

1957

# An Inquiry Into the Influence of a Professional Organization Upon Its Members

Frederick Dressler Chesterley  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Chesterley, Frederick Dressler, "An Inquiry Into the Influence of a Professional Organization Upon Its Members" (1957). *All Master's Theses*. 120.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/120>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

**AN INQUIRY INTO THE INFLUENCE OF A PROFESSIONAL  
ORGANIZATION UPON ITS MEMBERS**

---

**A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington College of Education  
Ellensburg, Washington**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education**

---

**by  
Frederick Dressler Chesterley**

**December 1957**

LD  
5771.3

0525i

SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

1971 7 11 10 30

alacM 4

ed notroer

ytinooi omubaii ole

intoooi to ytiaid neyqaiac. i. ahy

neeyi'ooi, yndaaed

intoooi to ytiaid neyqaiac

neeyi'ooi, yndaaed

intoooi to ytiaid neyqaiac

87355

yc

intoooi to ytiaid neyqaiac

neeyi'ooi, yndaaed

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

George C. Fetter, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

T. Dean Stinson

---

Marshall W. Mayberry

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. George C. Fetter for the time, guidance, and encouragement he has given throughout the development of this thesis, and to Dr. Marshall W. Mayberry and Dr. T. Dean Stinson for serving on the graduate committee.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	1
Statement of the problem . . . . .	1
Importance of the study . . . . .	2
The Method . . . . .	3
Limited subject for study . . . . .	3
Method of procedure . . . . .	3
Percentages . . . . .	4
Washington Education Association . . . . .	4
Magazine . . . . .	5
Review of the Literature . . . . .	5
II. THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	6
The Questions . . . . .	6
Sex of voter . . . . .	6
Years taught . . . . .	6
County taught in . . . . .	7
Are you a member of WEA? . . . . .	7
Do you read WEA and NEA Journals regularly?. . . . .	7
How did you vote? . . . . .	7
Why did you vote as you did? . . . . .	8
Facsimile of the Questionnaire . . . . .	9
III. QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION . . . . .	10
Returns of the questionnaire . . . . .	10

CHAPTER	PAGE
Distribution . . . . .	11
Who answered the questionnaires? . . . . .	13
<b>IV. DETERMINING WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION'S</b>	
<b>POSITION AND THE METHOD OF RELATING THE</b>	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE TO THIS POSITION . . . . .</b>	<b>14</b>
The Association's Position . . . . .	14
Mrs. Wanamaker . . . . .	14
Social security . . . . .	14
Method of Relating the Questionnaire to	
Washington Education Association's	
Position . . . . .	15
Determining Washington Education	
Association's position . . . . .	15
Relating the questionnaire to the	
Association's position regarding	
Mrs. Wanamaker and Mr. Andrews . . . . .	15
Washington Education Association's	
Arguments in Favor of Mrs. Wanamaker	
and Their Reduced Form . . . . .	15
Arguments Against Mr. Andrews . . . . .	17
Relating the Questionnaire with the	
Association's Endorsement of	
Social Security . . . . .	18

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. DISPOSITION OF NON-WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST MRS. WANAMAKER, MR. ANDREWS, AND SOCIAL SECURITY . . . . .	20
Mrs. Wanamaker . . . . .	20
Mr. Andrews . . . . .	21
Social security . . . . .	21
Non-Washington Education Arguments . . . . .	21
Non-WEA reasons for Mrs. Wanamaker . . . . .	21
Against Mrs. Wanamaker . . . . .	21
For Mr. Andrews . . . . .	22
Non-WEA reasons against Mr. Andrews . . . . .	22
Non-WEA reasons for social security . . . . .	22
Against social security . . . . .	22
VI. WHY PEOPLE VOTED AS THEY DID . . . . .	24
Ascribing the Reasons . . . . .	24
Explanation of the Discrepancy Between the Number of People Voting and the Number of Reasons Given . . . . .	25
VII. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION IN LEADING ITS MEMBERS . . . . .	27
Wanamaker Versus Andrews . . . . .	27
On the basis of the total vote . . . . .	27



CHAPTER	PAGE
On the basis of reasons given	
on the questionnaire . . . . .	28
Correlated to those who did and did	
not read "Washington Education" . . . . .	28
Social Security . . . . .	30
On the basis of the vote . . . . .	30
On the basis of reasons given on	
the questionnaire . . . . .	31
Correlated to those who did and those	
who did not read "Washington Education". .	32
Pairing of Votes . . . . .	32
VIII. THE TREND IN VOTING - 1952 TO 1956 . . . . .	34
IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	43
APPENDIX A . . . . .	45
APPENDIX B . . . . .	62

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Returns and Distribution by Sex and Usefulness . . . . .	10
II. Geographical Distribution of Voters Answering the Questionnaire . . . . .	46
III. Distribution of Votes for Mrs. Wanamaker and Mr. Andrews Based on the East - West Division of the State of Washington . . . . .	47
IV. Comparison of the Vote for Mrs. Wanamaker and Mr. Andrews Based Upon Heavily Populated Areas Versus Thinly Populated Areas . . . . .	48
V. Comparison of the Vote on Social Security Based Upon Heavily Populated Areas Versus Thinly Populated Areas . . . . .	49
VI. Breakdown of the Questionnaires Answered on the Basis of Occupation, WEA Member- ship, and Those Who Read or Did Not Read "Washington Education" . . . . .	50
VII. The Frequency with Which Different Arguments Appeared . . . . .	51
VIII. The Effect of Reading or Not Reading "Washington Education" on Men and Women Voting on Mrs. Wanamaker and Mr. Andrews; on Social Security . . . . .	55

TABLE

IX. Distribution of Votes for Mrs. Wanamaker  
and Mr. Andrews by Years of Experience  
and Sex of Voter . . . . . 56

X. Distribution of Votes on Social Security  
by Years of Experience and Sex . . . . . 57

XI. The Votes Grouped by Years of Experience  
and the Relationship of These Groups  
to the Total Vote, and the Vote for  
the Candidates . . . . . 58

XII. Pairing of Votes . . . . . 59

XIII. Comparison of Votes - 1952 and 1956 by  
Years of Experience and Sex . . . . . 60

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

Various non-political organizations have attempted to promote a favored person or party during elections. Where labor unions have embarked upon a political course the rank and file not only do not follow their leaders, but repeatedly history has shown that the union has been destroyed where such a course has been followed in the United States.<sup>1</sup> The question arises: is the member of a professional organization more likely to follow the recommendations of his organization than the member of a labor union or other non-professional group?

#### I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to compare: (1) how a professional organization's members voted in relation to the organization's recommendations; (2) how the professional group voted in comparison to the public in general; (3) deviations within the professional group on the basis of age and sex from the stated policy of the professional organization in order to

---

<sup>1</sup>Foster Rhea Dulles, Labor in America (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1955), pp. 35-45, 100-105, 147.

determine if any segment of the membership failed to follow the leadership, and if not, where and why they did not.

Importance of the study. When a non-political organization ventures into the political arena, even on a temporary basis, many members question the advisability of such a move. They may be in complete sympathy with the objectives sought, but feel the organization's life may be endangered by such an activity. This fear has been amply justified in such organizations as labor unions.<sup>2</sup> Other members may, for various reasons, differ with the leadership on what is best. When the organization endorses candidates or legislative bills, and asks its members to contribute to a campaign fund, these members become malcontents seeking a change in the organization; or, assuming their jobs are not dependent upon membership, they withdraw from the organization. This weakens the organization, and may destroy it. If the status quo of the organization is to survive, it needs to carry the vast majority of its members with it and at the same time not alienate, through too much pressure, those that disagree.

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

## II. THE METHOD

Limited subject for study. The Washington Education Association was used as the professional organization for the purposes of this inquiry. Its membership is voluntary and composed of trained people in the educational field. The reasons for this choice lay in this organization's strong stand in two areas. The Washington Education Association, through its magazine, "Washington Education," came out strongly in favor of one political candidate in the 1956 election, and just as strongly for a non-political issue, social security, in a later school election. Only the teachers voted on social security, which was approved, but the political candidate, backed by the Association, lost. This afforded an opportunity to determine whether the Association carried its members against the popular tide.

Method of procedure. This study was based upon a questionnaire. This system was deemed superior for the purpose, as many will divulge how they voted and tell why on an impersonal anonymous questionnaire, but will not in an interview. Four hundred ninety questionnaires were placed in the post office boxes at Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Washington, during July of 1957. The questionnaires were placed in two groups.

The first 290 were placed in post office boxes starting with 100. The second group of 200 questionnaires was distributed a week later, starting with box 400. Each of the second group carried the slogan, "A penny for your thoughts," and had a penny attached. The object of the penny and its slogan was to see if greater returns could be elicited by such a device.

The college post office offered an excellent means of obtaining a random sampling of teachers as, during the summer quarter, most of the students are teachers coming from all parts of the state. At the same time it was recognized that though the college draws from all sections of the state, not all sections are uniformly represented, nor are all counties represented. It was felt that the representation is broad enough to reflect the teachers' attitudes accurately, and show sectional differences, if any.

Percentages. All percentages used were rounded off to the nearest hundredth unless the decimal fraction would yield less than one per cent, in which case the decimal fraction was rounded off to the nearest thousandth.

Washington Education Association. The term "Association" as well as "WEA" refers to the Washington Education Association wherever found in this study.

Magazine. In this paper the term "magazine" refers to the official organ of the Washington Education Association, "Washington Education."

### III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The author made an exhaustive search of the Central Washington College of Education library under such topics as the American Medical Association, American Dental Association, American Bar Association, engineering, architecture, and other professional groups and was unable to find any reference to or evaluation of the leadership of professional organizations.



## CHAPTER II

### THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In considering the drawing up of the questionnaire, it was deemed important that certain checks be placed in the questions in order to determine its accuracy, and to see if any group voted in a different fashion than another.

#### I. THE QUESTIONS

Sex of voter. This information was requested to determine: (1) if men voted differently from women; (2) if they gave different reasons for voting as they did; (3) in case there was a discrepancy, to guard against over-weighting of the answers. There are more women teachers than men. If a disproportionately large number of returns were made by men, or if men as a group voted differently from women, this would have a bearing on the validity of the questionnaire.

Years taught. Rather than ask the age of the replyee, the number of years of teaching was felt to be accurate enough in grouping the answers, and more apt to bring forth truthful replies. The question serves the purpose of determining if the questionnaire's responses are too heavily represented by any one age group. If any age group was

disproportionately represented, it was possible to check to see if their vote was representative.

County taught in. This question was placed on the form in order to determine how representative the responses were on a sectional and state-wide basis. Were they representative of the state as a whole, and did the most responses come from the most heavily populated areas of the state?

Are you a member of WEA? All members of Washington Education Association receive regularly the Association's magazine, "Washington Education." If they received the magazine they had the opportunity to read it.

Do you read WEA and NEA Journals regularly? In this question the word "read" was underlined on the questionnaire to emphasize it. It was assumed if the voter read the magazine, the voter read articles pertinent to this study. If it could be determined that the voter had read the articles in the magazine, the assumption was that the voter was aware of Washington Education Association's stand and reasons therefor.

How did you vote? By checking the proper box the voter indicated for whom he voted in the 1952 and 1956 elections, and also on social security, whether he was for or against it. This served the purpose of rapid tabulation

and avoided any error on the part of the author in interpreting how the person voted on the basis of his written reasons for voting as he did.

Why did you vote as you did? This question was asked for both the general election, in which the position of Superintendent of Public Instruction was at stake, and the teachers' election on social security. By comparing the reasons stated on the questionnaire with the arguments presented by the Washington Education Association, one should be able to obtain a fairly reliable check on the influence of the Association upon its members.

## II. FACSIMILE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The information from this questionnaire is to be used for a thesis on the effectiveness of the leadership of professional organizations. Your help, in filling out this questionnaire, will be greatly appreciated. Please do not place your name upon the questionnaire. Return it to the CWCE post office.

1. Male , Female  2. Years you have taught. \_\_\_\_\_
3. County you teach in. \_\_\_\_\_
4. How did you vote in the last election?  
Wanamaker , Andrews
5. How did you vote in the election of 1952?  
Wanamaker , Turner
6. Why did you vote as you did? If you changed your vote between 1952 and 1956, why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. How did you vote in the social security election?  
For , Against
8. Why did you vote as you did? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. Are you a member of WEA? Yes , No
10. Do you read WEA and NEA Journals regularly?  
Yes , No

## CHAPTER III

### QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION

The validity of this inquiry rests upon having a sufficient number of questionnaires returned and that they are representative of the teachers of the State of Washington. The returns were examined as to: (1) the number returned; (2) how well they were distributed throughout the state; (3) who answered, whether teachers or not.

Returns of the questionnaire. Of the total of 490 questionnaires, 154 were returned, or 31 per cent. Those not bearing the slogan, "A penny for your thoughts," returned a little more than 28 per cent. The questionnaires bearing the slogan returned 35 per cent. Of the total, 95 per cent were usable and 5 per cent were not, as is shown in Table I.

TABLE I

#### RETURNS AND DISTRIBUTION BY SEX AND USEFULNESS

Male	68	Usable	67	*Blanks	5
Female	81	Usable	79	Humorous	1
*Blanks	5			Underage	2
Total	154		146		8

\*Blanks refer to questionnaires not filled out, but returned. These blanks were discarded, as well as questionnaires answered by people underage, as the underage could not vote and therefore did not fill the questionnaires out beyond their sex.

Distribution. Of the 39 counties in the state, the questionnaires represent 24, the largest representation being that of Yakima County with 33, and King following with 23. On 5 questionnaires the county was not specified.

Dividing the state on a geographical basis, 80 questionnaires were answered by people teaching on the east side of the mountains and 60 on the west side. The complete distribution by county is shown in Table II, page 46. As this distribution is not representative of the state's population, in that the heaviest population concentration is on the west side of the state, an analysis, to ascertain if there was a difference between the two sections of the state, was made in Table III, page 47. The west side gave Mrs. Wanamaker 80 per cent of the vote, the east side 87 per cent.

As a further check, the heaviest populated area in the state, King County, and containing the largest city, was compared with Yakima County which contains the largest city and heaviest population on the east side for which sufficient returns were available. Yakima County, lying close to Central Washington College of Education, has a disproportionate representation at the college and returned 10 more questionnaires than King County, though Yakima County has only one-fourth of King County's population. King County returned 100 per cent for Mrs. Wanamaker;

Yakima County gave Mrs. Wanamaker 81 per cent and gave Mr. Andrews 19 per cent.

To check further to see if the King County - Yakima County pattern held true for the rest of the west side - east side comparison, the more lightly populated counties were tabulated. On the west side, Clallam, Cowlitz, Jefferson, Kitsap, Snohomish, Thurston, and Whatcom counties gave Mrs. Wanamaker 61 per cent and Mr. Andrews 39 per cent. Of the lightly populated east side counties, which include Adams, Chelan, Douglas, Franklin, Grant, Kittitas, Klickitat, Okanogan, and Whitman, it was found that they gave Mrs. Wanamaker 88 per cent support and Mr. Andrews 12 per cent.

Thus we find the strongest and weakest support for Mrs. Wanamaker in the counties lying west of the mountains, as illustrated in Table IV, page 48, and not too great a difference between the lightly and heavily populated counties lying east of the mountains.

When the same comparison is made relative to social security, King County leads in support with 96 per cent followed by Yakima County with 90 per cent, as shown in Table V, page 49. The less populated west side counties gave social security 89 per cent support, and the small east side counties favored social security by only 84 per cent. There is greater uniformity in regard to social

security and a different pattern in the sequence of support by the different areas. King County leads in both cases, but in social security the spread is only 12 points, whereas with Mrs. Wanamaker the two extremes are 29 points apart.

The overall picture did not show a consistent pattern, and King County's position may be explained, possibly, on the fact that the Washington Education Association's headquarters is in King County. Also, the Association would bring to bear its greatest weight in this area where roughly one-fourth of the state's population resides. The big guns were probably leveled on the King County teachers as the most concentrated and accessible group of teachers in the state.

Who answered the questionnaires? Teachers answered 138 of the questionnaires, 7 were answered by people preparing for teaching, and one questionnaire gave no information as to his occupation.

Washington Education Association members totaled 134, and the remaining 11 of those answering were not WEA members.

Readers of the Association's magazine totaled 112, as is indicated on Table VI, page 50, and 33 said they did not read the magazine. Percentage-wise, 80 per cent read "Washington Education," and 20 per cent said they did not.



## CHAPTER IV

### DETERMINING WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION'S POSITION AND THE METHOD OF RELATING THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THIS POSITION

It was necessary to examine the position taken by the Washington Education Association in order to determine their stand on the issues and candidates. In this chapter, Washington Education Association's position is described and the method of relating the Association's arguments to those found in the questionnaires explained.

#### I. THE ASSOCIATION'S POSITION

Mrs. Wanamaker. The Association came out very strongly in favor of Mrs. Wanamaker. The Association's magazine carried several articles endorsing her, and the local units held meetings where the membership was urged to support her.

Social security. The Association favored the adoption of social security. Meetings were held promoting it and several articles in the Association's magazine were devoted to its support.

## II. METHOD OF RELATING THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION'S POSITION

Determining Washington Education Association's position. The Association publishes a monthly magazine. Prior to the general election in November of 1956 this official organ, "Washington Education," printed several articles bearing on the election. The same situation occurred in the spring of 1957 when the teachers were considering the merits of social security. From these articles the main points were extracted.

Relating the questionnaire to the Association's position regarding Mrs. Wanamaker and Mr. Andrews. The extracts are quoted under headings of: (1) WEA for Mrs. Wanamaker; (2) WEA against Mr. Andrews; (3) WEA for social security. There were no Association arguments in favor of Mr. Andrews, against Mrs. Wanamaker or social security. The extracts were reduced to a few identifying words in the form of a list.

## III. WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION'S ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF MRS. WANAMAKER AND THEIR REDUCED FORM

The following quotations obtained from "Washington Education,"<sup>3</sup> expressing the position of the Association,

---

<sup>3</sup>Washington Education, XXXVI (October, 1956).

are followed in brackets by the reduced form which was used in analyzing the answers on the questionnaires.

"the Teacher, the Candidates, the Issues"<sup>4</sup>

1. "WEA has endorsed Pearl A. Wanamaker as the only qualified candidate." (best qualified)

"In My Opinion"<sup>5</sup>

1. ". . . losing to special interests the educational gains of the past decade" if Pearl Wanamaker goes. (oppose special interests)
2. "Mrs. Wanamaker has the courage to oppose the special interests when the welfare of school-children was involved." (placed welfare of child first) (oppose special interests)
3. "She fought a good fight." (good fighter)
4. "She has always put the welfare of children first." (placed welfare of child first)
5. "Mrs. Wanamaker . . . capable school administrator." (competent)

"No Stand? Nonsense!"<sup>6</sup>

1. "Mrs. Wanamaker and the staff are competent." (competent)
2. Referring to the need to keep Mrs. Wanamaker, "Our great need for experienced and qualified leadership." (experienced) (best qualified)

Editorial<sup>7</sup>

1. The Andrews backers do so on his economy record, ". . . it is obvious that those supporters are not interested in the improvement of the public schools, or in keeping the gains that have been made." (keep our gains)

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 6.      <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 8.      <sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

2. Referring to Mr. Andrews: "We doubt if there is anyone, among Washington's more than 21,000 teachers, who has less educational training and experience than this aspirant for the state's highest educational position." (professional preparation and recognition) (experience)

#### IV. ARGUMENTS AGAINST MR. ANDREWS

Using the same source and articles, the following comments were made relative to Mr. Andrews:

##### "In My Opinion"<sup>8</sup>

1. Referring to the supporters of Mr. Andrews: ". . . efforts made by the opposition to intimidate the teachers during the primary." (intimidate teachers during primary)

##### "No Stand? Nonsense!"<sup>9</sup>

1. "I resent the attempt by some of the Andrews supporters to make the office of state superintendent partisan." (turn office into partisan job)

##### Editorial<sup>10</sup>

1. The Andrews backers do so on his economy record, ". . . it is obvious that those supporters are not interested in the improvement of the public schools, or in keeping the gains that have been made." (economy, not education, the platform)
2. Andrews on economy, ". . . eliminating \$17 million from the school budget." (economy, not education, the platform)
3. ". . . led the floor fight against state support for kindergartens." (economy, not education, the platform)

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

4. "We doubt if there is anyone, among Washington's more than 21,000 teachers, who has less educational training and experience than this aspirant for the state's highest educational position." (no experience) (not qualified)

V. RELATING THE QUESTIONNAIRE WITH THE ASSOCIATION'S  
ENDORSEMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The editor of "Washington Education," Mr. Albert Gerritz, in writing about social security stated: ". . . go to the polling place and vote 'yes.'"<sup>11</sup> The following quotations express the Association's sentiment in regard to social security:

"Your Vote Is Needed"<sup>12</sup>

1. "It does give you an opportunity to secure substantial additional benefits for yourself and your dependents." (benefits on retirement) (survivors benefits)
2. ". . . provide liberally for widow and children under 18 in the event of death of the insured." (survivors benefits)
3. ". . . costs of social security are negligible." (cheap insurance)
4. ". . . may be the best investment that a teacher will ever make." (good investment)
5. "Disability benefits also will be paid." (disability benefits)

---

<sup>11</sup>Washington Education, XXXVI (May, 1952), 15.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-19.

"Another Step in Retirement Progress"<sup>13</sup>

1. "Take into consideration what the proposal will do for you personally, what it will do for your fellow teacher, and what it will do for the whole profession of teaching." (group's good)

"Answers to Questions on RETIREMENT and OASI"<sup>14</sup>

1. "Q. If I quit teaching, would I lose what I have put into social security?"  
"A. No. It would be permanently credited to your social security account, and could be added to when you resume work that is covered by OASI." (covered if change work or state)

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 20-21.

## CHAPTER V

### DISPOSITION OF NON-WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST MRS. WANAMAKER, MR. ANDREWS, AND SOCIAL SECURITY

The Washington Education Association did not take a neutral position by presenting both sides of each issue to its members, and trusting to their good judgment to choose wisely. Its policy consisted of choosing one side and presenting only those arguments favorable to the side backed. Some, answering the questionnaire, would not agree with the reasons presented by the Association. Others, who perhaps had not read the magazine, might have different reasons for favoring the same candidate or issue as the Association. Thus, there was presented a number of arguments for or against an issue or candidate which were not the same as those presented by the Association. These arguments, and their disposition, were taken care of by listing them in an abbreviated form in this chapter.

Mrs. Wanamaker. Those reasons given for or against Mrs. Wanamaker and not covered by the Association's arguments have been listed in an abbreviated form under the heading of "non-WEA reasons for," or "against Mrs. Wanamaker," as the case required.

Mr. Andrews. As the Association did not present any reasons for backing Mr. Andrews, all such points originated from the questionnaires. Those arguments against Mr. Andrews, and not covered by the Association's list, are listed as "non-WEA reasons against Mr. Andrews." Arguments in favor of Mr. Andrews are listed as "for Mr. Andrews."

Social security. Non-Washington Education reasons for social security are listed separately as "non-WEA reasons for social security." Reasons against social security were not given by Washington Education Association and are, therefore, listed simply as "against social security," all such reasons originating from the questionnaire.

#### I. NON-WASHINGTON EDUCATION ARGUMENTS

##### Non-WEA reasons for Mrs. Wanamaker.

1. Lesser of two evils
2. Like Mrs. Wanamaker's political philosophy
3. Miscellaneous

##### Against Mrs. Wanamaker.

1. Dictatorial
2. Time for a change
3. Too many enemies - legislators antagonistic
4. Not open minded
5. Bureaucratic, ineffective, no progress



6. Entrenched too strongly
7. No hope of improvement
8. Pressure to support her campaign, including financial
9. Represents special interests
10. No standards

For Mr. Andrews.

1. Capable
2. Better candidate
3. Better to have man at the top

Non-WEA reasons against Mr. Andrews.

1. Politician seeking a job

Non-WEA reasons for social security.

1. Go along with majority
2. Believe in social security
3. Already belonged
4. Can't rely on state system
5. Attract others into the field or state

Against social security.

1. Depress wages
2. Wait until 65 instead of 30 years to retire
3. Rather have the money now
4. Poor investment

5. Covered or getting covered outside
6. Destroy state system
7. Won't get out as much as put in
8. Discriminates against single person

## CHAPTER VI

### WHY PEOPLE VOTED AS THEY DID

The questionnaire asked, "Why did you vote as you did?" The reasons given were listed and each time the same reason was expressed, the reason on the list was checked. The number of checks each reason received was totaled, thus indicating the relative importance of each reason to the voters, and supplying the information of whether the arguments of the Association were carrying weight with the voter.

#### I. ASCRIBING THE REASONS

In Table VII, beginning on page 51, the reasons for voting as the individual did are listed, with the frequency indicated for how many times each reason was listed by the voters. As an example of how the tally was arrived at, the following quotations were taken from questionnaires in answer to the question, "Why did you vote as you did?"

I believe that "Pearl" was the best qualified educational leader. She was nationally known in education and Lloyd would use this job as a stepping stone to the governor's seat. He was elected only because the people wanted a change not because he was the best qualified.

In the above quotation Mrs. Wanamaker would receive two points, both listed under "WEA reasons for Mrs. Wanamaker." She would receive one point under the subheading "best

qualified" and another under the subheading "professional preparation and recognition." Under the subheading "non-WEA reasons against Mr. Andrews," a point would be placed for "politician seeking a job."

Another questionnaire carried this statement:

The last four years Wanamaker was in office she seemed to bog down and didn't accomplish much as far as curriculum and teacher status were was concerned. She also was beginning to favor different businessmen - architects and builders.

Some of Andrews' ideas are not too to good but on the whole, with his initiative, he should do a better job for the public and profession profession than Mrs. Wanamaker.

The distribution of the arguments from the above quotation was as follows:

Under heading Against Mrs. Wanamaker.

Item 2. Time for a change

Item 9. Represents special interests

Under heading Reasons for Mr. Andrews.

Item 2. Better candidate

## II. EXPLANATION OF THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE VOTING AND THE NUMBER OF REASONS GIVEN

It is to be noted that the number of points listed on Table VI, page 50, will not correlate with the number of votes cast for or against any one issue or candidate. As in the two quotations cited above, a number of people gave

several arguments for or against a candidate or issue, while others gave just one or none. Of those who indicated how they voted, but did not give any reasons why they voted as they did, we found 5 men and 22 women gave no reasons on the Wanamaker - Andrews vote. In respect to the social security issue, 3 men and 10 women gave no reasons for their choice. In spite of those who did not fill in the reasons why, the total arguments far exceeded the number of questionnaires answered.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION IN LEADING ITS MEMBERS

The effectiveness of WEA in leading its membership will be examined on the basis of: (1) a comparison of how the teachers' vote compared with the state vote; (2) the reasons given for voting as expressed on the questionnaires versus the reasons given by WEA; (3) a comparison of those who read "Washington Education" or did not, and how they voted; (4) a pairing of votes to see if the same individual that voted for one WEA backed item was consistent and voted for the other WEA backed item and conversely.

#### I. WANAMAKER VERSUS ANDREWS

On the basis of the total vote. A total of 54 males and 63 females voted for Mrs. Wanamaker, giving her 84 per cent of the 139 votes indicated on the questionnaires. Mr. Andrews received 12 male and 10 female votes out of the 139 cast, which represents 16 per cent for Mr. Andrews. Assuming reasonable accuracy of the sampling, and taking Mr. Gerritz's figure of 21,000 teachers in the State of Washington,<sup>15</sup> this would mean that 17,640 teachers voted

---

<sup>15</sup>Washington Education, XXXVI (October, 1956), 5.

for Mrs. Wanamaker and 3,360 voted for Mr. Andrews. Had the teachers been representative of the views held by the general public, Mrs. Wanamaker would have been returned to office by a landslide. In actuality she was defeated, Mr. Andrews receiving a plurality of 165,000 votes. Conversely, had the general public's reasoning prevailed among the teachers, Mr. Andrews would have increased his plurality by about 13,490 votes.<sup>16</sup> Thus, on the basis of the total state vote, it was indicated that something influenced the teachers contrary to the public trend.

On the basis of reasons given on the questionnaire.

Grouping together all questionnaires which gave either WEA's reasons for Mrs. Wanamaker, or WEA's reasons against Mr. Andrews, and comparing this total with the number voting for Mrs. Wanamaker for non-WEA reasons, we found 46 males and 41 females voting for Mrs. Wanamaker for WEA reasons and only 10 voting for her on a non-WEA basis. Thus 90 per cent of those voting for Mrs. Wanamaker did so for reasons advanced by the Association. This constituted effective leadership and influence.

Correlated to those who did and did not read

"Washington Education." In Table VIII, page 55, we find

---

<sup>16</sup>See Appendix B, page 63.

80 per cent of the people, answering the questionnaire, claimed to read "Washington Education," and 20 per cent did not. Breaking this down in Table VIII, it was found that the percentage nearly doubled in voting for Mr. Andrews if the voter did not read the magazine.

The largest group by years of experience answering the questionnaire was found to be in the bracket of 0 to 5 years of experience. This group constituted 49 per cent of those answering the questions on Mrs. Wanamaker and Mr. Andrews. These figures are shown on Tables IX and X, pages 56 and 57. Though the 0 to 5 group constituted 49 per cent of the vote, it gave Mrs. Wanamaker only 44 per cent of the total vote. Mr. Andrews received 25 per cent of the group's votes. When checked against the figures in Table VIII, it was found that the 0 to 5 group supplied 20 out of the 32 men and women who did not read "Washington Education," thus they supplied 62 per cent of those not reading the magazine.

The official magazine of the Association seemed to be read and the articles contained seemed to be effective in influencing the reader.

One may wonder if there were no professional organization for the teachers, would not the teachers have voted as they did anyway in recognition of the past benefits in salary and working conditions gained during the regime of Mrs. Wanamaker? Washington Education Association's



membership is state wide, and includes close to 90 per cent of the state's teachers. It is safe to assume that no non-WEA member, or non-reader of "Washington Education," was isolated from WEA members so that he was not exposed to some degree of knowledge of WEA's arguments. In spite of this exposure, the non-reader of "Washington Education" was far more apt to vote against WEA's recommendations, than the reader. Had there been no organization promoting its particular arguments, the likelihood was that the vote would have been quite different, as the non-"Washington Education" readers indicated. This is pure conjecture, as there is no way of eliminating the organization's influence to determine what would have happened had there been no such influence.

## II. SOCIAL SECURITY

On the basis of the vote. Of the 123 who voted for social security, 51 were males and 72 females. Of the total, 88 per cent were in favor and 12 per cent against social security. Men voted 13 times against social security, whereas only 4 women were against it. The explanation for the large variation between men and women probably lies in the fact that more men carry outside jobs where they have obtained coverage, or are obtaining it.

The actual vote on a state-wide basis showed 21,354 in favor of social security and 1,560 against it. This works out as 93 per cent favoring and 7 per cent against social security.<sup>17</sup> Using this check, the comparison of the actual state vote with the questionnaire's returns, we find that 93 per cent voted in favor on the state-wide basis, while only 88 per cent of the questionnaires favored social security. Table XI, page 58, shows that those voting against social security were concentrated in the younger voters, those in the first five years of teaching, and that the largest group answering the questionnaire was in this same group of younger voters.

As the vote indicated, both state-wide and on the questionnaires, social security passed with a vast majority. The vote expressed on the questionnaires is in keeping with the state-wide vote.

On the basis of reasons given on the questionnaires. Out of a total of 117 votes in favor of social security, 110 gave reasons cited by "Washington Education" and only 7 voted in favor for "non-WEA" reasons. This would indicate a close relationship between the voter and WEA as the source of information.

---

<sup>17</sup>See Appendix B, page 63.

Correlated to those who did and those who did not read "Washington Education." In Table VIII, on page 55, a comparison was made between those who claimed to read "Washington Education" and their vote, and those who did not read the magazine and how they voted. As was the situation with the Wanamaker - Andrews vote, there was a decided increase percentage-wise in the vote against the WEA supported measure when the voter did not read the magazine. This difference is not quite so striking with social security as it was in the Wanamaker - Andrews vote, but it is clearly evident.

Table XI, page 58, is consistent with Tables VIII and IX in showing that the largest vote against social security came from those in the 0 - 5 years of experience group, and this is the group that supplied 62 per cent of those not reading "Washington Education" in the Wanamaker - Andrews vote.

### III. PAIRING OF VOTES

In Table XII, page 59, the consistency of the voter is checked. Did the voter voting against Mrs. Wanamaker vote against social security, and the voter voting for Mrs. Wanamaker vote for social security? If such was the case, it would indicate an anti-WEA vote regardless of the issues and candidates at stake. It was found that 106 did

as recommended, whereas those who went completely contrary to the Association's recommendations totaled only 7. Those casting a split ticket, Wanamaker and against social security, or for Andrews and for social security, totaled 21. This clarified the point that the persons voting against one of WEA's recommendations would automatically vote against the other recommendations on the basis of being anti-WEA. Three times as many split their vote as voted completely contrary to the Association's wishes.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE TREND IN VOTING - 1952 TO 1956

The trend away from Mrs. Wanamaker is evident when a comparison is made of the vote in 1952 with that of 1956. In 1952 only 9 teachers, of those answering the questionnaires, voted for Mr. Turner who was Mrs. Wanamaker's opponent in 1952. Of the 9 who voted for Mr. Turner, it was found that 2 did not vote in 1956, 2 voted for Mrs. Wanamaker in 1956, and 5 voted for Mr. Andrews. Mr. Andrews picked up 5 of the 7 who supported Mr. Turner in 1952. At the same time 10 that had voted for Mrs. Wanamaker in 1952 voted for Mr. Andrews in 1956.

Though the number of votes involved cannot be considered as sufficient in the above cases to warrant too much weight, they are indicative of the trend away from Mrs. Wanamaker, and reflect the general public trend. Mrs. Wanamaker, even with the aid of pressure brought by the Association in her favor, was not able to win back the support which left her in 1952, and the loss was increasing, as more defected.

This trend among the teachers became a flood with the general public, and there is no reason to believe that the teachers would have voted as a group contrary to the general public if some unifying force had not influenced

them. The unifying factor, stemming the tide against Mrs. Wanamaker among the teachers, seemed to be the Washington Education Association. However, the questionnaire did not eliminate the possibility of other factors influencing teachers. The author is assuming that the teachers would normally reflect the general public's attitudes, as they are an integral part of the general public. When any segment of the public, as in this case of the teachers, goes so decisively contrary to the general public, it is a strong indication of successful unified leadership on the part of some organization or group within that segment.<sup>18</sup>

The questionnaire did not entirely eliminate the influence of better pay as a cohesive factor in the teachers' attitude as a group. If the teachers associated better pay with Mrs. Wanamaker, and economy, meaning less pay, with Mr. Andrews, then it is easy to understand the teachers' vote for Mrs. Wanamaker and the general public's vote for lower taxes with Mr. Andrews. The teachers, on this issue, would not be an integral part of the general public, but on the other side of the fence. However, out of the 142 reasons given on the questionnaires for voting for Mrs. Wanamaker or voting against Mr. Andrews, only

---

<sup>18</sup>See pp. 29-30.

20 reasons were based on economics. If the economic factor was the prime influence with the teachers, they did not admit it generally on the questionnaire, nor did the comparison of the readers and non-readers of "Washington Education" bear this out, as it may be assumed that the non-readers are as interested in their salaries as the readers, yet a far higher percentage of non-readers voted against Mrs. Wanamaker.

For a comparison of the voting for the years 1952 and 1956, see Table XIII, page 60.

## CHAPTER IX

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

From all the information available, the Washington Education Association succeeded in leading its membership. The total state vote for the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction was contrary to the action of the teachers, as expressed upon the questionnaire. The public definitely repudiated Mrs. Wanamaker. The Washington Education Association supported her, and the teachers followed the Association's advice for the most part.

It can be seen that there was a slight trend away from Mrs. Wanamaker by the teachers when comparing the 1952 - 1956 elections. Whether this trend actually existed among the teachers is questionable, as the questionnaire did not cover the issue well enough to make any positive declaration on the point. More work could be done in this area to try to determine how strong this anti-Wanamaker feeling was among the teachers. It is interesting to note, however, that there were only 3 votes for Mr. Andrews, and 19 votes given to Mr. Andrews because the voter was voting against Mrs. Wanamaker. It would seem that Mr. Andrews did not win the election so much as Mrs. Wanamaker lost it. If those teachers voting for Mr. Andrews were representative of the general public, then it must be assumed that the



general public was voting against Mrs. Wanamaker.

In determining the effectiveness of the Washington Education Association's campaign, it was found that the readers of "Washington Education," 80 per cent of those answering, voted for Mrs. Wanamaker 87 per cent of the time. It should be kept in mind that those voting for Mrs. Wanamaker constituted such a large block of the teachers that they would naturally influence the small number of fence sitters. Thus the individual who did not read the magazine or was undecided was undoubtedly exposed to the arguments presented by WEA, whereas, he may never have heard the arguments against Mrs. Wanamaker from her teacher opponents.

In considering the reasons given on the questionnaire, out of a total of 111 reasons given for Mrs. Wanamaker, 106 were WEA reasons, and only 5 were non-WEA reasons. The same situation prevailed with Mr. Andrews, with 28 of the expressions against him being the arguments of the WEA and only one non-WEA reason expressed. Qualification of the candidate as an argument appeared 65 times as the reason for voting for Mrs. Wanamaker or against Mr. Andrews. Keeping in mind Mr. Gerritz's remark about Mrs. Wanamaker as the "only qualified candidate"<sup>19</sup> and then finding this in

---

<sup>19</sup>See page 16.

almost half of the reasons given for voting for Mrs. Wanamaker or against Mr. Andrews, indicated a great deal of influence on the part of the Association.

The situation is not so clearly drawn with the subject of social security. This vote involved the teachers only, and thus we do not have the opportunity to compare their vote with any other. Personality was not a condition, there was no organized opposition to present the valid arguments, or invalid ones for that matter, against the program. The Washington Education Association's arguments were based upon a financial appeal of all the things social security would do for the member at an extremely nominal charge. The emphasis was based on a "something for nothing" argument, which is a very difficult line of attack to stop. This attitude is best exemplified by one questionnaire in which the voter answered the reason for voting for social security by stating: "Are you kidding - a buck is still a buck."

Older teachers were appealed to on the basis that they would receive far more than they would put in. The younger teacher was wooed with all the benefits to be derived and the cheapness thereof. The few who recognized the drawbacks and hoped both sides would be presented so that the teachers would go into the program with open eyes, were drowned out, or ignored, and the Association carried the day.

Of those reasons given against social security, men listed 16 and women half as many. Men voted against social security 13 times, women only 4. If we were to believe WEA, the greatest benefits of social security would accrue to the men, as future or present heads of families, yet the men voted "no" more often than women. The reason for this paradox probably lay in the fact that more men carry summer jobs and jobs outside of school hours which gave them coverage from another source. They probably figured, therefore, that what little additional benefit they would derive from school coverage would not warrant the cost incurred.

It is also the married man, supporting a family, that is hardest hit by any deductions. If he is not very far up the salary schedule, he is using everything he is getting to keep things going, and can ill-afford to have another hundred dollars taken from his salary. Most women, on the other hand, are single or have a husband working, and do not need the hundred dollars just to keep going. Thus the woman teacher considers this as a method of laying aside something for old age, which she has intended to do all along and has not, so she welcomes this forced saving.

In checking on the foregoing suppositions, it is to be noted that 10 of the 13 men voting against social security were in the first 5 years of teaching, and probably, therefore, near the bottom of the wage scale. On the basis

of the entire vote against social security, 13 out of the 17, or 76 per cent, were in the first 5 years of teaching. Only one person with more than 10 years of experience voted against social security.

The Washington Education Association did not limit itself to presenting its arguments in its magazine. The local units had meetings in which the members were urged to back Mrs. Wanamaker and social security. Teachers were asked to organize door-to-door campaigns, send post cards to friends, stickers were supplied for car bumpers backing Mrs. Wanamaker, and in some local units pressure was brought upon the members to contribute to Mrs. Wanamaker's campaign funds. The author talked to a number of teachers who resented the pressure and tactics used, yet the resentment evidently was not sufficient to cause the voter to list this pressure as one of the reasons against Mrs. Wanamaker. Only 4, and these all men, listed this reason against Mrs. Wanamaker.

Some voters, while voting for Mrs. Wanamaker, felt that the Association was remiss in not putting a qualified candidate into the field, while others felt that she was the best possible candidate in the state. In general, though, it was found that the teachers gave WEA reasons for their vote, that they voted as WEA hoped they would vote, and those disagreeing with WEA were not too disgruntled

by the pressure the Association brought to bear upon the members. The Association succeeded in carrying its membership by a very high percentage on both issues - Superintendent of Public Instruction and social security.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dulles, Foster Rhea. Labor in America. New York:  
Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1955.

Washington Education, XXXVI (October, 1956), 5, 6, 8.

Washington Education, XXXVI (May, 1957), 15, 16-19, 20-21.

## **APPENDIX A**



TABLE II  
GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF VOTERS  
ANSWERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

County	Males	Females	Total
Adams	1	0	1
Benton	6	10	16
Chelan	1	8	9
Clallam	1	1	2
Clark	2	3	5
Cowlitz	2	2	4
Douglas	1	1	2
Franklin	0	1	1
Grant	4	5	9
Grays Harbor	0	3	3
Jefferson	1	0	1
King	10	13	23
Kitsap	3	1	4
Kittitas	0	2	2
Klickitat	1	3	4
Lewis	2	5	7
Okanogan	2	0	2
Pierce	4	1	5
Snohomish	2	0	2
Spokane	0	1	1
Thurston	1	2	3
Whatcom	1	0	1
Whitman	1	0	1
Yakima	17	16	33
Unknown	4	1	5

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES FOR MRS. WANAMAKER AND MR. ANDREWS  
 BASED ON THE EAST - WEST DIVISION  
 OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

West Side	Males	Females	Total
Mrs. Wanamaker	22	23	45
Mr. Andrews	6	5	11
Per cent for Mrs. Wanamaker	79%	82%	80%
Per cent for Mr. Andrews	21%	18%	20%
East Side	Males	Females	Total
Mrs. Wanamaker	29	39	68
Mr. Andrews	5	5	10
Per cent for Mrs. Wanamaker	85%	88%	87%
Per cent for Mr. Andrews	15%	12%	13%

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF THE VOTE FOR MRS. WANAMAKER AND MR. ANDREWS  
 BASED UPON HEAVILY POPULATED AREAS VERSUS  
 THINLY POPULATED AREAS

County	Number of Votes Cast by Sex		% of County Vote for
	Males	Females	
King County (West side, heaviest population in the state)			
Mrs. Wanamaker	10	12	100%
Mr. Andrews	0	0	0
Yakima County (East side, largest city 42,000)			
Mrs. Wanamaker	14	12	81
Mr. Andrews	3	3	19
Clallam, Cowlitz, Jefferson, Kitsap, Snohomish, Thurston, Whatcom Counties (West side, lightly populated)			
Mrs. Wanamaker	7	4	61
Mr. Andrews	5	2	39
Adams, Chelan, Douglas, Franklin, Grant, Kittitas, Klickitat, Okanogan, Whitman Counties (East side, lightly populated)			
Mrs. Wanamaker	9	14	88
Mr. Andrews	2	1	12

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF THE VOTE ON SOCIAL SECURITY BASED UPON  
HEAVILY POPULATED AREAS VERSUS  
THINLY POPULATED AREAS

County	Number of Votes Cast by Sex		% of County Vote for
	Males	Females	
King County (West side, heaviest population in the state)			
For social security	9	13	96%
Against social security	1	0	4
Yakima County (East side, largest city 42,000)			
For social security	15	13	90
Against social security	2	1	10
Clallam, Cowlitz, Jefferson, Kitsap, Snohomish, Thurston, Whatcom Counties (West side, lightly populated)			
For social security	8	6	89
Against social security	3	0	11
Adams, Chelan, Douglas, Franklin, Grant, Kittitas, Klickitat, Okanogan, Whitman Counties (East side, lightly populated)			
For social security	8	18	84
Against social security	3	2	16

TABLE VI

BREAKDOWN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES ANSWERED ON THE BASIS  
OF OCCUPATION, WEA MEMBERSHIP, AND THOSE WHO READ  
OR DID NOT READ "WASHINGTON EDUCATION"

	Males	Females	Total
Teachers	63	75	138
Preparing for teaching	3	4	7
Occupation unknown	1	0	1
WEA members	62	72	134
Non-WEA members	4	7	11
WEA members who read "Washington Education"	48	62	110
WEA members who did not read "Washington Education"	15	10	25
Non-WEA members who read "Washington Education"	0	2	2
Non-WEA members who did not read "Washington Education"	3	5	8

TABLE VII  
THE FREQUENCY WITH WHICH DIFFERENT ARGUMENTS APPEARED

Reasons	Males	Females	Total
<b>WEA REASONS FOR MRS. WANAMAKER</b>			
1. Best qualified	26	28	54
2. Oppose special interests	0	0	0
3. Good fighter	0	3	3
4. Placed welfare of the child first	4	5	9
5. Competent	3	1	4
6. Keep our gains	4	6	10
7. Experienced	10	7	17
8. Professional preparation and recognition	4	5	9
<b>NON-WEA REASONS FOR MRS. WANAMAKER</b>			
1. Lesser of two evils	1	1	2
2. Like Wanamaker's political philosophy	1	1	2
3. Miscellaneous	0	1	1
<b>REASONS AGAINST MRS. WANAMAKER</b>			
1. Dictatorial	0	4	4
2. Time for a change	1	5	6
3. Too many enemies, legislators antagonistic	2	1	3

TABLE VII (continued)

Reasons	Males	Females	Total
4. Not open minded	0	2	2
5. Bureaucratic, ineffective, no progress	3	1	4
6. Entrenched too strongly	0	1	1
7. No hope of improvement	4	0	4
8. Pressure to support her campaign - including financial	4	0	4
9. Represents special interests	1	0	1
10. No standards	1	0	1

## REASONS FOR MR. ANDREWS

1. Capable	0	1	1
2. Better candidate	1	1	2
3. Better to have man at the top	1	0	1

## WEA REASONS AGAINST MR. ANDREWS

1. Represents special interests	1	2	3
2. Tried to intimidate teachers during primary	0	0	0
3. Turn office into a partisan job	0	0	0
4. Economy, not education, the platform	6	4	10
5. No experience	3	1	4
6. Not qualified	5	6	11

TABLE VII (continued)

Reasons	Males	Females	Total
NON-WEA REASONS AGAINST MR. ANDREWS			
1. Politician seeking a job	2	1	3
WEA REASONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY			
1. Benefits on retirement	38	45	83
2. Survivors benefits	6	1	7
3. Cheap insurance	2	2	4
4. Good investment	1	1	2
5. Disability benefits	1	0	1
6. Covered if go into another field	3	2	5
7. Group's good	6	13	19
NON-WEA ARGUMENTS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY			
1. Go along with majority	2	2	4
2. Believe in social security	3	3	6
3. Already belonged	1	4	5
4. Can't rely on state system	0	1	1
5. Attract others into state or field	1	1	2
AGAINST SOCIAL SECURITY			
1. Depress wages	1	1	2
2. Wait until 65 to retire instead of 30 years	1	1	2



TABLE VII (continued)

Reasons	Males	Females	Total
3. Rather have the money now	1	3	4
4. Poor investment	3	2	5
5. Covered or getting covered outside	5	0	5
6. Destroy state system	3	0	3
7. Won't get out as much as put in	1	1	2
8. Discriminates against single person	1	0	1

TABLE VIII

THE EFFECT OF READING OR NOT READING "WASHINGTON EDUCATION" ON MEN  
AND WOMEN VOTING ON MRS. WANAMAKER AND MR. ANDREWS

	Did not Read "Washington Education"	Read "Washington Education"	Voted for Mrs. Wanamaker	Per cent for Mrs. Wanamaker	Voted for Mr. Andrews	Per cent for Mr. Andrews
Men		47	40	85%	7	15%
Women		60	53	88	7	12
Men	18		13	72	5	28
Women	14		11	79	3	21

THE EFFECT OF READING OR NOT READING "WASHINGTON EDUCATION" ON MEN  
AND WOMEN VOTING ON SOCIAL SECURITY

	Did not Read "Washington Education"	Read "Washington Education"	Voted for OASI	Per cent for OASI	Voted "No" on OASI	Per cent "No" on OASI
Men		47	38	81%	9	19%
Women		64	61	95	3	5
Men	17		12	71	5	29
Women	12		11	92	1	8

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES FOR MRS. WANAMAKER AND MR. ANDREWS  
BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND SEX OF VOTER\*

Years of Experience	For Mrs. Wanamaker			For Mr. Andrews		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
0 - 5	32	19	51	11	6	17
6 - 10	15	13	28	0	0	0
11 - 15	0	11	11	1	1	2
16 - 20	5	8	13	0	2	2
21 - 25	0	1	1	0	0	0
26 - 30	1	6	7	0	0	0
31 - 35	0	3	3	0	0	0
36 - 40	0	2	2	0	0	0
41 - 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	1	0	1	0	1	1

\*5 women did not indicate their vote - Wanamaker vs. Andrews.

1 man did not indicate his vote - Wanamaker vs. Andrews.

TABLE X  
 DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES ON SOCIAL SECURITY  
 BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND SEX\*

Years of Experience	For Social Security			Against Social Security		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
0 - 5	31	21	52	10	3	13
6 - 10	13	15	28	2	1	3
11 - 15	0	12	12	1	0	1
16 - 20	5	10	15	0	0	0
21 - 25	0	1	1	0	0	0
26 - 30	1	6	7	0	0	0
31 - 35	0	3	3	0	0	0
36 - 40	0	2	2	0	0	0
41 - 45	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 - 50	0	1	1	0	0	0
Unknown	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
	51	72	123	13	4	17

\*3 men and 3 women did not indicate their vote.

TABLE XI

THE VOTES GROUPED BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND  
THE RELATIONSHIP OF THESE GROUPS  
TO THE TOTAL VOTE, AND THE  
VOTE FOR THE CANDIDATES

Years of Experience	Per cent out of Total Vote	Per cent for Mrs. Wanamaker out of Total Vote for Mrs. Wanamaker	Per cent of Group for Mrs. Wanamaker
0 - 5	49%	44%	75%
6 - 10	20	24	100
11 - 15	9	9	85
16 - 20	11	11	87
21 - 25	.7	.9	100
26 - 30	5	6	100
31 - 35	2	3	100
36 - 40	1	2	100
41 - 50	0	0	0
Unknown	1	.9	50

  

Years of Experience	Per cent out of Total Vote	Per cent for Mr. Andrews out of Total Vote for Mr. Andrews	Per cent of Group for Mr. Andrews
0 - 5	49%	77%	25%
6 - 10	20	0	0
11 - 15	9	9	15
16 - 20	11	9	13
21 - 50	9	0	0
Unknown	.7	5	50

TABLE XII  
PAIRING OF VOTES

	Number Voting
Men voting for:	
Wanamaker and social security*	46
Wanamaker and against social security	6
Andrews and social security	4
Andrews and against social security**	7
Women voting for:	
Wanamaker and social security*	60
Wanamaker and against social security	3
Andrews and social security	8
Andrews and against social security**	0

\*Advocated by Washington Education Association

\*\*Completely contrary to the Association's  
recommendations

TABLE XIII  
COMPARISON OF VOTES - 1952 AND 1956  
BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND SEX

Years of Experience	*56W 52W	56W 52No	56W 52T	56A 52No	56A 52W	56A 52T	56No 52T
MALES							
0 - 5	20	11	1	6	4	1	0
6 - 10	14	0	1	0	0	0	0
11 - 15	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
16 - 20	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
21 - 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 - 30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
31 - 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	40	12	2	6	5	1	0
FEMALES							
0 - 5	6	13	0	1	1	3	1
6 - 10	10	3	0	0	1	0	1
11 - 15	10	1	0	0	1	0	0
16 - 20	8	0	0	0	1	1	0
21 - 25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 - 30	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
31 - 35	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 - 40	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
41 - 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total	45	18	0	1	5	4	2
TOTAL FOR MALES AND FEMALES							
0 - 5	26	24	1	7	5	4	1
6 - 10	24	3	1	0	1	0	1
11 - 15	10	1	0	0	2	0	0
16 - 20	12	1	0	0	1	1	0
21 - 25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 - 30	6	1	0	0	0	0	0
31 - 35	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 - 40	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
41 - 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total	85	30	2	7	10	5	2

## TABLE XIII (continued)

\*56W 52W - those voting for Mrs. Wanamaker both in 1956 and 1952

56W 52No - those voting for Mrs. Wanamaker in 1956, not voting in 1952

56W 52T - those voting for Mrs. Wanamaker in 1956, Mr. Turner in 1952

56A 52No - those voting for Mr. Andrews in 1956, not voting in 1952

56A 52W - those voting for Mr. Andrews in 1956, Mrs. Wanamaker in 1952

56A 52T - those voting for Mr. Andrews in 1956, Mr. Turner in 1952

56No 52T - those not voting in 1956, for Mr. Turner in 1952



## APPENDIX B

C O P Y

63

WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION  
910 Fifth Avenue  
Seattle 4, Washington

August 5, 1957

Mr. Frederick D. Chesterley  
CWCE Box 125  
Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Mr. Chesterley:

As Mr. Brighton is out of the office, I will answer your letter.

The vote for State Superintendent of Public Instruction was as follows:

Andrews . . . . .	562,000
Wanamaker . . . . .	397,000

The number of teachers voting on Social Security was 22,914. Yes votes -- 21,354; no votes -- 1,560 or 93.2%.

Sincerely yours,

Vern B. Archer  
Director of Field Service  
WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

VBA/lf