), some (2), undecided (3), few (4), and none (5). The remainder of

the variables were measured by yes-no responses or, in cases where teacher salary and attendance figures were requested, actual values.

The variables and items soliciting responses follow:

Perceived Benefits of Employee Assistance Programs

- (25) An employee assistance program is an effective way of enhancing employee performance on the job.
- (26) An employee assistance program enhances positive employee relations when handling problems of troubled personnel than more traditional options, including termination, supervisor reprimand, and ignoring the situation.
- (27) An employee assistance program is a cost-effective management tool.

Popularity of Employee Assistance Programs in the Community

- (28) Industries in the community sponsor employee assistance programs for their employees.
- (29) Public agencies in the community sponsor employee assistance programs for their employees.
- (30) Neighboring school systems provide employee assistance programs for their employees.

Influence of Teachers' Organizations on Employee Assistance Program Development

(31) The local teachers' organization has proposed the development of an employee assistance program for teachers.

(32) There is an item in the current teachers' contract that requires an employee assistance program.

(8) Do the teachers in your school system have a formally recognized bargaining unit?

(9-11) If the teachers do have a formally recognized bargaining unit, which organization is it with?

Ability of the System to Pay for Employee Assistance Program Services

(12-16) What is the approximate average annual salary for teachers in your school system? (Do not include administrators.)

Size of the School System

(17-23) What is the average daily attendance of your school system?

(24) Is the average daily attendance an average membership figure?

Implementation of Employee Assistance Program Services

(6) Does your school system have a formally established employee assistance program?

- (7) Does your school system plan to start an employee assistance program?

Change Factors

The review of the literature indicated that whether or not a school system has an employee assistance program may be related to the ability of the system to evoke change effectively. The following questions relate to this factor of planned change.

- (33) The school system administration has an individual or group of individuals responsible for long range, comprehensive planning.

- (34) The superintendent is the chief innovator or change agent in the system.

- (35) The superintendent has the resources to plan change and to follow up on these plans.

Field Test of Questionnaire

The Superintendents' Questionnaire was field tested in North Carolina with five school superintendents who were not part of the study sample. The five randomly selected superintendents were mailed the instrument on July 24, 1985. They were asked to complete the questionnaire and make suggestions regarding the clarity of the individual items and the ease of responding to the items. They were also asked

to make suggestions which they felt would be helpful in gathering the necessary data. The five superintendents made no major suggestions for modification in the questionnaire and recommended that it be implemented "as is."

Scale Structure and Reliability

A factor analysis, using the SPSSX program FACTOR, was run on the item responses in the survey instrument. The varimax criterion for orthogonal rotation was selected because it maximizes the number of very high and very low factor loadings. The results of the factor analysis are in Table 1.

Three factor clusters were identified. For factor 1, the "high loading" items were items 25 (increased performance), 26 (promotes good relations), and 27 (cost effective). This factor was labeled "attitude." Items 28 (local industrial sponsorship), 29 (local public agency sponsorship), and 30 (local school system sponsorship) loaded on factor 2. These items represent questions about the popularity of EAPs in the community. This factor was labeled "environment." Items 33 (system has designated change agent), 34 (superintendent is change agent), and 35 (resources available for planned change) loaded on factor 3. This factor was labeled "change."

Table 1

Factor Structure of Questionnaire Items Related to Superintendents' Perceptions of the Benefits of Employee Assistance Programs, the Popularity of Employee Assistance Programs in Other Organizations in the Community, and the Ability of the School System to Evoke Change (Varimax Rotation)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
25. Increased performance	<u>.862</u>	.055	.110
26. Promotes good relations	<u>.826</u>	.205	.078
27. Cost effective	<u>.826</u>	.062	-.006
28. Local industrial sponsorship	.199	<u>.783</u>	.020
29. Local public agency sponsorship	.128	<u>.866</u>	.026
30. Local school system sponsorship	-.009	<u>.800</u>	.062
33. System has designated change agent	-.054	-.012	<u>.588</u>
34. Superintendent is change agent	.117	.161	<u>.630</u>
35. Resources available for planned change	.109	-.043	<u>.780</u>

Factor	Percentage of Variance
1	30.7
2	17.8
3	14.3

Cronback's alpha was used as a measure of reliability. Alphas for the attitude, environment, and change clusters were .806, .765, and .396, respectively (Table 2).

Data Collection Procedures

The superintendents of the selected school systems were mailed the Superintendents' Questionnaire and cover letter on August 31, 1985 (Appendices C and D). The questionnaire was designed to take approximately five minutes to complete and was printed on yellow paper to make it more noticeable (Dillman, 1978). The enclosed cover letter requested the return of the questionnaire within 10 days of receipt. A stamped return envelope was included in the mailing. A follow-up postal card was sent to all who had not responded within 17 days (Appendix E).

Data Analysis Procedures

The SPSSX program DISCRIMINANT was used to perform discriminant analysis. The subprogram DIRECT was applied; all discriminating variables were entered directly into the analysis. The operation permitted the estimation of the discriminative ability of the variables as a group and individually. A second operation classified school systems into two groups of almost equal size, placing the last 112 usable responses to the survey in the first group and the

Table 2

Alpha Coefficients for Attitude, Environment, and Change Scales

Attitude Scale	
Item	Alpha if item deleted
25. Increased performance	.692
26. Promotes good relations	.725
27. Cost effective	.786
Alpha = .806	
Environment Scale	
Item	Alpha if item deleted
28. Local industrial sponsorship	.714
29. Local public agency sponsorship	.587
30. Local public school sponsorship	.745
Alpha = .765	
Change Scale	
Item	Alpha if item deleted
33. System has designated change agent	.433
34. Superintendent is change agent	.313
35. Resources available for planned change	.125
Alpha = .396	

remaining 115 usable responses in a second or holdout group. The validation of the discriminant function was obtained by developing the function on the first group then classifying the holdout group using the function. Data for the classification of the cases used in calculating the function and the classification of those held out are reported.

The first group of 115 usable responses was used to develop the discriminant function. The second group of 115 usable responses was used to validate the discriminant function. The classification of the cases used in calculating the function and the classification of those held out are reported.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

This chapter contains the findings from the analysis of the data for the 278 school superintendents who returned usable responses. The findings indicate how well the selected predictor variables do predict that a school system will provide an employee assistance program.

Table 3 provides a tally of the superintendents' responses to the survey questions requiring yes-no responses. The table reflects differences in the responses by EAP and non-EAP systems. The chi-square test of association indicates that there is a significant difference between EAP and non-EAP systems in their response to items 8 (collective bargaining), 31 (teacher organization has proposed), 32 (EAP is part of teacher contract), 34 (superintendent is change agent), and 35 (resources available for planned change). There is no association between item 33 (system has designated change agent) and the presence or absence of an employee assistance program.

These data indicate that school systems with EAPs are more likely than school systems without EAPs to have collective bargaining, to have a teachers' organization that proposed an EAP, and to have superintendents who identify

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Variables Requiring Yes-No Responses and Chi-Square Values for Relationships Between Presence of EAP Programs and Selected Variables

Item	Total				EAP				Non-EAP			
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
6. Has an EAP	105	37.8	173	62.2								
8. Collective bargaining ^a	143	58.4	102	41.6	66	72.5	25	27.5	77	50.0	77	50.0
31. Teacher organization ^b has proposed	120	44.1	152	55.9	58	56.9	44	43.1	62	36.5	108	63.5
32. EAP is part of teacher ^c contract	38	14.1	231	85.9	31	30.7	70	69.3	7	4.2	161	95.8
33. System has designated ^d change agent	241	89.3	29	10.7	91	88.3	12	11.7	150	89.8	17	10.2
34. Superintendent is change ^e agent	212	80.0	53	20.0	88	89.8	10	10.2	124	74.3	43	25.7
35. Resources available for ^f planned change	236	87.4	34	12.6	95	93.1	7	6.9	141	83.9	27	16.1

^aChi-square = 11.04, p. < .05

^bChi-square = 9.94, p. < .05

^cChi-square = 34.43, p. < .05

^dChi-square = .03, p. > .05

^eChi-square = 8.38, p. < .05

^fChi-square = 4.09, p. < .05

themselves as chief change agents for their systems and who feel they have adequate resources for making desired change.

Table 4 exhibits the frequencies, means, and standard deviations for items 25, 26, and 27, which compose the attitude scale, and items 28, 29, and 30, which compose the environment scale. The five responses for each item were combined into three categories for simplification: For the attitude scale, strongly agree and agree were combined into one category, strongly disagree and disagree were combined into a second category, and undecided became the third category. For the environment scale, many and some were combined into one category, few and none were combined into a second category, and undecided became the third category.

Although participating EAP superintendents more often agreed with the statements relating to attitude and environment, participating non-EAP superintendents also indicated agreement in large percentages. As can be seen in Table 4, both participating EAP and non-EAP superintendents agreed that EAPs increase employee performance and promote good employee relations. Item 27 indicates that most participating EAP superintendents felt EAPs are cost-effective, while the largest response from participating non-EAP superintendents was in the undecided category for this item. Items 28, 29, and 30 indicate participating EAP superintendents agreed more often than participating non-EAP

Table 4

Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Attitude and Environment Scales

	Attitude Scale ^a				Environment Scale ^b		
	(25) Increased Performance	(26) Promotes Good Relations	(27) Cost Effective		(28) Local Industrial Sponsorship	(29) Local Public Agency Sponsorship	(30) Local School System Sponsorship
EAP							
Strongly agree/ agree	90 (89.11)	92 (91.09)	78 (76.47)	Many/ some	76 (73.08)	66 (63.46)	43 (41.35)
Strongly disagree/ disagree	6 (5.94)	5 (4.95)	7 (6.86)	Few/ None	12 (11.54)	25 (24.04)	39 (37.50)
Undecided	5 (4.95)	4 (3.96)	17 (16.67)	Undecided	16 (15.38)	13 (12.50)	22 (21.15)
<u>M</u>	4.38	4.38	4.12	<u>M</u>	3.83	3.60	3.06
<u>SD</u>	.83	.82	.93	<u>SD</u>	.93	1.09	1.20
Non-EAP							
Strongly agree/ agree	120 (69.77)	113 (65.70)	72 (41.86)	Many/ some	81 (47.09)	46 (26.59)	41 (23.98)
Strongly disagree/ disagree	9 (5.23)	14 (8.14)	21 (12.21)	Few/ None	51 (29.65)	86 (49.71)	103 (60.23)
Undecided	43 (25.00)	45 (26.16)	79 (45.93)	Undecided	40 (23.26)	41 (23.70)	27 (15.79)
<u>M</u>	3.92	3.79	3.41	<u>M</u>	3.18	2.73	2.44
<u>SD</u>	.92	.91	.91	<u>SD</u>	.98	1.01	1.13

Note: Percentages are in parentheses. The attitude scale had a M = 11.70 and a SD = 2.37. The environment scale had a M = 9.13 and a SD = 2.74.

^a Item responses and weightings were strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, and undecided = 3.

^b Item responses and weightings were many = 5, some = 4, none = 1, few = 2, and undecided = 3.

superintendents that EAPs are present in local community organizations.

Table 5 denotes the average daily attendance of the reporting EAP units (16,822) is larger than the average daily attendance of the reporting non-EAP units (12,275). The reporting EAP units have a lower mean teacher salary (\$22,760) than the mean salary of the reporting non-EAP units (\$24,154).

Table 6 is a matrix of Pearson product-moment biserial correlation coefficients for wealth, size, and attitude, environment, and change with EAP presence/absence. The correlations between presence/absence of EAPs and size, attitude, environment, and change were statistically significant. The correlation between EAP presence/absence and the wealth variable was not statistically significant.

The DISCRIMINANT program in SPSSX was used to analyze the data. Subprogram Direct was applied. This procedure entered all predictor variables into the discriminant analysis at one time, and it permitted the estimation of the discriminative ability of the variables as a group and individually. Structure coefficients indicated the strength of the association between the predictors and the discriminant function. The unstandardized discriminant coefficients provided estimates of the amount of change in the discriminant score for a unit change in the predictor

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Size and Wealth Items

	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
(17-23) Size (Average Daily Attendance)			
Total Population	278	13,993	18,245.177
EAP No	173	12,275	16,501.653
EAP Yes	105	16,822	20,574.105
(12-16) Wealth (Average Teacher Salary)			
Total Population	278	\$23,628	7,240.346
EAP No	173	\$24,154	5,778.482
EAP Yes	105	\$22,760	9,120.340

Table 6

Pearson Product-Moment Biserial Correlation Coefficients for Relationships Between School Systems With and Without EAPs and the Variables of Wealth, Size, Superintendent's Attitude, Superintendent's Perception of Use of EAPs in the Environment, and Ability to Implement Change

	n	r
Wealth (Average Teacher Salary)	278	-.094
Size (Average Daily Attendance)	278	.121*
Attitude Scale	274	.359**
Environment Scale	277	.379**
Change Scale	270	.158**

* $p. < .05$. ** $p. < .01$.

variable. The structure coefficients and the unstandardized discriminant coefficients for discriminating between school systems with and without employee assistance programs may be found in Table 7.

Other statistics that helped in assessing the ability of the predictor variables to distinguish between the groups are the canonical correlation, tau, and the percentage of correctly classified cases. The canonical correlation coefficient is a measure of the association between the groups and the discriminant function. When this value is squared, it provides an estimate of the amount of variance in the discriminant function (in this case, there is only one function) accounted for by the groups. Tau provides a measure of the reduction in the amount of error in classifying cases into groups (see Appendix F for the formula for tau). The percentage of correctly classified cases based upon the discriminant function provides a clear-cut measure of the function's adequacy, particularly when the function is calculated on one set of data and that function is used to classify cases in a second set of data. This procedure was used in this study. The function was calculated on about half of the data, then this function was used to classify the remaining cases. Data for the classification of the cases used in calculating the function and the classification of those held out are reported in Table 8.

Table 7

Unstandardized Canonical Discriminant Coefficients and Structure Coefficients (N = 112)

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient	Structure Coefficient
Collective Bargaining for Employee Contracts	.361	.187
Wealth (Average Teacher Salary)	.000	-.167
Size (Average Daily Attendance)	.000	.194
Attitude Scale (Superintendent's Attitude Toward Employee Assistance Programs)	1.040	.822
Environment Scale (Popularity of Employee Assistance Programs in the Community)	.590	.701
Individual or Group Responsible for Planning	-.045	.035
Superintendent is Chief Change Agent	.200	.153
Resources Available for Planning Change	.343	.225
Constant	-6.836	

Note. The coefficients were calculated on approximately one-half of the usable cases (N = 112). The remainder of the usable cases (N = 115) was classified using the discriminant function calculated on these cases. A structure coefficient above .30 was considered meaningful.

Table 8

Classification of EAP and Non-EAP School Systems Using the Split-Validation Procedure

Actual Group Membership	Number of Cases Used in Calculating the Function	Predicted Group Membership			
		Non-EAP		EAP	
		<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Non-EAP	63	51	81.0	12	19.0
EAP	49	13	26.5	36	73.5
	—	—		—	
	112	64		48	

Percent Classified Correctly = 77.68%

Actual Group Membership	Number of Cases In Holdout Group	Predicted Group Membership			
		Non-EAP		EAP	
		<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Non-EAP	83	75	90.4	8	9.6
EAP	32	16	50.0	16	50.0
	—	—		—	
	115	91		24	

Percent Classified Correctly = 79.13%

Tau = .4814 (See Appendix F)

Since a sample was used in this study, a test of significance of the discriminant function was performed. The test used was Wilks' lambda. When lambda equals 1.0, the predictors do not discriminate between the groups. When lambda equals 0, the predictors are very effective in discriminating between the groups. The significance of lambda is determined by converting it into an approximation of chi-square (Table 9).

The square of the canonical correlation indicates that the groups account for 31.36% of the variance in the discriminant function. The predictors produced a lambda of .687 which is significant beyond the .00 level (Table 9). This means the predictors are effective in discriminating between the groups.

The structure coefficients for the environmental variable (.701) and the attitude variable (.822) are large enough (>.30) to be meaningful. All other variables had structure coefficients that did not exceed the .30 rule of thumb for considering coefficients as meaningful (Table 7).

Classification data indicate that the discriminant function correctly classified 77.68% of the cases used in the analysis and 79.13% of the cases held out for classification (Table 8). Tau indicated that the function was able to reduce classification error in the holdout group by 48.14%.

Table 9

Canonical Correlation, Lambda, Chi-Square, and Significance
for the Function Discriminating EAP from Non-EAP Systems

Number of Groups	2
Number of Subjects	112
Number of Discriminant Functions	1
Canonical Correlation	.560
Lamba	.687
Chi-Square for Lamba	39.821
df	8
Significance of Chi-Square	.00

Summary

Overall, the discriminant function is useful in predicting whether a school system will implement an employee assistance program. Using split samples, the function correctly classified over 79% of the cases in the holdout group. A τ of .4814 demonstrated that classification based on the discriminating variables made 48.14% fewer errors than would be expected by random assignment. Further, the groups accounted for about 31% of the variance in the discriminant function.

The best predictors of whether school systems will have an employee assistance program are whether the superintendent perceives that employee assistance programs exist in other organizations in the community environment and the superintendent's perception of the value of an employee assistance program (attitude). Other factors assessed by the study, including collective bargaining, system wealth, system size, and the system's ability to implement planned change were not found to be significant predictors of the presence of an employee assistance program in school systems.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND DISCUSSION

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study and its conclusions. A brief discussion is also included.

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to identify a set of variables that could be used to predict the type of school system which may provide an employee assistance program for its professional staff. The variables tested were identified by a review of existing literature on the subject.

The predictor variables, which were derived from the literature, were:

1. The school superintendent's perception of benefits received from the implementation of an employee assistance program as measured by the superintendent's response to questions regarding the ability of employee assistance program services to deal with specified personnel problems and concerns. This variable was referred to in the data analysis as "attitude."
2. The popularity of employee assistance programs in the community as measured by the superintendent's perception

of the extent to which employee assistance programs are employed in the community's agencies and organizations. This variable was referred to in the data analysis as "environment."

3. The influence of teachers' unions in the development of employee assistance programs as measured by the presence of a recognized bargaining unit.

4. The ability of the school system to pay for employee assistance program services as measured by the average annual salary of its classroom teachers. Average annual salary is a measure of a school system's wealth.

5. The size of the school system as measured by average daily attendance.

6. The ability of the school system to implement change.

The criterion variable for the study was whether or not a school system operates an employee assistance program.

The analysis consisted of data from 278 school superintendents who responded to the questionnaire from the 48 contiguous United States. Of the 278, 105 were in school systems that had employee assistance programs and 173 were in systems that did not have employee assistance programs.

The questionnaire mailed to the superintendents required responses to the items which assessed the variables stated above. They were asked to provide data on the size and wealth of the school system, the community environment, and the

personal attitude and perception of the superintendent regarding employee assistance programs.

Discriminant analysis was used to analyze the data. The discriminant analysis was the Direct method which entered all predictor variables at one time to determine the discriminative ability of the variables as a group and individually. Structure coefficients, unstandardized coefficients, canonical correlations, tau, and the percentage of correctly classified cases helped in assessing the ability of the predictor variables to distinguish between the groups. The discriminant function was calculated on about half of the data and this function was used to classify the remaining cases.

Discriminant analysis revealed that the best predictors of the presence of an employee assistance program were: (a) the superintendent's perception that employee assistance programs are popular in the community (this factor was labeled environment), and (b) the superintendent's attitude or perception that employee assistance programs are effective as a management tool (this factor was labeled attitude).

Conclusions

From the findings in this study, school systems which provide employee assistance programs and school systems that do not provide employee assistance programs do differ with

respect to some of the variables assessed. School systems that provide employee assistance programs have superintendents who feel more strongly than those who do not have employee assistance programs that employee assistance programs help them to deal with personnel problems.

School systems are more likely to have an employee assistance program if such programs are perceived by the superintendent to be popular in other agencies and organizations in the community. This variable suggests that community popularity is a means of assessing the likelihood of EAP presence in a school system.

The study determined that the variables of wealth (measured by average annual teacher salary), size (measured by average daily attendance), collective bargaining (measured by whether or not personnel contracts are collectively negotiated), and the ability to implement planned change (measured by superintendent's perception of the ability of the system to implement change) were not significant indicators of whether or not a school system has an employee assistance program. These variables were not significant in the discriminant analysis.

Discussion

Wealth, size, collective bargaining, and ability to implement planned change were anticipated to be significant

indications of EAP presence. The literature indicates that wealth, size, and collective bargaining are factors that encourage EAP development. These factors also seem to be very logical indicators of EAP presence. However, regardless of these variables, the superintendent's attitudes seem to be overpowering determinants of the implementation of an EAP. This is supported by this study which found that the superintendent's perception of program effectiveness and program popularity in the community were the only significant indicators.

The data show that superintendents in both categories, EAP and non-EAP, consider themselves to be the chief innovators in their systems (89.8% and 74.3% respectively). Therefore, if an employee assistance program is viewed by the superintendent as important, the chances of implementation are somewhat increased; if such a program is viewed as unimportant, the chances that it will be implemented are somewhat decreased. This is corroborated by the correlations between EAP implementation and the superintendents' perceptions of the effectiveness of EAPs and the superintendents' perceptions of the presence of EAPs in other community organizations. Both correlations were positive and significant (.359 and .379 respectively).

The data indicated that 89.11% of the EAP superintendents felt that EAPs enhance job performance and

91.09% felt EAPs improve employee relations. The review of literature suggests that many in business and industry are finding EAPs to be effective personnel management tools. The data indicated that many school superintendents also feel *EAPs are effective tools in personnel management.*

Recommendations

Conclusions of this study lead to recommendations that may be helpful to school system administrators as they face the decision of whether or not to invest in the development of an employee assistance program. In reviewing reasons why a school system has an employee assistance program, teachers and other interest groups must consider the factor of superintendent perception. If these groups are interested in initiating an EAP, convincing the superintendent of the value of the program is essential. The importance of securing the superintendent's support for program implementation is greatly emphasized by the findings of this report.

It should also be noted that state superintendents tended to name both EAP and non-EAP systems for the survey that were larger than average in size. Additional studies of this type should provide for securing a more random sampling of the school systems in the given population.

Superintendents who work in communities where employee assistance programs are popular in other agencies and institutions should consider that employee assistance program development may soon become an issue in the school system. The data clearly indicates that superintendents who perceive employee assistance programs to be popular in other community organizations tend to represent school systems that have employee assistance programs. By using community popularity as an indicator that EAPs may become a school system issue, the administrator could anticipate and plan for program development in a calculated and deliberate fashion.

This study generated a significant amount of data related to employee assistance programs from a nationwide survey. It is recommended that future research in this field of study take a case study approach, which will gather data the survey method was unable to tap, including the operational characteristics of successful school system programs.

Additional research in the area of employee assistance programs in public school systems is highly desirable. Questions should be answered concerning the specific benefits and services gained from a program in a school setting, the cost-effectiveness of the program, and appropriate administrative techniques for managing a program in a school system.

REFERENCES

- Ahern, J. (1983). A predominantly female professional work force: A multi-faceted approach. New York: New York City Board of Education.
- Ahern, J., & Gay, J. (1982). A municipal EAP that affects the community. Labor-Management Alcoholism Journal, 11, 189-191.
- Berman, P. (1981). Educational change: An implementation paradigm. In R. Lehming & M. Kane (Eds.), Improving Schools (pp. 253-286). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bierman, M. (1983). Characteristics of selected Wisconsin EAP's. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 85-89.
- Birkland, S. (1983). Staffing employee assistance programs. EAP Digest, 3(4), 24-28.
- Boettcher, J. (1983). The employee assistance program. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bohl, G., Brovarski, R., & O'Brien, M. (1982). Schools, communities, and EAP's. Labor-Management Alcoholism Journal, 12(1), 31-39.
- Burggrabe, J., & Swift, J. (1984). Evaluating your EAP: A practical approach. EAP Digest, 4(3), 12-18.
- Cahill, M. (1983). Tailoring EAP services. EAP Digest, 3(4), 32-36.
- Cameron, M. (1982). Employee assistance program: Impact on education. Unpublished manuscript.
- Comstock, D. (1983). Employee assistance programs: Current dimensions. EAP Digest, 3(4), 46-47.
- Corneil, W. (1983). Initiating a joint labor-management EAP. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 90-96.
- Dillman, D. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley.
- Education Commission of the States. (1983). Summary of major reports on education. Lincoln, NE: Author.

- Foote, A., & Erfurt, J. (1983). Evaluating an employee assistance program. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 46-59.
- Gaeta, E., Lynn, R., & Grey, L. (1983). AT and T looks at program evaluation. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 112-120.
- Godwin, D. (1980). Foreword in J. Wrich, The employee assistance program. Center City, MN: Hazelden Press.
- Googins, B., & Kurtz, N. (1983). The role of supervisors in occupational alcoholism intervention. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 17-21.
- Greenwood, M. (1983). Communicating EAP's. EAP Digest, 3(4), 30-32.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J., & Bernstein, M. (1971). Implementing organizational innovations. New York: Basic Books.
- Heller, S. (1984, May 16). More colleges offer programs to help employees cope with personal problems. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 21, 25.
- House, E. (1981). Three perspectives on innovation: Technological, political, and cultural. In R. Lehming & M. Kane (Eds.), Improving Schools (pp. 17-29). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (1982). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Random House.
- Klecka, W. (1980). Discriminant analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. New York: Archives of Psychology.
- McClellan, K. (1983). Changing EAP services. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 135-138.
- McGuire, W. (1979, November-December). Teacher burnout. Today's Education, p. 5.
- Minter, J. (1983). A contracted or in-house EAP? EAP Digest, 3(4), 20-24.

- Montgomery County, Maryland, Public Schools. (1982). An evaluation of the employee assistance program in the Montgomery County Schools. Unpublished manuscript.
- Moracco, J., & McFadden, J. (1983). The counselor's role in reducing teacher stress. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 549-552.
- Muldoon, J., & Bertie, M. (1980). Effective employee assistance. Minneapolis, MN: Comp Care.
- Myers, D. (1984). Measuring the cost effectiveness: Results and recommendations. EAP Digest, 4(3), 22-27.
- Scanlon, V. (1983). Trends in EAP's: Then and now. EAP Digest, 3(4), 36-40.
- Sergiovanni, T., & Carver, F. (1980). The new school executive. New York: Harper and Row.
- Sholette, R. (1983). Pre-program analysis and assessment. EAP Digest, 3(4), 17-20.
- Stewart, A. (1983). Increase utilization and develop skills through EAP training. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 124-128.
- Thorensen, R., Hosokawa, E., & Talcott, W. (1983). Reaching distressed faculty and staff. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 138-143.
- Vroom, V. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Walsh, D. (1979). Classroom stress and teacher burnout. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 253-254.
- Washousky, R., & Kruger, R. (1984). Evaluating employee assistance programs through supervisor follow up. EAP Digest, 4(3), 32-36.
- Witte, R., & Cannon, M. (1979). Employee assistance programs: Getting top management support. The Personnel Administrator, 32(4), 23-25.
- Wolfe, K. (1983). Identifying the impaired professional. EAP Digest Annual, 1, 96-100.
- Wrich, J. (1980). The employee assistance program. Center City, MN: Hazelden Press.

APPENDICES

Department of Education
July 5, 1963

Dear State Superintendent:

I am pleased to advise you that the first... of the... and... have been... to... This... will... the... of...

It is... that... of... will... to... the... of... and... (2) in... to... of... the... and... for... you... with...

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO STATE SUPERINTENDENTS

The enclosed... participate... Thank you for your assistance.

Martin Luther King, Jr.
Director

cc/...
.../...

College of Education

A&ES Division

July 3, 1985

Dear State Superintendent:

We are presently involved in studying the factors which relate to public school systems having employee assistance programs for their teaching staff. This study involves the implementation of a nationwide survey of selected school systems.

We hope that you can assist by simply naming eight (8) school units in your state that have employee assistance programs and eight (8) that do not. If you are not aware of units which have employee assistance programs, please return the form anyway within five (5) days. Results will be shared with you if you indicate an interest.

The successful completion of this study depends upon your participation. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Fred Mock
Project DirectorMartha Harder
Instructor

FM/MH/kl

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STATE SUPERINTENDENTS

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate eight school systems in your state which operate employee assistance programs for professional employees. Employee assistance programs are programmed services which provide professional counseling to employees in need of help in dealing with such personal problems as alcoholism, drug addiction, financial problems, marital discord, burnout, etc.

Name of System

Address

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

Please indicate eight systems in your state which do not offer employee assistance program services to employees.

Name of System

Address

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Dear Superintendent:

We are pleased to have you as a member of the study. We are sure that your participation will be most helpful. We are sure that your participation will be most helpful.

We hope that you will find the study interesting and helpful. We are sure that your participation will be most helpful.

We are sure that your participation will be most helpful. We are sure that your participation will be most helpful.

APPENDIX C

The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of your participation. **LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS**

Sincerely,

Red Fox
Project Director

Red Fox
Project Director

Thank you
for your participation

August 31, 1985

Dear School Superintendent:

We are presently involved in a research project at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University to study the factors related to the implementation of employee assistance programs in school systems. This is a nationwide study involving selected school districts.

We hope that you will be willing to share in our study by responding to the enclosed questionnaire and returning it within five (5) days. Approximately five minutes will be needed. All responses will be kept confidential. Questionnaires have been coded for follow-up purposes only. We will be glad to share the results of the study with you if you indicate an interest.

The successful completion of this study depends upon your participation. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Fred Mock
Project Director

Martha Harder
Instructor

FM/MH/kl

Enclosure

APPENDIX D
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUPERINTENDENTS

(17-21) SUPERINTENDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

For the purpose of this study, an employee assistance program is defined as "a program under the auspices of the school system which provides professional counseling for professional employees with personal problems which might affect their job performance." Keeping this definition in mind, please respond to the following questions or statements. (The numbers in parentheses identify items for data processing.)

GROUP A: CHECK OR FILL IN A RESPONSE FOR EACH QUESTION.

- (6) Does your school system have a formally established employee assistance program?
- No _____
- Yes _____
- (7) Does your school system plan to start an employee assistance program?
- No _____
- Yes _____
- (8) Do the teachers in your school system have a formally recognized bargaining unit?
- No _____
- Yes _____
- (9-11) If the teachers do have a formally recognized bargaining unit, which organization is it with?
- NEA _____
- AFT _____
- Other _____
- (12-16) What is the approximate average annual salary for teachers in your school system? (Do not include administrators.)
- \$ _____

(17-23) What is the average daily attendance of your school system?

(24) Is the average daily attendance an average membership figure?

No _____

Yes _____

GROUP B: FOR EACH OF THE NEXT THREE STATEMENTS, FILL IN THE BLANK AT THE BEGINNING OF THE STATEMENT USING THE SCALE OF:

- 1 = Strongly Agree
- 2 = Agree
- 3 = Undecided
- 4 = Disagree
- 5 = Strongly Disagree

(25) _____ An employee assistance program is an effective way of enhancing employee performance on the job.

(26) _____ An employee assistance program enhances positive employee relations when handling problems of troubled personnel than more traditional options, including termination, supervisor reprimand, and ignoring the situation.

(27) _____ An employee assistance program is a cost effective management tool.

GROUP C: FOR EACH OF THE NEXT THREE STATEMENTS, FILL IN THE BLANK AT THE BEGINNING OF THE STATEMENT USING THE SCALE OF:

- 1 = Many
- 2 = Some
- 3 = Undecided
- 4 = Few
- 5 = None

(28) _____ Industries in the community sponsor employee assistance programs for their employees.

- (29) _____ Public agencies in the community sponsor employee assistance programs for their employees.
- (30) _____ Neighboring school systems provide employee assistance programs for their employees.

GROUP D: FOR EACH OF THE REMAINING STATEMENTS, PLEASE RESPOND BY ANSWERING YES OR NO:

- (31) _____ The local teachers' organization has proposed the development of an employee assistance program for teachers.
- (32) _____ There is an item in the current teachers' contract that requires an employee assistance program.
- (33) _____ The school system administration has an individual or group of individuals responsible for long range, comprehensive planning.
- (34) _____ The superintendent is the chief innovator or change agent in the system.
- (35) _____ The superintendent has the resources to plan change and to follow up on these plans.

THANK YOU!

PLEASE RETURN TO: FRED MOCK
ROUTE 3, BOX 75
LEXINGTON, NC 27292

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY, PLEASE LET ME HAVE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS. THIS PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE REMOVED PRIOR TO THE ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO ENSURE ANONYMITY.

NAME _____
SCHOOL SYSTEM _____
ADDRESS _____

September 27, 1944

Dear Mr. [Name]

I am sorry that I have not been able to get the material you requested in the past few days. The material is now being prepared and should be ready in a few days. I will get the material together for you as soon as possible and will let you know when it is ready.

I am sure that you will find the material of interest and will appreciate it very much.

Sincerely,
[Name]

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

85

September 27, 1985

Dear Superintendent:

A few weeks ago I sent a Superintendents' Questionnaire to you requesting that you complete it and return it to me. If you have recently completed and returned it, thank you. If you have not had time to fill out the questionnaire, may I ask that you please take a few minutes to complete and return it.

Your assistance is needed for me to gather the necessary data for my study. It will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Fred Mock

APPENDIX F

CALCULATION OF TAU

The calculation of tau was as follows

$$\text{tau} = \frac{n_c - \sum_{i=1}^g p_i n_i}{n. - \sum_{i=1}^g p_i n_i}$$

Where n_c = number of cases correctly classified

p_i = prior probability of group membership

$n.$ = total number of cases

n_i = number of cases in group i

g = number of groups

(Klecka, 1980, p. 51)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tau} &= \frac{91 - [(.72 \times 83) + (.28 \times 32)]}{115 - [(.72 \times 83) + (.28 \times 32)]} \\ &= .4814 \end{aligned}$$

TABLE III

ALABAMA

Name of School System	Address	City	State
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama

APPENDIX G

LIST OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS SELECTED FOR SAMPLE

Name of School System	Address	City	State
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama
Alabama State Board of Education	100 North State Street	Montgomery	Alabama

MAILING LIST

ALABAMAEAP

Birmingham Board of Education
2015 Park Place
Birmingham, Alabama

Mobile County Public Schools
A1430 Courthouse
Birmingham, Alabama

Huntsville City Schools
P.O. Box 1256
Huntsville, Alabama

Bessemer Public Schools
P.O. Box 1440
Bessemer, Alabama

Dothan County Public Schools
P.O. Box 3894
Dothan, Alabama

NON-EAP

Randolph County Schools
310 Central Avenue
Wedonee, Alabama

Lowndes County Schools
P.O. Box 442
Waynesville, Alabama

Russell Public Schools
15 Seals Street
Russell, Alabama

Henry County Schools
Edwin Road
Abbeville, Alabama

Dale County Schools
120 Avon Road
Ozark, Alabama

ARIZONAEAP

Glendale Elem School District 40
9451 North 65th Avenue
Glendale, Arizona

Tempe Union High School District
500 West Guadalupe
Tempe, Arizona

Mesa Public School District
549 North Stapley Drive
Mesa, Arizona

Alhambra School District 68
3001 West Hazelwood
Phoenix, Arizona

Yuma School District
1463 E. Pima Street
Yuma, Arizona

NON-EAP

Tempe Elem School District
3205 South Rural Road
Tempe, Arizona

Phoenix Elem Sch District
125 East Lincoln
Phoenix, Arizona

Roosevelt Sch District 66
6000 South 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona

Tuba City Sch District 15
P.O. Box 67
Tuba City, Arizona

McNeal Elem Sch District
24A N. Main
McNeal, Arizona

ARKANSASEAP

Pulaski County School District
1500 Dixon Road
Little Rock, Arkansas

Fort Smith School District
P.O. Box 1384
Fort Smith, Arkansas

Harrison School District
400 South Sycamore Street
Harrison, Arkansas

Independence School District
Box 97
Batesville, Arkansas

Newport School District
Rommel Park
Newport, Arkansas

NON-EAP

Crossett School District
301 West Ninth Avenue
Crossett, Arkansas

Clay School District
P.O. Box 3670
Rector, Arkansas

School District
P.O. Box 368
Dermott, Arkansas

Brinkley School District
800 South Main
Arkansas

Pine Bluff Independent Sch
P.O. Box 7678
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

CALIFORNIAEAP

Los Angeles County Schools
9300 East Imperial Highway
Downey, California

Merced County Dept of Education
632 West 13th Street
Merced, California

Kern Union High School District
2000 24th Street
Bakersfield, California

Chino Unified School District
5130 Riverside Drive
Chino, California

Azusa Unified School District
P.O. Box 500
Azusa, California

NON-EAP

Bellflower School District
16703 South Clark Avenue
Bellflower, California

Moreno Valley Sch District
13911 Perris Blvd.
Sunnymead, California

Simi Valley Sch District
875 East Cochran Street
Simi Valley, California

Anaheim City Sch District
412 East Broadway
Anaheim, California

Hayward School District
2441 Amado School
Hayward, California

COLORADOEAP

Pueblo School District
Vineland Blvd.
Pueblo, Colorado

Colorado Springs Public School
P.O. Box 46818
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Denver Public Schools
900 Grant Street
Denver, Colorado

Boulder School District
Box 2362
Boulder, Colorado

Jefferson County Public Schools
1215 Quail Street
Lakewood, Colorado

NON-EAP

Adams County District 50
4476 West 86th Avenue
Westminster, Colorado

Delta County Sch District
765-2075 Road
Delta, Colorado

District No 6 Weld County
811 15th Street
Greeley, Colorado

School District 11
1115 North El Paso Street
Colorado Springs, Colorado

El Paso County District 6
400 West Alabama
Fountain, Colorado

CONNECTICUTEAP

Bristol Public Schools
P.O. Box 450
Bristol, Connecticut

Hamden Public Schools
1450 Whitney Avenue
Hamden, Connecticut

Fairfield Public Schools
P.O. Box 220
Fairfield, Connecticut

Clinton Board of Education
112 Glenwood Road
Clinton, Connecticut

Stratford Public Schools
1000 East Broadway
Stratford, Connecticut

NON-EAP

Manchester Public Schools
45 North School Street
Manchester, Connecticut

Windsor Board of Education
150 Bloomfield Avenue
Windsor, Connecticut

Meriden Board of Education
Room 135-City Hall
Meriden, Connecticut

Greenwich Bd of Education
Greenwich Avenue
Greenwich, Connecticut

Wethersfield Bd of Educ
222 Main Street
Wethersfield, Connecticut

DELAWAREEAP

Milford School District
115 Ledford Street
Milford, Delaware

Brookside Park Schools
906 Lakeview Avenue
Brookside, Delaware

Odessa School District
P.O. Box 134
Odessa, Delaware

Cape Henlopen School District
P.O. Box 441
Nassau, Delaware

Woodbridge School District
120 Edgewood Avenue
Bridgeville, Delaware

NON-EAP

Rodney Village Schools
Draw 104
Rodney Village, Delaware

Willow Grove Public Sch
330 East Mine
Willow Grove, Delaware

Leipsic Public Schools
Route 1
Leipsic, Delaware

Millsboro School District
4336 East Race Street
Millsboro, Delaware

Frankford School District
P.O. Box 286
Frankford, Delaware

FLORIDAEAP

School Board of Lee County
2055 Central Avenue
Fort Meyers, Florida

Orange County School Board
434 North Tampa Avenue
Orlando, Florida

School Board of Brevard County
3205 South Washington Avenue
Titusville, Florida

St. Lucie County School District
2909 Delaware Avenue
Fort Pierce, Florida

Dubal County School Board
1701 Prudential Drive
Jacksonville, Florida

NON-EAP

School Bd of Pinellas Co
P.O. Box 4688
Clearwater, Florida

Orange County Public Sch
P.O. Box 271
Orlando, Florida

School Bd of Pasco County
2609 U.S. Highway 41 N
Land O'Lakes, Florida

Clay County School Board
P.O. Box 488
Greencove Springs, Florida

Dixie County Sch Board
Shamrock, Florida

GEORGIAEAP

Atlanta City School District
210 Pryor Street, SW
Atlanta, Georgia

Chatham County Schools
208 Bull Street
Savannah, Georgia

Clarke County Schools
500 College Avenue
Athens, Georgia

DeKalb County Schools
3770 North Decatur Road
Decatur, Georgia

Cobb County Schools
P.O. Box 1088
Marietta, Georgia

NON-EAP

Gwinnett County Schools
52 Gwinnett Drive
Lawrenceville, Georgia

Henry County Schools
396 Tomlinson Street
McDonough, Georgia

Glynn County Schools
P.O. Box 1677
Brunswick, Georgia

Bibb County Schools
Box 6157
Macon, Georgia

Dalton City Schools
P.O. Box 1408
Dalton, Georgia

IDAHOEAP

Idaho Falls School District
P.O. Box 1224
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Ucon Schools
P.O. Box 56
Ucon, Idaho

Clark County School District
P.O. Box 237
Boise, Idaho

Bonneville County Sch District
690 Adams Boulevard
Bonneville, Idaho

Snake River School District
103 South Street
Blackfoot, Idaho

NON-EAP

Bear Lake County Schools
6970 Jackson Street
Montpelier, Idaho

Weizer Public Sch District
925 Pioneer Rd.
Weizer, Idaho

Butte County School Dist
P.O. Box 700
Butte City, Idaho

Teton School District
Route 4
Driggs, Idaho

Mountain Home School Dist
P.O. Box 890
Mountain Home, Idaho

IOWAEAP

Waterloo Community Schools
1516 Washington Street
Waterloo, Iowa

Dubuque Community Schools
2300 Chaney Road
Dubuque, Iowa

Bettendorf Community Schools
635 21st Street
Bettendorf, Iowa

Sioux City Schools
1221 Pierce Street
Sioux City, Iowa

Fort Dodge Schools
3300 First Avenue North
Fort Dodge, Iowa

NON-EAP

Ottumwa Community Schools
401 North Market
Ottumwa, Iowa

Lewis Central Schools
1600 E. S. Omaha Bridge Rd
Council Bluffs, Iowa

Des Moines Ind Schools
1800 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa

Jackson School District
Route 3
Maqueska, Iowa

Scott Independent Schools
165 Briggs Street
Bettendorf, Iowa

ILLINOISEAP

Community High Sch District 218
5933 West 115th Street
Worth, Illinois

Main Township High School
District 207
1131 South Dee Road
Park Ridge, Illinois

Crete-Monee School District 201-U
1742 Dixie Highway
Crete, Illinois

Community Consol Sch District 54
524 East Schaumburg Road
Schaumburg, Illinois

Community Unit Sch District 220
310 James
Barrington, Illinois

NON-EAP

High School District 155
45 Franklin
Crystal Lake, Illinois

Township High School
District 214
799 West Kensington Road
Mount Prospect, Illinois

Bloomington Public Schools
Box 249
Bloomington, Illinois

Decatur Public Sch Dist 61
101 West Cerro Gordo St
Decatur, Illinois

Addison School District 4
222 North Kennedy Drive
Addison, Illinois

INDIANAEAP

MSD of Warren Township
9301 East 18th Street
Indianapolis, Indiana

Lafayette School Corporation
2213 Alpena Court
Lafayette, Indiana

School District City of Hammond
5935 Hohman Avenue
Hammond, Indiana

Indianapolis Public Schools 120
120 East Walnut Street
Indianapolis, Indiana

East Allen County School Corp
Route 3, Box 395
Grabill, Indiana

NON-EAP

Fayette County School Corp
P.O. Box 425
Connersville, Indiana

New Castle Community Sch
522 Elliott Avenue
New Castle, Indiana

Fort Wayne Community Sch
1230 South Clinton Street
Fort Wayne, Indiana

Brown Public Schools
Route 2, Box 12
Nashville, Indiana

Salem City Schools
P.O. Box 2360
Salem City, Indiana

KANSASEAP

Geary County Unified Sch Dist 475
P.O. Box 370
Junction City, Kansas

Shawnee Mission Public Schools
7235 Antioch
Shawnee Mission, Kansas

Kansas City School District 500
625 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City, Kansas

Wichita Public Schools
428 South Broadway
Wichita, Kansas

Parsons District Schools
2900 Southern
Parsons, Kansas

NON-EAP

Unified Sch District 497
2017 Louisiana
Lawrence, Kansas

Alton Public School Dist
Box 92
Alton, Kansas

Cummings School District
360 East Railway
Cummings, Kansas

Anderson School District
1401 Foster Drive
Garnett, Kansas

Kingman Public Schools
Route 2, Box 340
Kingman, Kansas

KENTUCKYEAP

Fayette County Board of Education
701 East Main
Lexington, Kentucky

Jefferson County Schools
3332 Newburg Road
Louisville, Kentucky

Jackson County Schools
P.O. Box 217
McKee, Kentucky

Washington County Schools
P.O. Box 192
Springfield, Kentucky

Nelson County Schools
114 South Third Street
Bardstown, Kentucky

NON-EAP

Floyd School District
Route 1, Box 1130
Floyd, Kentucky

Leslie County Schools
P.O. Box 949
Hyden, Kentucky

Boyd County Schools
P.O. Tox 522
Castlebury, Kentucky

Powell County Schools
P.O. Box 5
Staunton, Kentucky

Boyle County Schools
P.O. Box 302
Danville, Kentucky

LOUISIANAEAP

Jefferson Parish School Board
519 Huey P. Long Avenue
Gretna, Louisiana

Calcasieu Parish School Board
1724 Kirkman Street
Lake Charles, Louisiana

St. Bernard Parish School Board
Chalmette Circle
Chalmette, Louisiana

Lafayette Parish School Board
P.O. Box 2158
Lafayette, Louisiana

East Baton Rouge Parish Sch Board
P.O. Box 2950
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

NON-EAP

Quachita Parish Schools
P.O. Box 1642
Monroe, Louisiana

Acadia Parish School Board
P.O. Box 309
Crowley, Louisiana

St. Martin Parish Sch Bd
111 Courtville Street
Breaux Bridge, Louisiana

Saint James Parish Schools
Drawer 11
Saint James, Louisiana

Pearl River Schools
P.O. Box 142
Pearl River, Louisiana

MAINEEAP

Cooper Mills Public Schools
P.O. Box 580
Cooper, Maine

Portland School District
371 Veranda Street
Portland, Maine

School District 41
41 West Main Street
Milo, Maine

Kennebec County School District
P.O. Box 67
Augusta, Maine

Bangor Schools
Route 49
Bangor, Maine

NON-EAP

Consolidated School Dist 8
P.O. Box 1245
East Holden, Maine

Hancock Schools
Route 1
Surry, Maine

Sanford Schools
265 Main Street
Sanford, Maine

Amherst Schools
R.F.D. 2
Amherst, Maine

Franklin School District
Winslow, Maine

MARYLANDEAP

Montgomery County Public Schools
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland

Baltimore City Public Schools
3 East 25th Street
Baltimore, Maryland

Bd of Education of Frederick Co
115 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland

Bd of Educ of Baltimore Co
6901 North Charles Street
Towson, Maryland

Public Sch of Anne Arundel Co
2644 Riva Road
Annapolis, Maryland

NON-EAP

Bd of Educ of Calvert Co
Dares Beach Road
Prince Frederick, Maryland

Prince George County Sch
P.O. Drawer 120
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dorchester Co Public Sch
700 Glasgow Street
Cambridge, Maryland

Hartford County Pub Sch
45 East Gordon Street
Bel Air, Maryland

Kent County Public Schools
Washington Avenue
Chestertown, Maryland

MASSACHUSETTSEAP

Wellesley Public Schools
12 Seaward Road
Wellesley, Massachusetts

Belmont Public Schools
644 Pleasant Street
Belmont, Massachusetts

New Bedford School Department
455 County Street
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Bedford Public Schools
Mudge Way
Bedford, Massachusetts

Springfield Public Schools
P.O. Box 1410
Springfield, Massachusetts

NON-EAP

Needham Public Schools
1330 Highland Avenue
Needham, Massachusetts

Acton-Boxborough Regional
School District
16 Charter Road
Acton, Massachusetts

Brookline Public Schools
333 Washington Street
Brookline, Massachusetts

Washington Public Schools
Eastport, Massachusetts

Columbia Falls Schools
Columbia Falls,
Massachusetts

MICHIGANEAP

Saginaw Public Schools
550 Millard
Saginaw, Michigan

Highland Park School District
20 Bartlett Street
Highland Park, Michigan

L'Anse Creuse Public Schools
36737 Jefferson Avenue
Mt. Clemens, Michigan

Flint Community Schools
923 East Kearsley Street
Flint, Michigan

Livonia Public Schools
15125 Farmington Road
Livonia, Michigan

NON-EAP

Warren Woods Public Sch
27100 Schoenherr Road
Warren, Michigan

Ottawa Area Int Sch Dist
12565 Port Sheldon Road
Holland, Michigan

Clarkston Community Sch
6389 Clarkston Road
Clarkston, Michigan

Bloomfield Hills Sch Dist
4175 Andover
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Grand Rapids Public Sch
143 Bostic Avenue, NE
Grand Rapids, Michigan

MINNESOTAEAP

Independent School District 31
15th and Beltrami
Bemidji, Minnesota

Independent School District 284
P.O. Box 600
Wayzata, Minnesota

Independent School District 412
628 Roosevelt Road
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Special Int School Dist 916
330 Century Avenue
White Bear Lake, Minnesota

Renville Schools
Olivia, Minnesota

NON-EAP

Minnetonka Public Schools
261 School Avenue
Excelsior, Minnesota

Independent Sch Dist 200
9th and Vermillion Street
Hastings, Minnesota

Independent Sch Dist 196
8900 Portland Avenue South
Bloomington, Minnesota

Rochester School Dist 535
Coffman Building
Rochester, Minnesota

Fillmore Independent Sch
Preston, Minnesota

MISSISSIPPIEAP

McComb Public Schools
P.O. Box 868
McComb, Mississippi

Jones County Schools
Route 4, Box 642-A
Ellisville, Mississippi

Jackson Public Schools
662 South President Street
Jackson, Mississippi

Hinds County Public Schools
P.O. Box 100
Raymond, Mississippi

Clairborne County Public Schools
P.O. Box 337
Port Gibson, Mississippi

NON-EAP

Lafayette County Sch Dist
P.O. Box 110
Oxford, Mississippi

Greene County Schools
P.O. Box 1660
Leaksville, Mississippi

Jackson County Schools
Box 104
Wade, Mississippi

Canton City Schools
Route 14, Box 69
Canton, Mississippi

DeSota Public Schools
Box 341
DeSota, Mississippi

MISSOURIEAP

Perry County School District 32
College & Edwards Streets
Perryville, Missouri

North Kansas City Sch District
2000 N. E. 46th Street
Kansas City, Missouri

Rockwood School District
111 East North Street
Eureka, Missouri

Belton School District 124
315 Colbern
Belton, Missouri

Consolidated School District 2
10500 East 60th Terrace
Raytown, Missouri

NON-EAP

Park Hill R-5 School Dist
7703 N. W. Barry Road
Kansas City, Missouri

St. Louis Public Schools
911 Locust Street
St. Louis, Missouri

Independence Public Sch
1231 South Windsor
Independence, Missouri

Kirkwood R-7 Sch District
1110 South Glenwood
Kirkwood, Missouri

School Dist City of La Due
9703 Conway Road
St. Louis, Missouri

MONTANAEAP

Bozeman Schools
P.O. Box 520
Bozeman, Montana

Garfield School District
New Avon Park
Jordan, Montana

Helena School District
P.O. Box 5417
Helena, Montana

School District 10
P.O. Box 1281
Anaconda, Montana

Fergus School District
215 7th Avenue
Lewistown, Montana

NON-EAP

Blaine School District
Chinook, Montana

Meagher School District
White Sulfur Springs,
Montana

Richland School District
121 5th Street
Sidney, Montana

Malta School District
P.O. Box 670
Malta, Montana

Musselshell Sch District
Route 9
Roundup, Montana

NEBRASKAEAP

Omaha Public Schools
3902 Davenport Street
Omaha, Nebraska

Sch Dist of Grand Island No. 2
615 North Elm Street
Grand Island, Nebraska

Lincoln Public Schools
720 South 22nd Street
Lincoln, Nebraska

Westside Community Schools
909 South 7th Street
Omaha, Nebraska

Millard Public Schools
12801 "L" Street
Millard, Nebraska

NON-EAP

Cedar Public Schools
1480 Ready Street
Hartington, Nebraska

Holt School District
P.O. Box 270
Atkinson, Nebraska

York School District
P.O. Box 1440
Tarnau, Nebraska

Logan Public Schools
Light Road
Stapleton, Nebraska

Cherry Public Schools
P.O. Box 1010
Wells, Nebraska

NEVADAEAP

Overton Schools
Box 19
Overton, Nevada

Lyon County Schools
P.O. Box 970
Carson, Nevada

Clark County Schools
East Flamingo Road
Las Vegas, Nevada

Pershing School District
P.O. Box 389
Lovelock, Nevada

Douglas County Sch District
P.O. Box 1888
Menden, Nevada

NON-EAP

East Ely School District
P.O. Box 1600
East Ely, Nevada

Lincoln County Schools
P.O. Box 118
Kanka, Nevada

Lander School District
P.O. Box 1300
Battle Mountain, Nevada

Elko School District
P.O. Box 1012
Elko, Nevada

McGill School District
P.O. Box 46
McGill, Nevada

NEW HAMPSHIREEAP

Conway School District
P.O. Box 650
North Conway, New Hampshire

Alton School District
P.O. Box 200
Center Barnstead, New Hampshire

Winnisquam Regional Sch Dist
P.O. Box 709
Tilton, New Hampshire

Nashau School District
6 Main Street
Nashau, New Hampshire

Cheimsford Public Schools
29 Dunbarton Drive
Nashau, New Hampshire

NON-EAP

Hillsboro Public Schools
E. Carol Avenue
Hillsboro, New Hampshire

Orleans School District
P.O. Box 88
Newport, New Hampshire

Strafford School District
P.O. Box 590
Dover, New Hampshire

Colebrook Schools
Route 1
Colebrook, New Hampshire

Rutland School District
14 Reid Street
Rutland, New Hampshire

NEW JERSEYEAP

Trenton Falls Schools
961 Sycamore Avenue
Trenton Falls, New Jersey

Union Co Regional High School
Mountain Avenue
Springfield, New Jersey

East Windsor Reg School District
384 Stockton Street
Highstown, New Jersey

Marlboro Township Public Schools
1980 Township Drive
Marlboro, New Jersey

Teaneck Board of Education
1 West Forest Avenue
Teaneck, New Jersey

NON-EAP

Hamilton Township Schools
90 Park Avenue
Hamilton Square,
New Jersey

Newark Board of Education
2 Cedar Street
Newark, New Jersey

Princeton Regional Schools
25 Valley Road
Princeton, New Jersey

Camden Public Schools
Room 511 City Hall
Camden, New Jersey

Tenafly Public Schools
500 Telafly Road
Tenafly, New Jersey

NEW MEXICOEAP

Bloomfield Municipal Schools
P.O. Box 157
Bloomfield, New Mexico

Des Moines Municipal Schools
P.O. Box 38
Des Moines, New Mexico

Espanola Municipal Schools
P.O. Box 249
Espanola, New Mexico

Eunice Municipal Schools
P.O. Box 128
Eunice, New Mexico

Hondo Valley Public Schools
P.O. Box 55
Hondo, New Mexico

NON-EAP

Los Alamos Public Schools
P.O. Drawer 90
Los Alamos, New Mexico

Magdalena Municipal Sch
P.O. Box 24
Magdalena, New Mexico

Moriarty Municipal Sch
P.O. Box 20
Moriarty, New Mexico

Mosquero Municipal Schools
P.O. Box 258
Mosquero, New Mexico

Portales Municipal Schools
P.O. Box 779
Portales, New Mexico

NEW YORKEAP

Albany City Schools
Academy Park
Albany, New York

New York City Board of Education
65 Court Street
New York, New York

Port Chester School District
Box 246
Port Chester, New York

Great Neck Public Schools
11 Heckley Lane
Great Neck, New York

Yonkers City Schools
C145 Palmer Road
Yonkers, New York

NON-EAP

Pittsfield Central Schools
Sutherland Street
Pittsfield, New York

Seaford Union Free Schools
1600 Washington Road
Seaford, New York

Johnstown City Schools
501 Glebe Street
Johnstown, New York

Plainedge Schools
Hicksville Road
Bethpage, New York

Corning City Schools
163 Charles Street
Painted Post, New York

NORTH CAROLINAEAP

Charlotte Mecklenberg Schools
P.O. Box 3025
Charlotte, North Carolina

Forsyth County Schools
P.O. Box 2513
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Wake County Schools
P.O. Box 28041
Raleigh, North Carolina

Greensboro City Schools
Drawer V
Greensboro, North Carolina

Granville County Schools
Box 927
Oxford, North Carolina

NON-EAP

Brunswick County Schools
Highway 133
Southport, North Carolina

Pitt County Schools
P.O. Box 1717
Greenville, North Carolina

Cumberland County Schools
P.O. Box 2357
Fayetteville,
North Carolina

Hickory City Schools
432 4th Avenue
Hickory, North Carolina

Burke County Schools
Drawer 989
Morganton, North Carolina

NORTH DAKOTAEAP

McHenry County Schools
Route 18
Towner, North Dakota

Ramsey School District
P.O. Box 497
Devils Lake, North Dakota

Maddock Public Schools
P.O. Box 189
Maddock, North Dakota

Fargo Public Schools
71 Lake Street
Fargo, North Dakota

Stutman School District
P.O. Box 112
Jamestown, North Dakota

NON-EAP

Wells School District
Harvey, North Dakota

Oliver School District
P.O. Box 28
Center, North Dakota

Griggs School District
1412 Hand Road
Cooperville, North Dakota

Pierce County Schools
P.O. Box 101
Balta, North Dakota

Logan School District
Box 24
Napoleon, North Dakota

OHIOEAP

Brookville Local Schools
Summer Road
Dayton, Ohio

Mahoning School Office
Canfield, Ohio

Kent City Schools
321 Depster Road
Kent, Ohio

Northmont School District
4001 Old Salem Road
Englewood, Ohio

Tallmadge City Schools
486 East Avenue
Tallmadge, Ohio

NON-EAP

Englewood City District
Box 96
Englewood, Ohio

Elyria City Sch District
Box 1490
Elyria, Ohio

Fairborn City Schools
306 E. Whitman Street
Fairborn, Ohio

Websterville City Schools
Box 61
Websterville, Ohio

Mansfield Local Sch Dist
P.O. Box 1448
Mansfield, Ohio

OKLAHOMAEAP

Oklahoma City Public Schools
Box 900
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Tulsa Public Schools
P.O. Box 4740208
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Lanton Public Schools
P.O. Box 124
Lanton, Oklahoma

Jenks First Independent Sch Dist
First and Blair St.
Jenks, Oklahoma

McAlester Public Schools
P.O. Box 71
McAlester, Oklahoma

NON-EAP

Ada School District
P.O. Box 16
Ada, Oklahoma

Stillwater City Schools
Route 1, Box 6
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Shawnee School District
326 N. Union
Shawnee, Oklahoma

Dunbar Schools
P.O. Box 40
Dunbar, Oklahoma

Delaware County Schools
P.O. Box 388
Jay, Oklahoma

OREGONEAP

Portland School District
Box 3107
Portland, Oregon

Marion Education District
26 East Ridge Street
Salem, Oregon

Centennial School District
P.O. Box 2984
Portland, Oregon

Reynolds School District
1424 N.E. Avenue
Troutdale, Oregon

Eugene School District
200 N. Monroe
Eugene, Oregon

NON-EAP

Beaverton Schools
P.O. Box 271
Beaverton, Oregon

Tigard Public Schools
Box 540
Tigard, Oregon

Gresham Graded Schools
1331 N.W. Eastman Parkway
Gresham, Oregon

Summerfield Union Schools
P.O. Box 693
Summerfield, Oregon

Lake School District
28 West Rook Lane
Paisley, Oregon

PENNSYLVANIAEAP

Upper St. Clair School
1820 McLaughlin Run Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Pine Richland Schools
4046 Ewalt Road
Gibsonia, Pennsylvania

Alleghany Intermediate Unit
200 Commerce Ct. Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Philadelphia School District
Parkway at 21st
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Shaler Area Schools
1800 Mr. Royal Blvd.
Glenshaw, Pennsylvania

NON-EAP

Steel Valley Schools
E. Oliver Road
Munhall, Pennsylvania

West Jefferson Hills Sch
Box 18019
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Bensalem Twp Schools
3000 Donallen Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Manheim School District
Drawer 40
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

State College School Dist
State College,
Pennsylvania

RHODE ISLANDEAP

Cranston School Department
845 Park Avenue
Cranston, Rhode Island

Warwick School Department
34 Warwick Lake Avenue
Warwick, Rhode Island

Arcadia School Department
P.O. Box 45
Arcadia, Rhode Island

Manville School District
Manville, Rhode Island

Newport School Department
200 Merry Avenue
Newport, Rhode Island

NON-EAP

Harmony School District
16 East Brooks Street
Harmony, Rhode Island

Clayville School District
P.O. Box 670
Clayville, Rhode Island

Summit School Department
4 Woodman Road
Summit, Rhode Island

Wood River School District
Route 3, Box 8
Wood River, Rhode Island

Westerly School Department
28 Chestnut Street
Westerly, Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINAEAP

Berkeley County Schools
P.O. Box 608
Moncks Corner, South Carolina

Horry County Schools
P.O. Box 1739
Conway, South Carolina

Lexington County Schools
715 Ninth Street
West Columbia, South Carolina

Fairfield County Schools
P.O. Box 622
Winnsboro, South Carolina

School Dist of Greenville Co.
P.O. Box 2848
Greenville, South Carolina

NON-EAP

Oconee School District
Box 220
Walhalla, South Carolina

Orangeburg City Schools
578 Ellis Avenue
Orangeburg, South Carolina

Sch District of Kershaw Co
Clyde Walton Educ Building
Camden, South Carolina

Georgetown Public Schools
P.O. Box 690
Georgetown, South Carolina

Hampton School Unit
Drawer 10
Hampton, South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTAEAP

Cissetor School District
502 E. Mable
Roberts, South Dakota

Sioux Falls School District
201 East 38th Street.
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Miller School District
P.O. Box 257
Miller, South Dakota

Watertown School District
200 State Street
Watertown, South Dakota

Turner School District
Route 1
Hurley, South Dakota

NON-EAP

Flandreau School District
600 W. First Avenue
Flandreau, South Dakota

Hughes School District
Pierre, South Dakota

Milbank School District
P.O. Box 1001
Milbank, South Dakota

Freeman School District
P.O. Box 57
Freeman, South Dakota

Mitchell Indep Sch Dist
Beloit, South Dakota

TEXASEAP

Dallas ISD
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas

Houston ISD
3830 Richmond
Houston, Texas

San Antonio ISD
141 Lavaca Street
San Antonio, Texas

Fort Worth ISD
3210 W. Lancaster
Fort Worth, Texas

El Paso ISD
Box 20100
El Paso, Texas

NON-EAP

Corpus Christi ISD
Box 110
Corpus Christi, Texas

San Benito Local Sch Dist
195 West Alameda Street
San Benito, Texas

Tyler Independent Schools
Box 2035
Tyler, Texas

Somerville Schools
Drawer 5
Somerville, Texas

Hooks Ind School District
Box 75561
Hooks, Texas

UTAHEAP

Provo United School District
280 West, 940 North
Provo, Utah

Grand Public School District
P.O. Box 304
Moab, Utah

Salt Lake City School District 1
44 East, 15 South
Salt Lake City, Utah

Emery Public Schools
130 N.W.
Castle Dale, Utah

Richfield School System
Box 17
Richfield, Utah

NON-EAP

Huntington School District
P.O. Box 179
Huntington, Utah

Mayfield School District
Route 5
Mayfield, Utah

Park City School District
P.O. Box 68310
Park City, Utah

Sigurd Ind School Dist
Highway 248
Sunset, Utah

Carbon Schools
City Building
Helper, Utah

VERMONTEAP

Brattlesboro Supervisory Unit
230 Main Street
Brattlesboro, Vermont

Central Supervisory Unit
P.O. Box 440
West Rutland, Vermont

Addison Central Supv Unit
Charles Avenue
Middleburg, Vermont

Montpelier School Unit
58 Berry St.
Montpelier, Vermont

Southwest Supervisory Unit
605 Main Street
Bennington, Vermont

NON-EAP

Essep North Supervisory
Newport, Vermont

Caledonia North Supv Unit
Box 107
Lyndon, Vermont

Saint Albans School System
Saint Albans, Vermont

Hartford Supervisory Dist
2 Park Avenue
White River, Vermont

Bristol Schools
9 Airport Road
Bristol, Vermont

VIRGINIAEAP

Fairfax Schools
10700 Page Avenue
Fairfax, Virginia

Arlington Schools
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia

Northampton Schools
P.O. Box 110
Eastville, Virginia

Loudoun County School Board
20 Union Street
Leesburg, Virginia

Falls Church Schools
2328 North Oak Street
Falls Church, Virginia

NON-EAP

Virginia Beach Schools
P.O. Box 6038
Virginia Beach, Virginia

Roanoke Schools
P.O. Box 13145
Roanoke, Virginia

Salem Schools
19 North College Avenue
Salem, Virginia

Chesterfield Schools
Chesterfield, Virginia

Newport News Public Sch
P.O. Box 6130
Newport News, Virginia

WASHINGTONEAP

Spokane School District
123 Bowdish Road
Spokane, Washington

Colfax County School District
N. Martin St.
Colfax, Washington

Seattle Public Schools
P.O. Box 66044
Seattle, Washington

Mason Public Schools
Box 79
Shelton, Washington

Dayton Schools
609 South Second Street
Dayton, Washington

NON-EAP

Anatone Schools
Anatone, Washington

Benton School Dist
P.O. Box 588
Benton, Washington

Ritzville Schools
615 E. Juniper
Adams, Washington

Waterville Schools
490
Waterville, Washington

Benton Ind School Dist
99336 Dayton Street
Prosser, Washington

WEST VIRGINIAEAP

Raleigh County Schools
305 Adair
Beckley, West Virginia

Monogalia County Schools
P.O. Box 75
Morgantown, West Virginia

Marion School District
P.O. Box 712
Fairmont, West Virginia

Wayne County Schools
2212 N. Central
Wayne, West Virginia

Kanawha County School District
200 Elizabeth Drive
Charleston, West Virginia

NON-EAP

Pendleton County Schools
P.O. Box 800
Franklin, West Virginia

Barbour County Schools
Route 7, P.O. 81
Phillippi, West Virginia

Hampshire School District
P.O. Box 570
Romney, West Virginia

Roane School District
Route 3
Spencer, West Virginia

Jackson County Public Sch
P.O. Box 770
Ripley, West Virginia

WISCONSINEAP

Cranford Schools
100 North Proper
Cranford, Wisconsin

Madison Public Schools
545 West Dayton
Madison, Wisconsin

Milwaukee Public Schools
2225 W. Vetel
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Kenosha Schools
P.O. Box 490
Kenosha, Wisconsin

Wausau Schools
1018 S. 12th Avenue
Wausau, Wisconsin

NON-EAP

Ashland Schools
P.O. Box 1138
Mellon, Wisconsin

Douglas School District
823 Velknap Road
Superior, Wisconsin

Barron School District
1443 Division Avenue
Barron, Wisconsin

Clarke School District
P.O. Box 618
Neilsville, Wisconsin

Unity Public District
Box 307
Balsam Lake, Wisconsin

WYOMINGEAP

Lincoln Schools
P.O. Box 1014
Kemmerer, Wyoming

Sweetwater Public Schools
Box 10
Greenriver, Wyoming

Carbon County Schools
Route 1
Rawling, Wyoming

Casper Schools
900 N. Crown Street
Casper, Wyoming

Cheyenne Public Schools
W. Role Avenue
Cheyenne, Wyoming

NON-EAP

Goshen School District
6243 Trowe Street
Torrington, Wyoming

Fremont Schools
P.O. Box 168
Lander, Wyoming

Park School District
P.O. Box 44
Cody, Wyoming

Campbell Schools
1000 W. 8th
Gillette, Wyoming

Alimti Schools
1948 Grand Avenue
Laramie, Wyoming

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**