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INTRODUCTION

The recent investigations into the status of basic skills in urban schools consistently report that instructional leadership is an important factor in the degree to which the school is academically high or low (Edmonds, 1979; Bloom, 1976; Brookover and Lezotte, 1979). The knowledge that leadership is an essential factor in the effectiveness of a school is not necessarily a new discovery (Greenfield, 1968; Halpin, 1958, 1955; Stogdill, R.M., and Coon, A.E., 1957). However, a new and refreshing perspective is the knowledge that perhaps certain dimensions of leadership may differentiate academically high from academically low achieving schools. Such fruitful knowledge signals the dawn of a new era in school renewal and effectiveness for the economically poor areas of this nation.

Schools in economically poor areas of the United States have been a focus of inquiries since the middle of the twentieth century (Great Cities School Improvement Studies, 1958; Rlessman, 1962; Hawkes and Frost, 1966; Perel and Vairo, 1969; Hurwitz and Tesconi, 1975). Although these inquiries have been identified under different names and titles, the common concern voiced by scholars is the need for improved urban school performance. For example, the recent emphasis in competency-based education (Butler, 1978; Lazarus, 1981) and accountability (Browder, Atkins and Kaya, 1980) underscores a continuing belief in public education as a vehicle to enhance rather than retard the ability of all students to acquire basic skill mastery. Over the years, a variety of federal and state resources have been channeled to schools with a high incidence of poor students to change this dismal and seemingly static urban academic record (Campbell, and
others, 1970). To date, these efforts have proven to produce only marginal results (Mullins and Summers, 1983).

The researchers involved in the recent investigation of schools in economically poor areas have identified certain vehicles which may assist school administrators, especially principals, in developing school-based strategies to reverse the long-standing pattern of hopelessness and stagnation. For example, three types of school improvement strategies have resulted:

1. programs that are organized and administered within schools and school districts;
2. programs that are administered by state agencies, which provide incentives and technical assistance to local schools and districts;
3. programs of research development and technical assistance usually located in a university (Educational Leadership, pp. 5-11, December, 1982).

Such efforts form the systemic basis for the effective schools improvements. These efforts offer hope and encouragement for urban school practitioners who seek to promote academic excellence for children from economically poor areas.

The recent body of research on effective and ineffective urban schools originated in the seventies. This body of research suggests that procedures for distinguishing an effective school include examining: 1) cognitive school outcomes, such as test scores; 2) percentage of low-income students who score above the city-wide mean; and 3) other school processes and structural characteristics. The following offers a rationale for this conceptualization of effective schools.

Cognitive school outcomes are measures of students' scores in the basic skill subjects of reading and mathematics. These scores are reported on city-wide standardized achievement test results. Cognitive school outcomes are, however, viewed as only one indicator of a quality and equity-based education (Moody, 1982). Also, cognitive school outcomes are conceptualized not as ends but, rather, such
outcomes are to be viewed as closely interrelated with process and structural school characteristics (Rutter, 1979; Brookover and others, 1977; Lezotte, 1980).

Similarly, how the student learns is purported as essential in assessing to what degree a student learns. That is, the better the match between the leadership process and the test, the better students are likely to perform in testing situations. The effective school advocates recognize the limitations of standardized tests, but these assessment tools are, at the moment, the most assessible and realistic basis for portraying pupil performance progress.

The standard, cognitive outcome is also used as a criterion to judge a school as effective because it demonstrates how well students have mastered the basic skills needed for students to succeed. This standard of effectiveness requires that the proportion of poor children who achieve minimum mastery approximate the proportion of middle-class children achieving minimum mastery. As a group, middle class children may still out-perform poor children, but no significant proportion of either group in an effective school will fail to obtain the pre-requisites to successfully access the next level of schooling (Edmonds, 1979, 1982). Hence, an effective school is defined as one which brings the children of the poor to those minimal masteries of basic skills that now describe minimally successful pupil performance for the children of the middle class.

The research on effective and ineffective schools has largely been conducted in "urban" settings (Weber, 1971; Edmonds, 1974, 1979; Marname, 1980; Brookover and Lezotte, 1979). These settings are targeted largely because achievement rankings tend to be shockingly low. In this regard, Wolf (1978) states:

(A) Student attending public school in a large city is almost twice as likely to be low achieving as are his peers elsewhere in the country.
(B) City students also perform at lower levels than their suburban counterparts with comparable incomes.
Another reference illustrating a concern for the abysmally low achievement status among poor students is reflected in the following statement by Clauset and Gaynor (1982):

By and large, poor children enter elementary school at lower levels of reading readiness than middle class and upper class children. As these children move through elementary school, the gap persists and widens.

Until recently, two major reasons were prominent regarding why some students do poorer in school than others. Some scholars suggested that poor children did not achieve satisfactorily in school because of genetic differences. In this regard, biological factors were considered the cause for poor student not learning as quickly and absorbing as much as advantaged children (Jensen, 1969). Other scholars advocated simply that the environment, particularly family background and milieu, were the basis for lower achievement among groups of poor students. Such arguments as these are clearly rooted in the age-old nature/nurture debate on how learning occurs.

It is the contention of contemporary effective school researchers that the nature/nurture theorists have missed the point. The traditional theorist, in essence, assumes that something is inherently wrong with the student. In contrast, seminal thinkers involved in the effective schools movement believe that a variety of bureaucratic, administrative and/or climate roadblocks may serve to impede the learning process for poor students. For example, leadership, a key characteristic at the building level, is viewed as often missing in urban school settings. Levin (1977) elaborates on this latter perspective by stating:

Overloaded with too many students who themselves are overloaded with a multitude of individual family problems, the public schools as traditionally organized and operated sometimes then may all but cease functioning educationally at all, becoming little more than custodial institutions in which students and teachers expect little and achieve less.
Effective schools have these similarities (Edmonds, 1979; Clark, Lotto and McCarthy, 1980; Moody, 1980; Brookover and Lezotte, 1979):

a. a principal who is a strong leader
b. an atmosphere that is orderly without being rigid or oppressive
c. a climate of high expectations in which no children are permitted to fall below minimal levels
d. an emphasis on teaching of basic skills in a well-prepared classroom where students spend most of their time on task
e. a means for frequent monitoring of pupil progress.

Finding out more about these school characteristics, particularly leadership, is viewed as helpful in promoting learning and is the theme of contemporary effective schools research. This knowledge will be helpful if a process is to be built in schools that will result in improved achievement for students in urban schools.
CHAPTER ONE

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A recurring characteristic noted among effective urban schools is leadership provided by the building principal (Weber, 1979; Brookover and Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Lezotte, 1978; Shoemaker and Frasier, 1981; Clark, Lotto and McCarthy, 1980). The existing effective schools literature describes several dimensions of leadership; however, there has been one empirical study that describes the specific leader behaviors of elementary principals that promote effective schools for students in urban areas. If elementary principals are to assume the important role of instructional leadership, they must work successfully with teachers to achieve organizational goals and objectives. The literature on effective and ineffective urban schools fails to indicate empirically how principals are perceived in their leader behaviors by teachers. This body of literature is also lacking in providing operational definitions and reliable constructs of leadership.

The research will be guided by the following questions:

1. Do staff’s perception of elementary principals’ leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire differ in the effective and ineffective urban schools?
2. What are the significant leadership dimensions as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire on which elementary school principals in effective and ineffective urban schools differ as perceived by teachers?
3. Do elementary school principals in effective and ineffective schools perceive their leader behaviors differently than teachers as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?
4. Do elementary school teachers and their principals in effective schools differ in their perceptions of the principal’s leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?
5. Do elementary school teachers and their principals in ineffective schools differ in their perceptions of the principal's leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

The premise behind these questions recognizes that in performing the leadership role, a principal must carry out various tasks using many administrative human relations skills. The principal has to also be a politician, as well as one who can effectively utilize human relations skills. The principal also has to be able to convince subordinates of the needs to achieve district goals and objectives. As a technician, the principal has to be one who organizes and performs the daily operations which are essential to maintaining smooth operating procedures. An effective administrator is believed to be able to adapt to various situations, and is able to emphasize different skills, depending upon the situation. The principal wears many hats and carries out multiple duties. These research questions seek to uncover what teachers' perceptions are regarding the behavior of principals.

II. METHODOLOGY

Variables

This study focuses on the variables of leader behavior and student achievement. The perceptions of respondents regarding leader behavior represent the independent variables while the dependent variable is student achievement. The study is exploratory. Unlike causal comparative and experimental research, this study emphasizes the discovery of new ideas. Analysis of variance and T test will be the major statistical techniques used. Using the reported perceptions of teachers and principals, this study seeks to identify if a relationship exists between leader behavior in effective and ineffective schools.
In addition, data will be collected on school variables such as size of student population, sex of the principal, racial makeup of staff and student populations, length of staff time in that building, free and reduced lunch status, staff and building characteristics and standardized reading test scores.

Selection of Population/Sample

The target population of urban elementary schools will be selected on the basis of several criteria. This population includes the 1982-83 listings from Kent State University and The Ohio Department of Education of schools in the northeast region of the state. These schools have reported involvement in effective school workshops and/or conferences. Also, only schools will be included which are receiving Chapter I Funds. The respondent groups will be the teachers and principals from these urban elementary schools. This population of 42 urban elementary schools constitutes approximately 25 percent of the total population of Ohio elementary schools involved in effective schools (ODE 1982-83). The subjects will also comprise elementary teachers who are assigned to urban schools, and who are also involved in the effective schools movement. Schools also will have a student population in which 25-75 percent of the students are on free or reduced lunches. In addition, school participants will be selected on the basis of their willingness to participate in the study. In this regard, the sample is "purposive" rather than random.

Instrumentation

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) Form XII (Stogdill, 1963) will be used in this study to collect data related to reported
perceptions of the principals towards the variables of leaders behavioral subscales. This questionnaire was selected because four of the twelve subscales related to the dimensions of leader behavior commonly referred to in effective and ineffective school research. The findings on the subscale will provide insight into whether principals are more task-oriented. The subscales will also give insight into the principal's interactions with superiors and the ability to influence others.

This questionnaire was also selected because it is one of three most commonly used measures for leadership in education (Schriesheim and Kerr, 1974). The decision to select the LBDQ Form XII rather than the Fiedler's LPC or the University of Michigan Four Factor Leadership Scales, is based upon its purpose to describe rather than to predict behavior. Also, the LBDQ was selected because it requires reasonable time for administering and is not exorbitantly expensive.

The four subscales are persuasion, initiation of structure, consideration, and superior orientation. Persuasion is leader behavior that delineates the ability of the leader to influence and argue effectively with subordinates. Initiation of structure is leader behavior that defines patterns of organization, channels or communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration is leader behavior that indicates friendship, trust, warmth, interest, and respect in the relationship between the leader and members of the group. The latter variable regards the comfort, well-being status, and contributions of followers. Superior orientation is leader behavior that maintains cordial relationships with superiors; has influence with them; and is striving for higher status. The subscales represent an operational definition and the construct being measured.
The LBDQ was developed in the latter part of the 1940's by the personnel research board at The Ohio State University as one of several projects connected with the research program in the field of leadership studies. This project was directed by Dr. Carroll L. Shartle (Halpin, 1957). The instrument grew out of the work initiated by Hemphill (1949). The instrument was further developed by Hemphill and Coons (1957), later refined by Halpin and Winer (1957), Halpin and Croft (1962). The most recent revision was developed by Stogdill (1963). Each refinement has as its intent to make the instrument more reliable and valid.

The population upon which the LBDQ Form XII instrument was devised included an army air-borne division and a state highway patrol organization (Marder, 1960). The two scales, composed of the subscales consideration and initiating structures, have been used to report perceptions of college department heads (Hemphill, 1955) and school superintendents (Halpin, 1956).

**Validity**

One of the central problems in selecting and measuring the instrument is whether it actually measures what it is intended to measure. The validity of the original LBDQ has been demonstrated through its systematic use in a variety of settings (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). The LBDQ Form XII is an instrument similar to its original form in that operational definitions exist for a subscale. Respondents are asked to rate their perception of the leader behavior on items that typify the leader behavior as defined by the operational definitions. In this regard, the instrument is valid (Ebel, 1977).

However, a review of the literature of various studies conducted shows that while some extraneous items may exist, and while various
interpretations of the items exist with revised LBDQ Form XII, the findings of studies are in the direction that was expected (Schriesheim and Kerr, 1974). From a review of previous research, it is obvious that an extensive effort has been marshalled to establish construct and content validity of the LBDQ Form XII.

**RELIABILITY**

Reliability of the LBDQ Form XII instrument has been well-established for internal consistency with coefficients of .75 or better. The test-retest coefficients for 1-, 2- and 3-month intervals using the same sample has resulted in coefficients of between .57 and .72 for structure and .71 and .79 for consideration. Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) and Fleishman (1957) reported that the subscales persuasion, initiating structure, and consideration are reliable at between .7 and .8 levels. While the subscale superior orientation suggest a slightly lower reliability of .6.

The LBDQ is an instrument which describes but does not predict the behavior of leaders such as principals. This instrument seeks to obtain an indication of teachers' and principals' perceptions at a given point in time, with the hope that this will measure typical behavior patterns if the respondents were repeatedly subjected to this same measuring device. The instrument is a group test in that it allows many individuals to take the test simultaneously.

The LBDQ Form XII is a questionnaire-type instrument; therefore, it is inherently limited with problems such as "halo effect" and "generosity effect." Gay (1976) described the halo effect as the
tendency of the respondent to let overall feelings toward a person affect responses of items, while generosity effect is the tendency of a rater to give the person being rated the benefit of the doubt. Attempts will be made to reduce these problems by giving similar written instructions to the raters. Every effort will be made to increase the honesty of the response. In this regard, sealed envelopes will be provided to all respondents.

Since the purpose of this study is to describe the relationships or interaction between the leader behavior and student achievement, correlational research will be conducted to determine whether and to what degree a relationship exists between two or more variables. This research will shed light on whether certain dimensions of leader behavior are highly related or whether certain dimensions can be eliminated from further considerations. The variables which are highly related may suggest future causal comparative or experimental studies which will determine if relationships are causal (Gay, 1976).

DATA ANALYSIS

The forty items are listed randomly on the questionnaire. The respondents are asked to describe the behavior of the leader on a five-point Likert-type scale; always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never. Separate scores for each of the four subscales are determined by summing the items response to each subscale.

In order to study school variables and the relationship of the variable to achievement, the unit of analysis in this study will be the school building. This unit of analysis is consistent with related research
and school improvement efforts (Edmonds, 1982). This method is founded in the philosophical underpinning that school processes influence what happens in the school environment. These school processes are believed as links to student achievement outcomes. In other words, descriptive statistics, such as mean, standard deviation, T test and ANOVA will be computed for respondent groups, principals and teachers.

In order to investigate questions one, three, four and five, data will be subjected to T test. ANOVA, discriminant analysis procedures will be used to analyze question two. The independent variables is the type of school with two levels: effective and ineffective schools. This dimension which constitutes the dependent variables are persuasion, initiating structure, consideration, and superior orientation.

F test will be used to test the difference in variance between respondents. The T test statistical procedure is employed to measure the amount of spread the scores in each dimension of leader behavior are from the mean. This analysis will demonstrate whether leader behavior is multi-dimensional or singularly focused. In other words, this analysis will provide insight into whether the leader behavior is more task in nature or if task and consideration and other dimensions are behaviors that reflect principal behavior.

**COLLECTION OF THE DATA**

Before the administration of the test, arrangements will be made as to when the questionnaire will be administered and the nature of the instrumentation conditions. The method of data collection will be standardized throughout all group sessions.
A letter of instructions will establish the procedures to use in administering the instrument. For example, principals will be asked to complete their questionnaire apart from teachers in order to avoid any influence that their presence might have on teachers' responses.

The initial contact with superintendents and principals will be in early spring of 1983. An invitational letter introducing the motives of the research will be sent to each district involved in Ohio effective schools movement. A follow-up letter along with the LBDQ Form XII and a self-addressed envelope will be sent to each school building participation.

III. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The instrument to ascertain elementary school administrator and teacher perceptions of principal's leader behavior is assumed to be adequate for the purposes of this study before used in other similar studies.

2. The respondents perception reports of the principal is assumed to be reflective of the respondents feelings at the time of instrumentation.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study will be limited because of the nature of selecting the population as well as due to the exclusion of leadership properties other than those defined in the LBDQ Form XII instrument. As a result of the small sample and the willing cooperation needed by all respondent participants, generalizations will be limited to school districts similar to the sample.
Also, the utilization of the LBDQ Form XII is not without problems. The validity of the instrument is not perfect. However, because of the dearth of research on the effective schools movement, it is believed that the instrument proposed has merit. Validity problems are evident by its operational definitions of the subscale incorporated in the study. The concept of leadership is more complex than the definition of leader behavior implies. For the purpose(s) of a dissertation, it is difficult to include all aspects of the variable, leadership.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Consideration: Refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his/her staff.

Effective School: Refers to schools which score above the 50th percentile on standardized tests in the basic skill area reading.

Elementary School: In Ohio, elementary schools are described by various organizational arrangements inclusive of grades K-8.

Initiating Structure: Refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between the self and the members of the work-group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ): Refers to the instrument used to determine the leader behavior patterns of elementary principals in effective and ineffective schools within urban school districts.

Persuation: Refers to leader behavior that delineates the ability of the leader to influence and argue effectively with subordinates.

Superior Orientation: Refers to leader behavior that maintains cordial relationships with superiors, has influence with them, and strives for higher status.
VI. A REVIEW OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH

For the past fifty years, researchers have been attempting to discover those factors which make a difference in the educational achievement of students (Clark, McCarthy, 1980). To date, different conclusions have been drawn. The researchers generally fall into three broad categories. The cost-analysis technicians, the conventional wisdom theorist and the seminal thinkers.

Among the earliest studies were the cost-analysis studies conducted by Mort (1952). Mort used input measures such as school expenditures as an index of school quality. Input expenditures were generally such things as the number of library books, the amount of dollars spent on instruction and the experience and training of staff. On the side of quality output were such factors as grades, entrance to college and achievement test scores. Although the work of Mort was considered a breakthrough in educational research, it was soon realized that these studies were limited (Averch, 1974; Bridge, Judd and Moock, 1979). This body of research did not account for social-economic background and other experiences outside the school as a possible link to student achievement. This period of school effective research was often used as a basis for recommending more money be spent on particular aspects of schools as a way to bring about quality education.

The second group of research, classified as the conventional wisdom theorist, represents another stage in the development of effective school research. This research originated in the sixties. Researchers involved with this particular line of inquiry realized that cost-analysis studies were efficient in not accounting for family background factors as a way of explaining student achievement. The study on Equality of Educational Opportunity by Coleman and others (1966), perhaps, is
the best-known example of this second stage of research on effective schools. This study concluded:

Taking all these results together, one implication stands out above all: that schools bring little influence to bear upon a child's achievement that is independent of his background and social context, and that this very lack of independent effect means that the inequalities imposed upon children by their home, neighborhood, and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of school (p. 325).

This research created a national furor. Squire (1980) suggests that the tenor of this mood may be reflected in the following implications drawn by educational policy thinkers:

Despite all the resources put into schools, they are not able to affect student achievement; and

If social-economic status is what makes a difference, then the rich get richer, the poor, poorer and the schools perpetrate and reinforce the American class systems (p. 4).

This period of research also fostered considerable debate about the role American schools play in fulfilling the dream of the American democracy. Education has always been viewed as the great hope for both individuals and society. Schools, as social institutions, have been conceived as the main grounds upon which equality of opportunity for an individual could be achieved; yet during the seventies, a mood of intellectual defeatism surfaced, particularly among sociologists. During this period, social scientists seem to openly suggest that the effects of schooling were negligible in reducing disparities between poor and nonpoor, between racial minorities and white populations.

Schools, according to the conventional theorist, do not make a difference. In other words, academic achievement is viewed as inevitable and inherently linked to the student characteristics and not connected to what decisions policymakers and educators make in relation to school processes such as instruction. The convention
wisdom perspective can also be viewed as myopic and perpetuates a stereotypic national image of the urban learner. This line of inquiry examined only one dimension of school: the student's family background. The complexity of today's school and interrelatedness of internal processes were not taken into consideration.

The current body of effective school research has focused upon what has been termed mediating (Perrow, 1961), operative (Clauset, and Gaynot, 1982), and causal (Averch, 1974) dimensions of schools. A trend reflected in these research studies is their focus on teaching and leadership and the relationship to basic skills achievements. This research looked at organizational attributes and identified a number of process variables that correlate with student achievement.

This body of research is similar to the work conducted in the other developmental stages in that it utilized the school as the unit of analysis (Bridge, 1979). However, this research differs in that it offers an alternative theoretical perspective of the role and process of schooling as well as cognitive school outcomes. This research supports the growing evidence that schools do have an impact regardless of family and social economic background factors. This research, therefore, focuses on a constellation of variables within the boundaries of the school setting known as school characteristic (See note: Appendix A).

VII. PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP IN EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS: A CONCEPTUALIZATION

One approach to gaining an understanding of what the effective school proponents mean by the term leadership is to compare and contrast their use of the term. The researchers use a number of referents to describe leadership. Dimensions such as style (Clark, Lotto and McCarthy, 1980; Brookover and Lezotte, 1979), attitude (Clark, Lotto and McCarthy, 1980), and behavior (Clark, Lotto and
McCarthy, 1980) are among the school characteristics that have been correlated
with student achievement. Herein lies a persistent problem. In short, it appears
that these proponents lack agreement about the classification or labeling of
leadership. There is no single dimension of leadership that has been associated
with effective schools. Rather, effective school proponents suggest that student
achievement occurs as a result of a network of interlocking characteristics which
exist within the control of the school; one is leadership.

Edmonds (1979) writes:

Schools are instructionally effective for the poor because
they have tyrannical principals ... they have principals with
a strong administrative leadership ... without these dis-
parate elements of good schooling can neither be brought
nor kept together. (p. 16)

This viewpoint characterizes the principal from a classical perspective
(Fuller, and others, 1982). In this regard, the principal could be viewed as
exhibiting: 1) a despotic behavior towards people, and 2) a high degree of concern
for production. Accomplishment to the mission is the watchword of this concep-
tualization, and interaction with staff is strictly along authority lines.

The question Edmonds' conceptualization raises is whether it is plausible to
assume that task-oriented principals are patently dictator in their approach. To
the contrary, there is research which indicates that task-oriented elementary
principals deliberately foster upward communications, stimulate participation in
faculty meetings, and encourage participation in decision making (Miskel, 1977,
1979). In other words, the task-oriented elementary principals may be viewed as
directive but not authoritative.

In contrast, Shoemaker and Frasier (1981) describes assertiveness as one of
the factors associated with the principal. Using this reference, the principal is
conceptualized as openly expressing feelings and ideas, and stands up for legitimate rights that do not violate the rights of others. Similarly, Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980) suggests that in order to get the job done, the principal must obtain needed support. Thus, their notion conveys the idea that the principal is neither aggressive nor passive. The principal conversely demonstrates honest, direct, and appropriate communication skills.

The effective school is also described as having a principal who performs several vital instructional leadership and managerial functions. For example, Clark, Lotto and McCarthy (1980) states: "they framed goals and objectives, and set standards of performance" (p. 468). This perspective supports Edmonde's (1979) conclusion that "administrative behavior, policies, and practices in schools appear to have significant impact on school effectiveness." Moreover, Wellisch, Marcus, and others (1976) indicated that in effective schools:

1. administrators emphasized the importance of selecting basic instructional materials
2. administrators assumed more responsibility for the selection of instructional materials
3. administrators effectively communicated a point of view concerning teaching practices.

Moody summarized the concept of the principal in effective schools as a strong instructional leader. The professional behaviors that describe the strong instructional leader are:

- taking initiative in identifying and articulating goals and priorities
- setting instruction as a first priority and communicating this to staff
- spending half of time in classrooms and halls
- caring more about his/her school's academic progress than human relations and informal collateral relations
- attempting to handpick his/her staff
- finding ways to reward excellent teachers with greater responsibilities
- setting a consistent tone of high expectations.
This research on urban principal seems to indicate that there is a relationship between the principals' behaviors—what the principal does—and academic achievement. The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) developed by Halpin (1958) is designed to assist in diagnosing leadership dimensions.

VIII. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

One of the critical challenges facing urban education in the decade of the eighties is raising what appears to be the public's low levels of confidence in urban school systems. Urban schools are criticized in particular for its failure to educate substantial numbers of urban students. Through the identification, a new image has emerged. As a result of the effective schools movement, practitioners have focused their attention on identifying the success rather than the problems of urban education. This investigation intends contribute to that school of thought focused on stimulating public interest and awareness with regard to the fact that some school contextual processes do relate to success and accomplishment of urban school improvement efforts.

Numerous efforts have been focused on improving the leader behavior of urban school principals. All these efforts point to the need to apply more specific pedagogical techniques into preservice and inservice training of urban principals. Although there still remains a need to establish a direct causal link between what dimensions of principals' behavior directly influences the achievement outcomes of students and teacher performance, the characteristic of leadership is believed to be a significant factor. If it could be established whether the dimensions of leader behavior proposed by LBDQ are associated with achievement in effective and
ineffective urban schools, then presumably urban principals could be trained to become more prepared to carry out their prescribed functions and role expectations.

The significance of this research study, therefore, serves to fill part of the void created by limited knowledge regarding what constitutes effective leadership and what dimensions, perceived by teachers, best describe how principals in effective and ineffective schools perform.

IX. SUMMARY

Public schools in low income areas are in a period of crisis. How schools survive this crisis depends upon several complex and interwoven factors, one of which is the leadership manifested by principals. This chapter has highlighted five basic questions for assessing school effectiveness. The premise undergirding this chapter was that some schools, no matter what race, or the low economic status of students, are making progress toward promoting excellence. The thesis of this study is that leadership is a key factor in achieving school effectiveness.

The following have been identified as elements of school effectiveness: school inputs such as the number of books per pupil, expenditures, student grades and achievement test scores; student background characteristics such as socioeconomic status; school characteristics such as building mission and goals, basic skills emphasis, ethos, norms, climate and leader behavior. The recent effective schools researcher investigation pursue uncovering the latter school characteristics as possible links of inquiry pictures the school principal as strong and assertive. The principal emphasized instructional leadership over other tasks and responsi-
bilities. The principal places a high priority on students achieving basic skills regardless of the student's social-economic status. The five research questions and the methodology chosen for this investigation serve as a framework for sorting out the complexity surrounding the concept leadership.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to review several perspectives that have contributed to contemporary notions regarding the concept leadership. The impetus for this study is based on the current point of view that the characteristics of leadership distinguish effective from ineffective schools. The theoretical models developed by Getzel and Guba (1957), Sergiovanni and Starrett (1971), and Blake and Mouton (1964) serve as a frame of reference for conceptualizing leadership within the context of the elementary principalship in effective and ineffective schools.

The importance that the leadership exhibited by elementary school principals is a consistent theme found in the literature and research on public school education for over a century. This notion is theoretically promising, yet the notion continues in both research and practice as a highly evasive and complex concept.

Lipham and Getzels (1973) illustrates this dilemma with the following statement:

"...theoretical orientation may range from complicated to simple, intricate to evident or many to few ...biographical studies ...the analysts tended to ignore ...the large societal context ...the traitist studies ...tended to measure the traits singly ...situational studies tended to ignore not only the personalistic variable but also the interactive nature or the group variables ...(the) behavior approach ...focused upon the behavior of the leader to the exclusion of the behavior of the followers." (p. 11)

One factor contributing to bridging the gap between theory and practice regarding the concept leadership in education is the recent research conducted by
effective schools proponents. This research is founded in the premise that accountability for students, particularly achievement economically poor students is a responsibility of the school (Edmonds, 1979; PDK, 1980). Thus, the principal as the person in the position of authority is charged to insure that all children learn. This view of accountability focused on principal instructional leadership at the building level is a shift from the principal as a manager. Similarly, successful student achievement is a responsibility of the principal in conjunction with classroom teachers. Also, teachers' style or instructional management are no longer considered the sole school characteristics that foster student achievement (Amidon and Flanders, 1963; Dunkin and Biddle, 1974).

II. THE NATURE OF LEADERSHIP

The study of educational philosophies, unlike the hard quantitative sciences, is rampant with differences of opinions regarding the precise meaning of concepts. The concept--leadership--reflects this condition. Scholars interested in leadership represent the varying views within the broad fields of psychology, sociology and social systems theory. Each of these points of view interprets leadership using the techniques of that frame of reference.

Bennis (1959) supports this interpretation by stating:

of all the hazy and confounding areas in social psychology, leadership theory undoubtedly contends for top nomination. And, ironically, probably more has been written and less is known about leadership than about any other topic in the behavioral sciences

Leadership is considered a part of management, but not all of it. Managers are required to plan and organize but so are leaders. Leaders, however, do more. Leaders develop people and work with people to accomplish the mission and goal.
Pfiffner and Fels (1964) definition of leadership reflects how scholars often use the concepts interchangeably with other organizational roles, such as supervision:

Expectations that all supervisors should exhibit similar behavioral patterns are not in keeping without knowledge of human nature. Successful supervision is not of any one type. In fact, past attempts to define leadership in terms of leader characteristics were generally fruitless. There is a range of behaviors a supervisor might exhibit and still be judged as a good leader, though he must have insight enough to be able to attempt the pattern through which he can become effective (p. 276-277).

Cunningham explains complexity as well as directness of leadership.

It is the curious blending of leading and following, provoking and calming, disturbing and stabilizing, but always in a posture of movement, generating new strength and capability along the way.

Stogdill (1974) explained that the variety of definitions available are so extreme that he was able to classify these into eleven categories. His categorizations delineate the definitions of leadership in terms of:

a. the focus of the group process
b. personality and its effects
c. the art of inducing compliances
d. the exercise of influence
e. act or behavior
f. a form of persuasion
g. a power relation
h. an instrument of goal achievement
i. an effect of interaction
j. a differentiated role
k. the initiation of structure.

Lipham and Hoeh (1974) suggest another type of definition of leadership. In this sense, leadership is defined "as that behavior of an individual which initiates a new structure in interaction within a social system; it initiates change in goals, objectives, configurations, procedures, in input processes and ultimately the outputs of the social system" (p. 182). The key idea in this definition is that
leadership is an organizational function involved in initiating change in the structure of the organization.

Lipham (1964) believes that while administration and leadership have many factors in common, they are, indeed, not synonymous. The following definitions concur with Lipham and Hoeh but also suggest that the process in achieving the objectives is equally important:

Leadership (is) the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing goals and objectives ... that leadership ... is concerned with means as well as ends (p. 122-123).

Some scholars concerned with the vagueness and indefiniteness of the concept leadership, have made efforts to quantify it to some degree: Hemphill (1958) believes that the frequency of leadership acts/behaviors is a crucial factor. Accordingly, leadership is described as a series of steps:

1. **Attempted Leadership**: acts which are accompanied by an intention of initiating a structure—an interaction.

2. **Successful Leadership**: acts that have initiated a structure in interaction during the process of mutual problem solution.

3. **Effective Leadership**: acts that have initiated a structure in interaction that has contributed to the solution of a mutual problem (p. 105-106).

Bavelas (1960), like Lipham (1964) and Lipham and Hoeh (1964) describes leadership as an organizational function. This function refers to the distribution of "power" throughout the organization. Certain organizational functions are believed to stem from leadership acts designed to help the group achieve its objectives.

Hanchek ( ) suggests that one of the main dimensions of leadership is the style. Style is viewed as situational and must be considered in light of the personality of the leader and the personality of the followers. Style as a component of leadership is expressed in the following:
"You either consciously or unconsciously reflect particular style of leadership ... which suits you, the individual. Each of you is a kind of 'model' and as such, is variously perceived by different persons ... in either contemptuously or with respect ..."

Fox (1965) supports the notion that style as a dimension of leadership is focused in the total personality of the individual and the interactions with environment. The self establishes a base, but the situational factors condition the resulting style. In this regard, styles describe a leader's predominant way of acting and relating with the group. Styles of leadership may also be examined in terms of the way a leader approaches people to motivate them (Sims and Szilagyi, 1975). The way in which a leader uses power also establishes a type of style. Davis (1977) discusses three types of styles relating to power:

Autocratic leaders centralize power and decision-making in themselves ... participative leadership decentralizes authority. Participative decisions, however, are not unilateral as with the autocrats ... free-reign leaders avoid power. They depend largely upon the group to establish its own goals and to work out its own problems. (p. 113-114)

Implicit in each of these definitions is the idea that there is no one agreed upon way of viewing the concept of leadership. Each scholar has interpreted the phenomenon of leadership within the restrictive boundary of the diverse fields of psychology and sociology. A common theme that is suggested in all definitions is that leadership is an aspect of human behavior. Behavior in organizational settings is viewed as conditioned by the leader, the group and the organizational setting.

Scholars agree that leadership is distinguished from administration. However, scholars often interpret leadership using principles of supervision. Behaviors in this sense can be described as a dimension of style. When discussed within this frame of reference, style is viewed as idiosyncratic or psychological in nature. It is through leadership that organizations have the human ability to perform the necessary tasks to reach goals.
For the purpose of this study, Stodgill's (1973) definition of leadership will be used:

Leadership is behavior that demonstrates a concern for the task for individuals, and for interpersonal group relation. Stated differently it is a sequence of activities by a leader towards followers that set the tone of their interaction with one another and for their performance behavior (p. 7).

This definition is selected because it reflects leadership as incorporating both psychological and sociological dimensions. Leadership is conceived as a group process with two flow communication between the leader and group members. The leader is also depicted as consciously concerned with 1) behavior of self, 2) enhancing the development of others, and 3) organizational effectiveness. This definition grows out of the behavioral approach to the study of leader behavior. The behavioral approach sets the framework for the methodology used in this study. The behavioral approach undergirds the philosophy of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, the instrument used in this study.

III. THE GREAT MAN APPROACH

The study of leadership in theory as well as from a research perspective has been a basic element of interest for over a century. The leader's role as a ruler, military and social figure has been recognized and respected in every society. Until the late nineteenth century, many scholars believed that leadership was more of an art than a science. As an art, it was presumed as an inherited quality reserved for only certain hero-type individuals. One principle that underlies the thinking was that leaders were born and not made.(Knezevich, 1969).

The great man theory, however, has been criticized particularly as a thrust in education because of the use of biographical methodological techniques. Burien-game (1973) summarizes this problem in the following manner:
...biographical dissertations in education are the product of a non-professional biographer, non-professional historian... The end product is poorly written, biographically ill-conceived because it isn't concerned with the personality of its subjects, and so intent upon listing contributions it fails to include any kind of perspective about the net worth of these gains on the larger stage of American educational history (p. 50).

In conclusion, commonalities found in biographies according to Burlengame (1973) are 1) sense of missionality zeal; 2) ethic of work; 3) intellectual base/practicality; 4) obsolency; and 5) service. "These are the values which keep schools afloat, not ahead." (p. 3)

. IV. THE TRAIT APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP

Stogdill and Coughlan (1973) pinpoints the research on personality traits begun during World War I. These efforts emerged primarily as a result of Woodworth (1920) investigations of a textbook dealing with the topic of psychiatry. Following World War II, numerous texts were developed with subsets designed to measure various types of abnormal personality syndromes. This methodology was popularized when military psychologists used similar subscales to devise a test of intelligence for use in selecting, classifying and assigning military personnel.

Two publications and associates (1925) and Cox (1926) were very influential in furthering the discourse on personality traits as a link to leadership. These publications reported research results on the personality traits of gifted children, genius in areas such as music and science as well as military and political leaders. This approach continued to use as a premise that leaders are born and not made.

Basil ( ) reports that this analysis of leadership fell short in many areas, however. Its prime deficiency was in the eventual recognition that traits possessed by leaders in one particular type of situation might not be appropriate in other
types of situations. Therefore, it became necessary to identify general principles for leaders to be truly effective.

The concept's validity can be questioned for another reason. As Lane (1969) suggests, personality by itself does not make the person important; the job does. The fact that the leader coordinates and makes policy makes him important.

Empirical studies do not support the idea that leaders are born. Height, weight, energy, health, emotional stability, appearance, intelligence and self-confidence are not validated by the research as indicators of leadership ability (Bowers and Seashore, 1969).

The idea that physical attributes bear direct relationship to acts of leadership and that, in effect, tall men rather than short, thin rather than husky, or vice versa, make the better leaders cannot be upheld; by itself it is somewhat a simplistic notion and gives little empirical support. To this assertion, both Lloyd McCleary and Stephen Hensley testify:

Criticisms of the trait approach have pointed out that such studies have not indicated the relative importance of different traits, that they have not proved various traits to be mutually exclusive, and that they have not differentiated between traits consistently necessary in positions of leadership. Moreover, conflicting studies have indicated that leaders have been successful and effective even though they have exhibited strikingly dissimilar traits.

Behavioral scientists have attacked the pure traitist theory on the grounds that the possession of specific traits does not guarantee effective leadership. Moreover, it makes no distinction between the innate and acquired traits of leaders.

Furthermore, the traits approach holds implicitly that the leader, because he does possess certain traits, is automatically able to exercise leadership. This belief assumes an essentially static situation, but human relations are dynamic,
with constantly changing group relationships and group demands; one situation may require aggressiveness in the leader, while another situation with the same group may require him to be reticent and assuming (Basil, ).

This is similar to the opinion held by Katz (1950). He states that,

The futility of pursuing specific traits becomes apparent when we consider the responses of an administrator in a number of different situations. It is (therefore) more useful to judge an administrator on the results of his performance than on his apparent traits.

In conclusion, it was shown that the traits approach has yielded inconsistent, if not contradictory results. Sanford (1952) reports that, (a) there are either no general leadership traits or, if they do exist, they are not to be described in any one of our familiar psychological or common-sense terms, (b) in a specific situation, leaders do have traits which set them apart from followers, but what traits set what leaders apart from what situations will vary from situation to situation. As Stryker (1954) has noted, one has to only look at the successful managers in any company to see how enormously their particular qualities vary from any ideal list.

V. OTHER TRENDS TOWARD THE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP: BEHAVIORAL APPROACHES

Halpin (1954) maintains that we will greatly increase our understanding of the leadership phenomenon if we abandon the notion of leadership as a trait, and concentrate instead upon an analysis of the behavior of individuals. Investigations of leadership which focus their attention upon the behavior of the formally designated head of a specified work-group fall under the category of leader behavior studies. In this arrangement leadership will not be considered so much of an attribute of a leader's traits, but rather an interactional process between the
leader and his followers as the leader's definition of the problem and the enlistment of the cooperation of the group to carry it out. Accordingly, no prior assumptions are made dealing with the leader's inherent capabilities, his certain traits toward leadership or the situational constraints or variables impinging upon his leadership role, as mentioned earlier.

On the basis of a factor analysis, Halpin (1973) identified two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. These were seen as:

1. Initiating structure, which refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of the work-group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedures.

2. Consideration, which refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff.

The LBDQ has been used for research purposes in industrial, military and educational settings. Fleishman (1953) and Fleishman, Harris and Burtt (1956) have used the LBDQ for their studies of factory foremen; the two dimensions of leader behavior were found useful in evaluating the results of a supervisory training program. Halpin (1953, 1954) has reported the relationship between the aircraft commander's behavior on these dimensions and evaluations of his performance made both by his superiors and his crew.

These two dimensions also parallel the two objectives of every group described by Cartwright and Zander (1960). These have been described as follows:

It appears that most, or perhaps all, group objectives can be subsumed under one of two headings: (a) the achievement of the specific group goals, or (b) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself. (p. 541)

One will recall the two dimensions of leadership behavior cited earlier in the works of Guba and Getzels (1965). Guba states that:
The unique task of the administrator can now be understood as that of mediating between those two sets of behavior eliciting forces, that is, the nomothetic and the idiographic, so as to produce behavior which is at once organizationally useful as well as individually satisfying action which will lead to such behavior on the part of personnel (and) is the highest expression of the administrator's art. (p. 121)

Bernard Bass (1965) realized that leaders (supervisors) played an important role in the success of an organization. They are pictured as the control-relay station between the superiors and the subordinates in the work environment. As such, they should be aware that their actions influence their subordinates.

In describing a successful leader's behavior, Bass emphasized that a successful leader (supervisor) is one who is considerate of the welfare of his subordinates, and also one who initiates a structure of relations between his workers and their job.

VI. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF LEADER BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL SETTINGS

Although it is frequently very painful for educators to recognize and admit the naked truth, many educators are often overwhelmed by the complexity of human behavior. It is not the purpose of this section to detail all aspects of human behavior, for there are a multiplicity of viewpoints. This section will, therefore, focus on selected psychological and social characteristics which are believed to have an impact as the leader's behavior attempts to positively influence teaching and learning. The formulation of the concept or social systems advanced by Getzel and Guba (1957) provides a framework for analytically viewing leader behavior in schools.
The importance of understanding the social milieu is a prerequisite for school administrators involved in supervision if maximized school effectiveness is to be achieved. This idea is emphasized by Sergiovanni and Starrett (1971).

In order for administrators... to behave in ways which increase school effectiveness, they must first come to understand and be able to work from an understanding of the sociological milieu for supervision. Crucial to this understanding is a comprehension of authority systems, compliance systems and status systems which form the basis for administrative actions. Power systems operate in an interaction arrangement between the bureaucratic tendencies of the schools and the professional tendencies of the schools of interaction invariably contain conflict. (p. 30)

Organizations such as American public schools are, by nature, a hierarchy comprising subordinate and superordinate relationships. Thus, the school is a structured social system. Within the structure each relationship and role is designed to facilitate the goals of the social system. The social system is designed to discharge certain institutional functions to facilitate the goals of the social system. The work flow within the organization is designed to produce an identifiable product which is useful to the larger social system. The school, for example, is designed to provide an educated citizenry for the larger society.

The organization as a social system may be viewed analytically in two dimensions, the sociological and the psychological. The important unit of the sociological dimension is the role. The role represents the dynamic aspects of the positions or offices. The role defines the behavior of individuals within the organization. Roles are defined in terms of expectations or the normative obligations and responsibilities which govern proper and legal modes of action. All roles are complimentary, meaning each role derives its function in terms of other roles. School systems, for example, are structured in terms of complimentary roles
such as principals and teachers or principals and superintendents. Each role has certain rules and regulations which govern the behaviors of individuals.

The psychological dimension relates to the interpersonal relationships within the context of schools, individuals are constantly interacting. To create a fulfilling emotional life for school staff, the leader must recognize the basic needs and personalities of the staff.

This set of assumptions is presented diagrammatically in the following model developed by Getzel and Guba (1957).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\hline
NOMOTHETIC DIMENSION & \\
Institution & Role & Expectation \\
Social System & \\
& \\
Individual & Personality & Needs Disposition \\
\hline
IDEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION & \\
& & \\
Observed Behavior & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Figure 1

These authors pointed out three sources of conflict in administration that may be deduced from their model. These are role-personality conflict, role-conflict and personality conflict. Leaders in schools, such as principal, will need to be aware of these environmental elements in order to understand staff. Neagly and Evans (1980) have formulated these hypotheses from this theory of social systems.

1. If the expectations of the staff and leader are congruent, then the goals of the institutions are more likely to be achieved.

2. If the personality and needs dispositions of the individual conflict with the institutional role expectation, then quality performance will not result.
Moser (1957) investigated leadership patterns of school principals reflects this idea that conflict situations potentially result from organization's interactions. This study revealed that conflict in expectations exists. Through extensive interviews of 12 principals and 12 superintendents and school staff, this study found that expectations of operational areas differed markedly between these three groups. Principals emphasized goals (nomothetic expectations) in relations with superiors and group needs and need dispositions (idiographic expectations) when interacting with teachers.

Lipham (1973) suggests that this typifies the principal as "man in the middle." Eye and Vodacek (1960) and Moyer (1955) studies revealed conflict and ambivalence in carrying out leadership. Sharp differences were found in what teachers expect the principal's role to be as compared to others.

Research which examined relations of personality to performance in schools has been conducted. Lipham (1973) suggests that conflict in personalities may exist between leader and staff. In examining the nature of leadership in this regard, he stressed that for psychological reasons some individuals don't mesh together. No amount of group participation concerning operational problems will be able to modify drastically those basic personality configurations which have been uniquely patterned by largely unknown factors.

The idea that there existed two separate dimensions for examining a leader's role can be seen in other leadership studies. Barnard (1938), for example, uses the terms "effectiveness" and "efficiency" in referring to the functions of an executive. According to his propositions, the persistence of cooperation depends upon the satisfaction of two conditions:
(a) its effectiveness; and (b) its efficiency. Effectiveness relates to the satisfaction on individual motives, and is personal in character. The test of effectiveness is the accomplishment of a common purpose or purposes; effectiveness can be measured. The test of efficiency (however) is the eliciting of sufficient individuals willing to cooperate. (pp. 60-61)

Along these same lines, Katz (1965) feels that the administrator needs: (a) sufficient technical skill to accomplish the mechanics of the particular job for which he is responsible; (b) sufficient human skill in working with others to be an effective group member and to be able to build cooperative effort within the team he leads; (c) sufficient conceptual skill to recognize the interrelationships of the various factors involved in his situation, which will lead him to take that action which is likely to achieve the maximum good for the total organization.

Sergiovanni ( ) explained that task-oriented behavior on the part of the school administrator will help to increase teachers' job satisfactions by helping teachers identify more closely with the task at hand. This task-oriented behavior includes such activities as organizing, planning work, and implementing goal achievement.

Mannheim, Rim and Grinberg (1967), however, suggests that structuring behavior is not conducive to being chosen by workers unless the workers' supervisor is perceived as being considerate of the employee's feelings and their self-worth. He showed that there exists a high concensus among workers' attitudes concerning the ideal conditions of consideration, but that much less concensus exists concerning structure. The results of his study showed that workers feel that they get less consideration than they would ideally expect.

Gross and Herriot (1966) reported possible determinants of the professional leadership of elementary school principals. Their analysis stemmed from a study of Executive Professional Leadership (EPL). In their research they examined the
behavior of principals in an effort to improve the quality of teacher performance. EPL scores derived for each principal were secured from a sample of that principal's staff.

Their findings stand in the way of previously held notions of effective leadership. They suggest that:

...if Executive Professional Leadership is to be the criterion, many school systems are selecting principals on grounds that appear to have little empirical justifications (such as): type or amount of teaching experience, experience as an assistant or a vice principal, number of graduate courses in educational administration, sex or marital status.

The possible criterion which these authors felt should be used for selecting elementary school principals are seen as: a high level of academic performance in college, a high order of interpersonal skill, the motive of service, the willingness to commit off-duty time to their work, and relatively little seniority as teachers.

In another study by Gross (1965), it was revealed that the majority of teachers expect and approve of the principal's exercising of close supervision over their activities. It was shown that the closer the supervision a principal exercises over his staff members, the greater is his/her effort to be of maximum service to the pupils. Thus, close supervision was not only positively related to teacher morale, but the student performance as well.

If, indeed, one assumes that successful leaders are those who mediate through the workers to efficiently accomplish the task at hand, one can identify effective leaders as high in the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration as measured by the LBDQ. Conversely, ineffective leaders can be seen as those who score low on the same variables. These assumptions are in keeping with Halpin, Barnard, Cartwright and Zander, Getzels and Guba, Bass and Katz.
Leaders have also been described as organizational climbers. Cribbin (1972) suggests that "climbers, as the name implies, are self-propelled in their quest for ever-increasing power and prestige. They are sensitively opportunistic in seeking out avenues for personal progress and self-aggrandizement."

When a frontal assault is blocked, climbers are likely to consolidate their present position or to more obliquely to increase their sphere of influence.

Persuasion is often used by leaders to influence the work group. Blake and Mouton (1963) suggest that the 1,9 style management is reflected in what Fromm (1953) described as gentle persuasion. An inflexible order may become an apologetic request. A favor is promised in return for the inconvenience incurred. The manager avoids rejection by coating with sugar those required inconveniences that cannot be prevented. The 1,9 motto is that nice guys don't fight. Sympathetic understanding of the problem is the tactic used to as one technique to encourage group acceptance of the task or decision.

Kent ( ) identifies three channels of communication that reaches and influences people as the eye, the ear and the sense of touch. These channels, while not the goals of the messages, are viewed as important avenues to be linked between the sender of the message and the receiver.

In summary, the quality of leadership therefore appears to involve more than merely responding to normative expectations of the school's social system. Leadership also entails an interpersonal relationship with others. If leadership is to be effective as a role expectation, the principal must take into account the needs disposition (idiographic dimension) of self and others. Perceptions of others are also important. In addition, the personal needs of leaders should be taken into account. Often leaders' behaviors are conditioned by their desire to move up the hierarchial level to higher, more responsible, positions. The ability of the leader to
persuade subordinates and superordinates of their abilities as well as the needs of the group and is also crucial if positive teaching and learning are to occur.

VII. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

The concept of instructional leadership, according to the effective schools' researchers, is a crucial role of principals. This role, however, has been addressed in the recent effective schools research mainly in terms of the accomplishment of learning outcomes or the style the principal uses to accomplish goals is less often discussed. It is within this latter dimension that the supervisory style or behavior of the principal becomes important, if they are to be successful in the improvement of both teaching and learning (Dull, 1981).

In recent years many principals have been accepting more and more responsibility for the supervision of instruction. The supervisory function is believed to be one of the fundamental reasons for the existence of the principalship. This belief has existed since the 1950's. There is a preponderance of educational literature which states that supervision is considered the most important function in the changing role of the modern principal: Pittenger (1951) wrote

Today, in the better systems, the principal is held primarily responsible for improving the instruction in his school. His duties include adapting the curriculum, stimulating teacher growth and improvement, setting up local experimentation and research, providing test and guidance facilities, and securing teaching materials ... (pp. 206-207)

The same point of view is expressed by MacKenzie and Corney (1954):

Status leaders in charge of instruction in an individual school are, in a broad sense, responsible for mobilizing the abilities and efforts of the teaching staff to provide an effective educational program ... (p. 29)

The supervisory behavior of principals continues as a topic of interest. Neagly and Evans (1980) summarizes the current thinking:
It should be readily apparent ... that the principal performs as a member of a team. The job of educational leadership is so immense today that it no longer can be accomplished successfully by individuals working independently. The more successful ... administrators surround themselves with a corps of well prepared specialists ... the ability to work with individuals and to utilize their special skills and talents thus becomes a priority in the qualities essential to dynamic leadership (p. 136).

Within the current thinking, several styles have emerged. Style results in the integration of task and people (Sergiovanni, Metzus and Burden, 1969). The standards to judge leadership excellence could therefore represent Sergiovanni's model of transaction.

Dull (1981) points out that principals as supervisors of teachers must be motivators.

Motivational leaders instill a feeling of personal achievement in their teaching staff. They communicate matters to teachers that will make them feel happy about their work. This role includes:

1. use of talents of staff
2. enthusiasm in their work and seek same for staff
3. maintain positive attitude in their relations with staff ...
4. support the facilitation of individual and school-wide goals provide feedback on their achievement (p. 70)

Instructional leadership, by its very nature, involves relationships with other members of the staff. Coladance and Getzel (1955) point out that the interpersonal relationship is the basic unit in administrative practice. The structural functions of an organization such as accomplishment of successful student outcomes, evaluation of staff and student performance become effective only when it is communicated and "takes" from the superordinate member to subordinate members.

"It is written this circumstance that administration always operates ... which makes the nature of the human relationships the overall factor in the administrative process." (p. 16)
DeBruyn (1976), in discussing modern approach to the principalship, points out that:

"To effect leadership, one must adjust his/her own behavior when attempting to get others to change their behavior ... the successful leader finds quickly it is he/she who must make adjustments to compensate for the strengths, weaknesses, beliefs, opinions and skills of his/her people ...(yet) leadership is a management responsibility and should be effected from the top down ..." (p. 66 and 96)

Sergiovanni and Starrett (1971) affirm the notion that both management philosophy and supervisory assumptions have an impact on leadership behavior and style.

Whatever a person does makes sense to him/her. This explains why two educators with similar supervisory responsibilities, in similar schools, with similar personnel, when confronted with an identical problem may operate in dramatically different ways. Each perceives that his/her method of operation is perhaps the only one suitable to his tasks and circumstances (p. 74-75).

Since the early 1920's, traditional management philosophy about supervisory response has shifted. Leaders today are no longer considered effective if solely governed by the Theory X, advocated by McGregor (1966). During the last fifty years, managerial styles and assumptions seem to have evolved to adopt the principle of participative or team management. Leaders in organizations operate from the assumption that organizational development is dependent upon human growth and change within the organization. The emphasis today appears to be a balance of concern for both people and results (see Figure 2).
## Managerial Philosophy and Supervisory Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type of Leader</th>
<th>Summary of Philosophy Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1920 - 1930 | Authoritarian Manager         | Father knows best  
i am the boss  
Results were stressed |
| 1940 - 1950 | Human Relations              | Happy people resulted in production effectiveness  
Leader job was to keep  
environment pleasant and  
staff contented         |
| 1950 - 1960 | Results Conformity           | Forced necessary because  
people are lazy            |
| 1960-Present | Participative/Team Management | Organizational Development is Dependent upon Human Development  
Balance between results/people |


**Figure 2**

In summary, effective leaders in schools, as in other organizations today, are reflective of having a concern about human relationships and the needs of their staff (Sergiovanni and Starrett). Equally crucial is the need to accomplish the expectation of the organization. The current thinking of leadership suggests that as an instructional leader, the principal must be able to marshall resources and people. The following section seeks to examine research that supports this conceptualization.
VI. STUDIES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

A study conducted by Lipham (1960) has considerable merit for the purposes of this particular study. He revealed that effective principals in large school systems were:

1. inclined to engage in meaningful and purposeful activity
2. concerned with achieving success and positions of higher status
3. able to relate well with others
4. secure in their home and environment.

Ineffective principals were seen to:

1. deliberate on problems and become involved with speculative reasoning
2. indicate a satisfaction with their present level of achievement and status
3. show anxiety about working with teachers but indicate an eagerness to work with students
4. be dependent upon others for support
5. exhibit strong emotional reactions in upsetting situations.

The study tends to confirm that secure principals are seen by their teachers as being more effective than less secure principals.

Nolan (1969) conducted a study of the leadership behaviors and the administrative action patterns of elementary school principals in New Jersey. He compared their leadership behaviors (as perceived by their superintendents, the principals themselves, their teachers and the presidents of the parent organizations) to the administrative actions of leaders and non-leaders in the same district.

The analysis of the returns from 128 selected school districts revealed that:

1. There was a marked similarity in the perceptions of the four respondents as to what leadership behaviors were expected of the principals.
2. Superintendents expect principals to manifest all dimensions of leader behavior.
3. The leadership behavior of the principals did not seem to significantly influence their administrative actions.
4. The teachers and the presidents of the parents' organizations shared a similar view of the principals' leadership roles. Surprisingly, this was similar to the superintendents' responses.
5. The principals' appraisals of their own leadership behavior were realistic.

Croft (1968) described a team study from the University of Oregon which sought a description of teachers' perceptions of administrative and supervisory practices. Their study was based on the schools of one particular school district in Oregon. The conclusions of the study were that teachers indicated that they turned more frequently to their colleagues than to their principals for guidance on certain key professional issues. It was also found that the practices of the school principals were often in direct conflict with the teachers' normative expectations of supervisory behavior. Indeed, the teachers in the study saw their principals' major responsibilities as budget, coordinating policy and public relations rather than instructional leadership.

In examining the effective leader behaviors of elementary school principals, Medseker (1959) asked teachers to describe the leader behaviors of their principals. He found that there was a wide area of agreement among the teachers sampled. Effective principals were those who provided leadership through building morale among staff members and who created an overall unity within the organization proper.

Campbell (1964) conducted a study with teachers to determine the types of behavior which they felt were pleasing and displeasing. His study ranked the style of pleasing principal, as described by his staff, and by parent-teacher association presidents in the following order:

1. shows an interest work and offers assistance
2. possesses pleasing personality traits, such as courtesy, firmness and high integrity
3. praises personnel and passes on compliments
4. supports actions and decisions of personnel
5. is a good organizer
6. assumes authority and stands by convictions
7. allows self-direction in work and shows confidence in ability
8. makes wishes clearly known
9. allows participation in decision-making
10. is firm with school standards and student discipline
11. is considerate of employees' workload.

Types of displeasing principal behavior as ranked by Campbell are:

1. possesses poor personality traits, such as rudeness, unfairness, low integrity, and moral offensiveness
2. is a "fence-sitter" and seems afraid to assume authority rightfully his
3. is a poor disciplinarian
4. is not a good organizer
5. does not allow participation in decision-making
6. is not considerate of the workload of personnel
7. does not support personnel in decisions or actions
8. does not make wishes clearly known
9. does not show an interest in, or offer assistance with work
10. does not allow self-direction in work or show confidence in ability
11. allows too much parental influence
12. is critical of the actions of personnel
13. is too demanding about little details
14. show inadequate job knowledge and does not praise personnel.

VII. RESEARCH ON LEADER BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPALS

One of the expected organizational goals of schools is to achieve the highest possible quality of student learning. The way a leader behaves in motivating and influencing human resources is believed to be a link that contributes to the quality of teaching and learning. Research suggests that multiple leader behaviors are required to achieve quality teaching and learning (DeBruyn, 1976; Dull, 1981; Pfiferer and Fels, 1964). A popular way of characterizing these principals behaviors has been to use a dichotomous model. For instance, Sergiovanni and Starrett (1971) have summarized research which reflects this trend.
### SUMMARY OF LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Interaction Facilitation</th>
<th>Work Facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowers and Seashore</td>
<td>Interaction facilitation</td>
<td>Work facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemphill and Coons 1975</td>
<td>Group interaction</td>
<td>Objective attainment behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halpin and Winer 1957</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz et al 1950</td>
<td>Employee orientation</td>
<td>Production orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn 1958</td>
<td>Providing need satisfaction</td>
<td>Enabling Goal Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann 1962</td>
<td>Providing needed</td>
<td>Administrative skills; technical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human relation skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert 1961</td>
<td>Principle of supportive relationship</td>
<td>Technical Knowledge Planning, Scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartwright and Zander 1960</td>
<td>Group maintenance</td>
<td>Goal achievement functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getzels and Guba 1957</td>
<td>Idiographic</td>
<td>Nomothetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Person Orientation</td>
<td>System Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake and Mouton</td>
<td>Concern for people</td>
<td>Concern for production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
The influence a leader in educational settings has on those under his/her supervision seems to depend on how successful the leader is in willingly expressing the support and confidence of others. The leader will not be successful unless the leader can inspire colleagues with the zest to work harmoniously in realizing goals they have cooperatively developed.

Several studies in education research have relied heavily on the instrument developed at the Ohio State University. This instrument identifies initiating structure and consideration as two fundamental leadership dimensions (Halpin, 1955, 1959, 1967).

Initiating structure refers to the leader behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration refers to the behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff. (p. 86)

The two leadership dimensions may be viewed schematically in Figure 4 (Halpin, 1958).

**HALPIN INITIATING STRUCTURE AND CONSIDERATION MODEL**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{INITIATING STRUCTURE} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{High} \\
\text{C-} \\
\text{C+} \\
(2)
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CONSIDERATION Low} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{High} \\
(4)
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IS-} \\
\text{C-} \\
\text{C+} \\
(3)
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Low} \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 4
Sergiovanni and Starrett (1971) summary of this model suggests that each of four quadrants represents a distinct leadership style. Quadrant 1 describes leaders who emphasize both initiating structure and consideration, the leader exhibiting this type of style is perceived as most effective. Quadrant 2 describes leaders who emphasize initiating structure at the expense of consideration. Leaders, however, may be effective in terms of tension, when the work is routine, but this effectiveness is short in duration. Quadrant 3 emphasizes consideration of members at the expense of initiating structure. Quadrant 4 is viewed as least effective (p. 91).

Halpin (1967) in summarizing work with the LBDQ in educational organizations notes that the evidence clearly indicates that initiating structure and consideration are fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. Effective leadership is generally associated with high performance on both dimensions. However, there is a tendency for superiors and subordinates to rank opposite dimensions of leadership as being most crucial to effectiveness.

Using these descriptors of initiating structure and consideration from the LBDQ, many researchers have attempted to study task and person oriented behavior. Morris and Bennett (1979) reported results of a study in which elementary teachers assessed the supervisory behaviors of either their principals or instructional supervisor. The teachers' assessments were graphed onto two leadership guides, one devised by Halpin (1955) and the other devised by Blake and Mouton. See Figure 4 for the Halpin guide. The Blake and Mouton guide depicts five leadership styles of which four are basically the same as those used by Halpin. The fifth leadership style indicated by Blake and Mouton represents a balance emphasis between tasks and persons orientation (see Figure 5).
BLAKE AND MOUTON’S
MANAGEMENT GRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>1,9 Management</th>
<th>9,9 Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,5 Management</td>
<td>Adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out work with maintaining morale of people at satisfactory level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,1 Management</td>
<td>9,1 Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

For the twelve competency areas investigated by Morris and Bennett in their study, differences between teacher's ratings of principals and supervisors, the following findings were made. That supervisors' overall behaviors more closely approached the high task/high person orientation leadership extreme in both the Halpin and the Blake and Mouton guides. However, principals' overall behaviors most closely approached the 5,5 section of the Blake and Mouton guide. The section denotes a balance of emphasis on task and people.
Feitler and Long (1971) showed five combined organizations climate variables to account for significant amounts of the statistical variance of ten leadership behaviors of elementary principals. The LBDQ Form XII was used as the assessment instrument. These ten behaviors were: Representation, Persuasion, Initiation of Structure, Tolerance of Freedom, Role Assumption, Consideration, Production Emphasis, Integration, Demand Reconciliation and Tolerance of Uncertainty.

The organizational climate variables were:

1. the nature of the interpersonal environment derived from the behavior of the principal
2. the quality and amount of cooperation operative in the school particularly as it relates to tasks and goals
3. the communication process and the quality of decision-making in schools
4. the friendliness and support present in schools
5. the effect of involvement in setting goals and decision-making on the motivation of teachers.

The person-oriented dimension of principal leadership was found significantly greater in schools have "participatory" group organizational processes than in schools having "authoritarian" processes.

VIII. RESEARCH OF LEADER BEHAVIOR AND SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

Which of the broadly defined leader behavior is related to greater academic achievement is a question raised in this study. A variety of methodologies made by different researchers prevent a definitive answer. Austin (1981) reviewed six studies that exemplified the characteristics of exemplary schools. The studies were conducted by researchers in the states of Maryland, California, Delaware, Michigan, New York and Pennsylvania. From the findings, Austin summarized that the greatest asset of an exemplary school common to the six studies:
- Create a sense of direction for the school
- Execute their designed leadership role
- Fasten high expectations
- Recruits on staff members
- Have had advance training
- Tend to have an education as an elementary teacher
- Have particular competency in one area of the curriculum, such as reading or mathematics.

With respect to academic achievement, some research findings tend to support both behaviors (Weber, 1971; Armor and others, 1976; Edmonds, 1979). Brookover and Lezotte (1979) found that, in six schools sampled, schools registering improvement in student achievement, the principal was more likely to be assertive in his instructional role and is more likely to be an instructional leader and assume responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic objectives. Whereas permissiveness, informality with staff, greater emphasis on public relations and lesser emphasis on the evaluation of the school's effectiveness were associated with principals in the two declining schools.

In a study of eight successful urban elementary schools sponsored by Phi Delta Kappa (1980) researchers concluded that certain behaviors were a key factor for the improvement in student achievement. These behaviors included participatory decision-making; possession and communications of high expectations for achievement, successful communications of the principal's own expectations to the staff; empathy, interest and concern for others.
### FINDINGS OF RESEARCH STUDIES RELATING PRINCIPALS' BEHAVIOR, ATTITUDES, AND TRAINING TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Year of Study</th>
<th>The Relationship Between Characteristics of Principals and Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies of Exemplary Schools in Six States: California (1977), Delaware (1977), Maryland (1978), Michigan (1974), New York (1976), and Pennsylvania (1978)</td>
<td>The six studies found that principals in exemplary schools provided their schools with a sense of direction, displayed strong leadership, communicated high academic expectations, recruited their staff, possessed advanced training, had an elementary teaching background, and were particularly skilled in one area of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber/Council for Basic Education (1971)</td>
<td>Strong leadership was a factor common to four inner-city schools demonstrating high reading achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of New York Office of Education Performance Review (1974)</td>
<td>The principal of a school having high reading achievement scores emphasized stability, maintained good teacher-principal relations, delegated authority, engaged in informal observational practices, was supportive of the staff, and was goal/achievement oriented. Researchers observed that administrative effectiveness greatly depended on teamwork.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6**
### Findings of Research Studies Relating Principals' Behavior, Attitudes, and Training to Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vallina (1978)</td>
<td>Principals in high reading achieving schools, compared to principals in low achieving schools were more involved in instructional assessment; displayed greater use of creative approaches to school organization; effected greater inclusion of staff and parents in planning program improvements; provided greater leadership in the area of pupil personnel services; were more adept at community relations; and were more concerned with staff selection, assimilation, evaluation, and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookover and Lezotte/College of Urban Development, Michigan State University (1979)</td>
<td>Principals in improving schools were more apt to be instructional leaders, more apt to be disciplinarians, and more apt to assume responsibility for evaluation. Principals in declining schools were more permissive, more informal with teachers, and more concerned with general public relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean and Others/Office of Research and Evaluation of the School District of Philadelphia and the Research Department of Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia (1979)</td>
<td>Principals who had experience in the field of reading and principals who often observed 4th grade reading classes had 4th grade students who exhibited higher reading growth. Other variables, such as the principal's administrative experience, degree status, and tenure in the school, were not significantly related to 4th grade student reading achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 (continued)
**FINDINGS OF RESEARCH STUDIES RELATING PRINCIPALS' BEHAVIOR, ATTITUDES, AND TRAINING TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Project/New York City Public Schools (1979)</td>
<td>Strong administrative leadership, high teacher expectations concerning student ability, an emphasis on basic skills instruction, continuous evaluation of student progress, and a school climate conducive to learning, were more characteristic of improving schools than of maintaining/declining schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezky and Winfield (1979)</td>
<td>The two major requirements for reading success in low socio-economic areas were &quot;strong building-wide curricular leadership&quot; (usually generated by achievement-oriented principals) and then the school's efficient implementation of the instructional program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeGuire (1980)</td>
<td>Principals in schools experiencing improvement in 6th grade reading achievement exhibited greater involvement in the reading program and were less frustrated with limitations of time and resources than principals in declining schools. Frequent assessment of students was another characteristic of the improving schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappa (1980)</td>
<td>Characteristics of high achievement schools were participatory decision making by teachers, and principals who had the authority to make the final decision in staff selections, who had high expectations for achievement, who clearly communicated their role expectations to staff, who were highly visible to students, who were action-oriented, and who related well to others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 (continued)
Utsey (1963) examined perceptions of teachers regarding instructional leadership behaviors of principals. Analysis of the instructional leadership patterns of the thirty principals revealed that the following seven actions were emphasized:

1. Working with teachers by means of individual conferences
2. Working with teachers by means of group conferences
3. Attempting to build and maintain harmonious interpersonal staff relationships
4. Establishing good building organization
5. Providing instructional materials and supplies
6. Providing information
7. Conducting classroom visits.

IX. SUMMARY

This chapter presented a review of the literature regarding dimensions of leader behaviors that influence group's working relationship as well as organizational goals. From this review there seems to be an agreement that if leader behaviors are perceived as both high initiating structure and consideration that the leader and the organization may be viewed as effective. Since the LBDQ has been widely used to examine leader behaviors in school settings, and since it has not been used as a methodological approach to describing leader behavior in the recent effective and ineffective school research, it has been selected for use in this study.

Leadership has been explored using various theoretical underpinnings. Research has evolved from the inherited trait theory to modern collegial theories.

The Ohio State Studies acted as a foundation for modern theory. Through a review of the literature, there exists little doubt that the elementary principal is in a position of leadership. This leadership is, however, interwoven into the role as an official position of power as well as intertwined in the ability of the leader to influence people to also want to achieve the mission of theory.
CHAPTER THREE

I. INTRODUCTION

Before much progress can be made in resolving such complex problems as low levels of achievement or ineffective leadership in schools, educators must learn about the setting in which these phenomena occur. One outgrowth of this study is that it will serve as a miniscule part of a gigantic growing body of research efforts aimed at describing more fully characteristics that differentiate high and low achieving schools.

This chapter discusses the research design, defines the population and sample, administration and collections of questionnaire, describes the instrument and the procedure used in the treatment of the data. This chapter also presents a listing of the questions underlying the rationale of this study.

II. RESEARCH DESIGN

The design best suited to achieve the intent of this study is ex post facto research. In defense of ex post facto research in education pointed out Kerlinger:

Ex post facto research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables. (p. 379)

F. McGuigan (1968), a psychologist, also supports the use of ex post facto design by stating:
In using this method the investigator goes into the fields to collect data. He takes an event as if it occurs naturally and studies it, with no effort to produce or to control the event, as in experimentation. (p. 58)

III. POPULATION/SAMPLE SELECTION

The unit of analysis is the school building. This focus on the school building is predicated on the methodology used in the growing body of effective schools research. Cohen (1980) summarizes one of the reasons effective schools researchers focus on the school level in contrast to the district level:

...important differences in student achievement occur between schools. This is especially true when we compare schools with different socio-economic and racial compositions. At the school level, there is a strong correlation between the proportion of poor and minority students and the achievement scores of the schools. (p. 2)

Considerable evidence conducted by Edmonds (1979), Brookover et al (1977) and Weber (1971) also supports the view that there are some schools serving disadvantaged populations in urban areas which are unusually effective in raising the achievement levels of these students.

The universe of school buildings selected for this study were the only identifiable public elementary schools in northeast Ohio involved in the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities OASIS Projects (see Appendix ). The OASIS Project is centered on providing technical assistance to Ohio school administrators interested in making their schools more reflective of the characteristics of effective schools. A review of this listing indicated that nine districts and thirty-three schools were eligible to participate in this study (see Appendix ). All buildings but one were located in city school districts as classified by the 1981-82 and 1982-83 Ohio Department of Education School Directory (Table 1).
### Table 1

TOTAL SAMPLE: DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS; ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT CODE</th>
<th>DISTRICT TYPE</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>STUDENT BODY SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K, 4-6</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The District types were obtained from the 1981-82 ODE Directory.

C = City
L = Local

The decision to participate in this study was voluntarily made. In this regard, the independent variable, leader behavior, could not be manipulated nor could the researcher assign schools to groups at random or to assign treatments to groups at random. Kerlinger (1973) supports self selection as a valid tool in social sciences
and particularly education. His basic premise is that behavioral science research such as education, particularly formalized schooling, does not exist in an idealized social scientific research world.

In an ideal social scientific research world, the drawing of random assignment of subjects to groups and treatments of groups, would always be possible. In the real world, however, one, two, or even all three of these possibilities do not exist. It is possible to draw subjects at random in both experimental and ex post facto research, to assign subjects to groups at random or to assign treatment to groups at random. Thus subjects can "assign themselves" to groups, can "select themselves" into the groups or the basic of characteristics other than those in which the investigator may be interested. The subjects and the treatments come, as it were already assigned to the groups. (p. 381)

The superintendent or appropriate assistant superintendent of each school district involved in the effective schools movement was contacted by telephone to request permission for schools to participate in the study. Each superintendent or appropriate assistant superintendent was informed by the author that the study was designed to determine if any difference in leader behavior existed between the effective and ineffective schools.

Further explanations were given to the effect that:

- degree of effectiveness or ineffectiveness would be assessed by district and building level standardized achievement test scores.
- the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) would be used to assess perceptions of leader behavior.
- the LBDQ required approximately 30-40 minutes to complete at a time and place convenient for the respondent.
- all materials would be sent to the central office, or the building principal
- all materials would be packaged and ready for distribution to the participants
- to avoid undue administrative paperwork, districts were given options for respondents to return questionnaires either in self-addressed postage paid envelopes to the author or in sealed envelopes to a central location for bulk mailing
- autonomy of districts was assured
- results of the study would be sent to each participatory school.
All but one school district contacted replied affirmatively to the request. However, all that replied affirmatively did so with the stipulation that participation depended upon cooperation from principals or district committees responsible for external research efforts. In this regard, three districts initially contacted were not included in the sample. One district that declined was already involved in several other similar research efforts which focused on teachers. In another case, even though willingness was obtained from the assistant superintendent, the committee decision-making process within the district included a time line extending beyond the May 1983 instrumentation period established in this study.

The second step, securing cooperation from principals, was initially done by telephone. During the initial telephone conversation, most principals enthusiastically accepted. However, many principals in one large urban area declined due to problems inherent in the district's change of administration and pending court litigation. A follow-up letter was sent to willing principals describing the purpose of the study and the procedure for administering the instrument.

The building participation in the study also depended upon the district's willingness to provide the researcher with information on: 1) district and building level achievement as measured by standardized test scores basic skills subjects; 2) district and building level ethnic composition; and 3) free reduced lunch. This data is important in that school characteristics such as this have frequently been used in other research on effective and ineffective schools.

Cohen (1980), a senior researcher with the National Institute of Education, in the following statement supports the view that standardized test scores in basic skills areas and ethnic composition are important elements to include in defining a school as effective and ineffective.
Two criteria applied simultaneously, for a conceptual, working definition of effective schools. The first criterion is a high mean level of achievement. Ideally, this would be defined on an absolute scale, reflecting the extent to which students performed at some desirable levels. (This is in contrast with a relative or comparative definition of achievement in which effectiveness would be defined as schools with a performance level which is higher than those of schools with similar student bodies.

The second criterion deals with the relationship between pupil background characteristics (e.g. socio-economic status, race ...) and pupil performance. (p. 3)

The decision to release district level achievement and pupil composition data to a researcher external to the district was a determination supported by superintendent but delegated through designated central office administrators. In this regard, this researcher made contact with individuals who occupied various roles in central office. Thus, contact with the latter was made by telephone and/or in person.

It was doing this step that the researcher found that not only the names of achievement test differed among the group of districts but that the manner of reporting test scores also varied considerably from district to district. A review of this information did, however, reveal that percentile test scores were most commonly used in a majority of the districts. This latter measure, central tendency, was used as a procedure to select the sample for this study. Table 2 shows the variation among district with regard to the different standardized achievement instrument used as well as to the variation among districts with regard to how test scores were reported.

After determining which central tendency measure of student test scores to use, the next step ranks the buildings into two categories of high and low achieving schools. The buildings ranging 1981-82 reading test scores that were above the fiftieth percentile level were categorized as high achieving schools. In contrast, the building having
1981-82 reading test scores that were below the fiftieth percentile level were categorized as low achieving schools (note Table 3).

Table 2

TYPE OF CENTRAL TENDENCY MEASURES
TEST RESULTS REPORTED BY
DISTRICTS 1982-83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT CODES</th>
<th>NCE</th>
<th>CRT</th>
<th>PERCENTILES</th>
<th>GRADE EQUIVALENTS</th>
<th>STANTINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District C</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District E</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

TOTAL SAMPLE: BUILDINGS ABOVE AND BELOW 50TH PERCENTILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT CODES</th>
<th>ABOVE(^n=7)</th>
<th>BELOW(^n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to insure the validity of these results, with previous methodological procedures used in effective school research, it was also necessary to assure that the school student populations had between 25-75% free and reduced lunch status as well as a racial composition of at least 24%. If schools did not meet this criteria they were eliminated from the sample. The distribution of schools finally selected comprise a sample of seventeen schools in six school districts (see Table 1).
Descriptive data concerning the total sample schools finally included revealed that all but one of the participating schools were classified as city districts (Ohio Educational Directory 1982-83). Eight schools house grades K-6, two schools housed 6-8, two other schools housed K-5, two others housed K-4, one housed K, 4-6, one housed 5-6 and another contained K-3. Eleven schools had a student population equal to or less than 500, six contained between 501 and 700 students.

The sample of seventeen schools, high and low achieving schools show that all seven high achieving schools reflected student minority composition which ranged from 24% to 98.4%. The low achieving schools sample is composed of ten schools (see Table 4).

IV. DATA COLLECTION

The data in this study were collected through a mailed survey. Kerlinger (1973), Issac (1974), Newman (1973) and Meyers and Grossen (1974), consider survey research appropriate for education and behavioral fact finding. This mailing consisted of two cover letters, and a questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section one asked for demographic information on respondents and section two included 40 items for the revised LBDQ Form XII. The letters explained the purpose of this study and the procedures to use in filling out the questionnaire. To add credibility to the study, the letters were typed on The Ohio State University stationery. The demographic information gathered information such as respondent's age, sex, race, experience and training. Also the demographic section elicited information regarding characteristics of the school such as respondents' awareness of effective schools, their involvement level and building's curricular focus (Appendix B).
An appeal was made to each district representative and respondent to complete the questionnaire before the end of the school year. The data collection period was during the months of May and June 1983. All respondents were assured anonymity for their responses.

V. MEASURE OF VARIABLES

Two variables—leader behavior and levels of school achievement are measured in this study. The level of student achievement was accomplished by definition. The leader behavior of principals was determined by using a modified version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) Form XII. Although the questions of the LBDQ remained basically the same, the wording was changed to emphasize principal and teacher referents. All forty items from the revised LBDQ Form XII were focused on the dimensions of consideration, initiating structure, persuasion and upward mobility.

The LBDQ (Appendix B), was chosen because it was designed to measure leader behavior, or as Stodgill (1963; p. 11) suggests in the Manual for Administering The LBDQ Form XII:

LBDQ will describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any group or organization; provided the followers have an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader in the group.

Although the revised LBDQ Form XII has been widely used to investigate leader behavior outside educational settings, it has had considerable use in schools.

Schriesheim and Kerr (1975) examined the information available about the validity and reliability of the early LBDQ and the revised Form LBDQ XII. This is reviewed in Chapter One of this research. These researchers concluded that the instrument could benefit from some refinement. But, based on their study, the
instrument does not suffer from shortcomings which plague other versions of leadership descriptors.

Table 4

PERCENT OF STUDENT RACIAL COMPOSITION AND FREE/REDUCED LUNCH STATUS REPORTED BY BUILDING 1982-83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Codes</th>
<th>Racial Composition Minority</th>
<th>Economic Status Free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. TREATMENT OF DATA-SCORING

The modified LBDQ Form XII is composed of four subscales, each of which is totaled independently. In completing the modified LBDQ XII, the respondents recorded selected answers on the answer sheet that was a part of the test booklet. The respondent scored, always = 5, often = 4, occasionally = 3, seldom = 2, and never = 1. These point values were used for all but four questions (see Scoring Key in Appendix C). These questions were scored in reverse order, or 1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = occasionally, 4 = seldom, and 5 = never.

A record sheet for each of the four subscales allowed the researcher to compute a mean score for each of the subscales. These scores will be tabulated and examined for significant differences between respondent groups.

VII. STATISTICAL ANALYSES

The statistical analyses of this study include descriptive statistical methods. Identification of leader behavior of principals will be computed through tabulation of the LBDQ for each principal and teacher. The means and standard deviation for each subscale will be computed for principals and teachers by categories of student achievement.

Determination of the differences in leader behavior will be computed through running ANOVA, T test and F test using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. The mean and significant differences of each subscale will be compared principals and teachers for each category of schools to determine if any significant differences in leader behavior can be found. Since leader behavior defined by the revised LBDQ Form XII is a function of four subscales, it appears that a significant difference in any of the four subscales is cause to describe a significant difference in the total leader behavior.
VIII. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the leader behavior of principals as perceived by teachers in two categories of schools, high and low achieving schools. Specifically, four leader dimensions, persuasion, initiating structure, consideration and superior orientation will be analyzed. The design of the study includes how the sample was selected, the collection of data procedures, the instrument description and statistical procedures for analyzing the data.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted to examine the perceptions of elementary teachers concerning their respective principal's leader behavior. The unit of analysis for this study comprised academically high and low achieving schools. These schools were geographically located in the northeastern section of Ohio. This study sought to answer these specific questions:

1. Do teacher's perceptions of elementary principals leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) differ in the effective and ineffective urban schools?

2. What are the significant leadership behaviors as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire on which elementary school principals in effective and ineffective urban schools differ as perceived by teachers.

3. Do elementary school principals in effective and ineffective schools self perceptions of leader behavior differ from teachers as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

4. Do elementary school teachers and principals in effective schools differ in their perceptions of principal's leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

5. Do elementary school teachers and their principals in ineffective schools differ in their perceptions of the principals leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

II. RESPONSE RATE

The target population consisted of twenty-one school buildings representing a total of 435 principals and teachers. This target population is located in eight Ohio
School Districts representing geographically six counties of the state. Of the 435 questionnaires that were distributed, 78.6 percent (or 342) were returned. After the questionnaires were sorted and reviewed, several were rejected from the sample due to insufficient standardized test score results. These scores were needed in order to separate school buildings into academically high and low categories. The total rate of return for usable questionnaires was seventy percent (63.4) or 262 teachers and 17 principals. Table 1 provides a listing of number of staff per building and number returned. The rate of return per building meets the criteria established by instruction developers (HALPIN). All data from selected local and city school districts was collected during a period of time commencing May 12, 1982 and ending July 26, 1982.

The results of this research project are described in this chapter by 1) analyzing the response rate; 2) analyzing the characteristics of the respondents; 3) analyzing the characteristics of schools using effective schools characteristics as a basis and; 4) analyzing the aforementioned five questions focusing on teachers and principals perceptions of leader behavior from two categories of academically high and low elementary schools.

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Teacher Respondents

There was a total of 261 teacher respondents in this study. Tables 2 and 3 describe several personal and professional characteristics of teachers in high and low achieving schools. Percent scores were tabulated and a chi square statistical technique was used to determine whether significant differences occurred between high and low schools. No significant difference
was found between two groups of schools in either of the personal characteristics of teachers in high and low achieving schools.

The data in Table 6 does show that the largest percent of the teacher respondents in both groups of schools were white female. Twenty-five percent of the teaching staff in both groups held masters degrees with the majority of the staff in both groups of schools having only bachelor as the highest degree. This table shows that 53.7 percent of teachers in low achieving schools had continuing contracts as compared to 48.4 percent of teachers in high achieving buildings.

Table 7 shows that as a group, teachers in low achieving schools had more total years of experience than teachers in high achieving schools, whereas teachers in high achieving group had more teaching experience in their current building assignment than teachers in low achieving schools.

Principals Respondents

There was a total of 16 principal respondents who filled out the demographic profile. Table 8 describes the personal and professional characteristics of principals in high and low achieving buildings to items requesting information on sex, race, training and type of contract. Percentages were tabulated and in items where possible a chi square statistical technique was used to determine whether significant differences occurred between high and low achieving schools.

No significant differences were found. This table does illustrate that the largest percent of principal respondents in both groups of schools were white females. More principals in the low achieving schools had degrees beyond the masters than in the high achieving schools. In addition, more principals in the low achieving schools had continuing eight year contracts as compared to principals in high achieving schools.
Table 7 shows that the group of high achieving school principals had more years of total experience in the profession as well as a longer period of time in current assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLDG. CODES</th>
<th>NO. OF BUILDING STAFF</th>
<th>NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED</th>
<th>NO. OF USABLE LBDQ RET.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCHR</td>
<td>PRNCPL</td>
<td>TCHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Separate: 77.5% 100% 63.0% 80.9%
Combined: 78.6%

Note: All building usable response rate exceeded 6 or 7 standard prescribed per leader (HALPIN 1957).
### Table 6

PERCENTAGES OF PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHER RESPONDENTS IN HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
<th>HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7

PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS IN LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS COMPARED TO TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS IN HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOLS REPORTED IN MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience</td>
<td>L 14.1</td>
<td>L 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 11.9</td>
<td>H 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Building</td>
<td>L 6.9</td>
<td>L 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 7.3</td>
<td>H 7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L = Low achieving schools
H = High achieving schools
IV. SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

Tables 9 and 10 provide a profile of each group of high and low achieving schools according to teachers and principals perceptions of the level of effective school involvement. Level of involvement is divided into three sections including Staff Personal Awareness, Staff Development Activities and Building Implementation Focus. A chi square statistical technique was possible when used to determine if there is a significant difference between teachers in the two categories of schools.

This profile of both groups of schools resembles the prototype of other effective school studies. In other words, at least 40% of the schools' staffs indicated that the following four effective school characteristics are in operation.

1. sense of mission
2. emphasis on basic skills
3. time on task
4. frequent monitoring of pupil progress

What is different in this profile is that it provides a more thorough assessment of effective schools' characteristics by reporting percentage responses from teachers as well as principals. The data supports recent ideas and theories about school improvement, the staff acceptance and impact at the building level is often uneven. Tables 9 and 10 demonstrate that while the characteristics of effective schools are operational in all schools, staff perceptions in each group of schools fall short of having total awareness, implementation and focus. Interestingly, more staff in low achieving groups of schools have participated in inservice at the building and district level than high achieving schools. The data also suggests that high achieving schools tend to emphasize the basic skill area of reading and language arts more than low achieving group of schools. Table 5 illustrates that
.05 level of significant differences occur between teachers in high and low achieving schools in the following items:

1. awareness of effective schools movement
2. articles read on effective schools
3. building inservice
4. language arts
5. time on task
6. emphasis on high expectation.

Table 8

CHARACTERISTICS OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
<th>HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n Percentages</td>
<td>n Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 44.4</td>
<td>3 42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5 55.6</td>
<td>4 57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5 55.6</td>
<td>5 71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4 44.4</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>0 ----</td>
<td>0 ----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7 77.3</td>
<td>7 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
<td>0 ----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
<td>0 ----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Contract:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>4 44.4</td>
<td>5 71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>5 55.6</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One principal declined to fill out demographic data section of the questionnaire.*
Table 9
RESPONSE OF TEACHERS REGARDING STAGES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS REPORTED IN PERCENTAGE BY HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
<th>HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of the Effective School Movement?*</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you read any article on Effective Schools?*</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you participated in any of the following inservice and/or conference devoted to Effective Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inservice*</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Inservice</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conference</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Conference</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/Academy</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any of the following curricular areas emphasized as a part of your building's Mission Statement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts*</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any of the following Effective Schools characteristics implemented in your school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on Task*</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent monitoring of pupil progress</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on High Expectations*</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates .05 level of significance.
Table 10
PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS REGARDING STAGES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
<th>HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Awareness**
- Are you aware of the Effective Schools Movement? **100** **100**
- Have you read any articles on Effective Schools **100** **100**

**Level of Implementation**
- Have you participated in any of the following inservice and/or conference devoted to Effective Schools?
  - Building Inservice **90.0** **71.4**
  - District Inservice **80.0** **85.7**
  - Regional Conference **40.0** **57.1**
  - State Conference **60.3** **57.1**
  - University/Academy **40.0** **28.6**

**Level of Focus**
- Are any of the following curriculum areas emphasized as a part of your building mission statement?
  - Reading **90.0** **25.7**
  - Math **100.0** **85.7**
  - Science **40.0** **14.3**
  - Social Studies **10.0** **14.3**
  - Language Arts **30.0** **71.4**

Are any of the following effective schools characteristics implemented in your schools?
- Time on Task **66.5** **42.9**
- Parent Involvement **80.0** **57.1**
- Frequent Monitoring **88.9** **85.7**
- Pupil Monitoring
- Emphasis on High Expectations **100.00** **85.7**
V. ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS PERCEPTIONS OF LEADER BEHAVIOR MEASURED BY THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The following teacher and principal responses to questions 1, 3, 4, and 5 were analyzed using a T test calculation for each group's mean scores. A two-tailed probability F test was used as a check for homogeneity of variance between scores of high and low achieving groups. In cases where the F test determined that group variability was significant at .05 level, a separate variance two tailed probability T value analysis was calculated. If, however, the F test was analyzed as not significant, the .05 level a pooled variance two tailed probability test was used.

Question One: Do staff's perceptions of elementary principals' leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire differ in effective and ineffective urban schools?

Table 11 provides teachers in high and low achieving schools responses to the above question. The results of a T test revealed that two groups of high and low achieving school teachers do differ in their perceptions of leader behavior. This difference was evident, however, only in two of the four subscales, consideration and superior orientation. This data suggests that teachers in high achieving schools perceived their principals exhibited consideration behaviors more often than did teachers perceived principal consideration leader behaviors in low achieving schools. However, the mean scores of teachers in low achieving schools demonstrate that principals often exhibit behaviors indicative of cordiality with central office staff and superiors, having influence with upper level echelons and striving for high job status.

Question Two: What are the significant leadership behaviors as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire on which elementary school principals in effective and ineffective urban schools differ as perceived by teachers?
Table 11

T TEST ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS OF LEADER BEHAVIOR IN HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS AS MEASURED BY THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>BUILDING CATEGORY</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>2 TAILED F VALUE</th>
<th>POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2 TAILED PROB.</th>
<th>SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE 2 TAILED PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Consideration</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>* .003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Superior Orientation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>* .024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level using 2 tailed probability test.

As a result of analysis of variance tests, a measure of significant difference between high and low school groups, thirteen items out of the forty item questionnaire, were found to have a .05 level of significance. Table 12 illustrates the specific items and subscales of each of these thirteen items. These items approximate an operational definition of the leader behavior which teachers rated on a Likert-type scale of occasional to often. Although thirteen of these items are significant at the .05 level, no follow-up test was run to determine if any of these items are significant at the .01 level. According to Bonerone (1970) about five of these thirteen items may have occurred by chance.
Table 11 illustrates that teachers in high achieving groups of schools perceived principals' behavior as reflecting contemporary leadership styles. In other words, principals treat teachers as equals, make the environment pleasant, are willing to make changes and are friendly and approaching. Whereas, teachers in the low achieving group of schools perceived that principals exhibit behavior indicative of persuasion initiating structure and superior orientation.

This study's findings differ from the prevailing body of effective school research. For example, rather than principals in the high achieving group of schools exhibiting predominate autocratic, tyrannical leadership behavior, these principals appear to be perceived as democratic. A concern for people and task is highly evident by these principals' behavior.

**Question Three:** Do elementary school principals in effective and ineffective schools differ from teachers in their self perceptions of leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

Table 13 indicates that mean scores of principals and teachers are essentially the same in three subscales, persuasion, initiating structure and consideration. The mean score, 3.5 for principal and 3.8 for teachers, according to the T test are, however, significantly different on the subscale superior orientation. In other words, the combined group of high and low achieving school teachers perceived that principals, in general, reflect leader behaviors indicative of congenital relationships with upper echelon, influencing upper echelons and striving for higher job status.

**Question Four:** Do elementary school teachers and principals in high achieving schools differ in their perceptions of leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

Table 14 indicates that teachers and principals in high achieving schools held similar perceptions with regard to leader behavior. No significant differences exist
between mean and test scores in either of the four subscales of leader behavior. Teachers and principals in this category of schools both perceived that Leader Behavior was often indicative of initiating structure and consideration. Persuasion and superior orientation behaviors were also occasionally evident in this group of schools.

**Question Five:** Do elementary teachers and principals in low achieving schools perceive Leader Behavior differently as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

A significant difference does exist between the self perceptions of principal and leader behavior perceptions of teachers in low achieving schools. Teachers and principals in this group of schools do not hold similar views regarding leader behavior in three of the four subscales. Table 15 provides a summary of perceptions in this category of schools. A significant difference, the table shows, exists between principal and teachers perceptions of principals' behavior toward superiors. Teachers in this group perceive that principals are striving for upward mobility.

**VI. SUMMARY**

This chapter presented an analysis of the data answering a set of five research questions. In addition, demographic data was provided on respondent's characteristics and response rate. The characteristics of schools were also discussed, showing similarities between the school in the study and other schools involved in effective schools movement.

The major premise underlying the research questions was that principals in effective, high achieving schools exhibited leader behaviors which differed from that of principals in ineffective, low achieving schools. Through a T test and an
ANOVA analysis, significant differences were found in two of the subscales, consideration and superior orientation.

In essence, the data support the general effective school notions that distinguishing leader behavior characterizes principals in high and low achieving schools. While it is commonly known that there are many factors, both within and without the person, that affect behavior, the primary concern of this study has been to focus upon perceptions of self and others as a guide to understanding more about leader behavior. These perceptions suggest that social relationships with subordinates and superiors is crucial in leadership. This research does not propose to infer that social relationships are used to the exclusion of task oriented decisions. Initiating structure appeared in the data as perceived as evident to a high degree in both sets of schools. However, the data did suggest that high achieving school staffs perceived consideration items such as warmth, support, and care as more indicative of leader behavior.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES AND ITEMS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>F TEST LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW ACHVNG SCHOOLS</td>
<td>HIGH ACHVNG SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks from a strong inner conviction</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is friendly and approachable</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats all group members as his/her equal</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is willing to make changes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Refuses to explain his/her actions</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Acts without consulting the group</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets along well with people above him/her</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys the privileges of his/her position</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is working for a promotion</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reverse scoring
Table 13
MEANS OF COMBINED PRINCIPALS SELF PERCEPTION OF LEADER COMPARED TO COMBINED TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF LEADER BEHAVIOR AS MEASURED BY THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>ALL PRNCPLS</th>
<th>ALL TCHRS</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>2 TAILED PROB.</th>
<th>POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE</th>
<th>SEPARATE VARIANCE ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>*.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Table 14
MEAN SCORES OF TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS IN HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOLS COMPARED TO PRINCIPALS IN HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOL PERCEPTIONS OF LEADER BEHAVIOR AS MEASURED BY THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>TCHR IN HIGH ACHVNG SCHOOLS</th>
<th>PRNCPL IN HIGH ACHVNG SCHOOLS</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>SEPARATE VARIANCE EST. T VALUE</th>
<th>POOLED VARIANCE EST. T VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS IN LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS REGARDING PRINCIPALS LEADER BEHAVIOR AS MEASURED BY THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>SEPARATE V.T.</th>
<th>POOLED V.T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCHRS IN LOW ACHYNG SCHOOLS</td>
<td>PRNCPLS IN LOW ACHYNG SCHOOLS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>*Superior Orientation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

I. INTRODUCTION

Chapter One dealt with the problem, purpose and the limitations of the study. This was followed by a review of the literature in Chapter Two, a delineation of the research methodology in Chapter Three, and a presentation of the results of this investigation in Chapter Four. The present chapter will include:

1. A brief restatement of the purpose, procedures and research questions tested
2. A discussion of the conclusion derived from research pertaining to demographic characteristics of the sample respondents and schools as well as from the measure of Leader Behavior derived from the LBDQ
3. A discussion of recommendations and implications for further research.

II. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine if the leader behavior of principals differed between high and low achieving schools. The leader behavior was measured by Halpin’s Revised Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII.

Results of this study were secured from a sample of seven high achieving schools and ten low achieving schools. The seven high achieving schools included seven principals and 131 teachers, and the ten low achieving schools included ten principals and 130 teachers. Table 5 shows that the usable responses to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire represent a return rate of 63% for teachers and 80% for principals (Table 5).
This study investigated five questions:

1. Do staff's perception of elementary principals' leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire differ in effective and ineffective urban schools?

2. What are the significant leadership dimensions as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire on which elementary principals in effective and ineffective urban schools differ as perceived by teachers?

3. Do elementary school principals in effective and ineffective schools perceive their leader behavior differently than teachers in effective and ineffective schools as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

4. Do elementary school teachers and their principals in effective schools differ in their perceptions of the principal's leader behaviors as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

5. Do elementary school teachers and their principals in ineffective schools differ in their perceptions of the principal's leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire?

A T test was used to calculate mean differences between the two groups in research questions 1, 3, 4 and 5. While an analysis of variance was used to analyze whether significant difference level in research question two, demographic data was also collected to gather information on characteristics of respondents and schools. With regard to selection of schools, all schools involved in the study represented similar study body population with a range of 10 to 84 percent low income families.

The LBDQ did describe the principal's behavior and found that significant differences do exist between principals in high and low achieving schools. These differences occurred in the subscales of consideration and superior orientation.

The demographic data found that no significant difference existed between the two groups of schools in either of the personal or professional characteristics
of teachers or principals. The data regarding school characteristics illustrated that four structural characteristics of effective schools are operational and the high achieving schools tend to emphasize the basic skill areas of reading and language arts more than low achieving groups of schools.

III. REVIEW OF FINDINGS

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

No significant differences were found between teachers in high and low achieving schools with regard to sex, race, training, experience and length of contract.

Differences were analyzed with regard to sex, race, training, type of teaching contract and years of teaching experience. It is noteworthy that a majority of teachers in both groups of schools had only bachelor's degrees. Also, more teachers in schools which had reading test scores that fell below the fiftieth percentile level had received tenure as compared to most teachers in high achieving schools who had only limited teaching contracts.

The years of teaching experience is an important variable to examine in view of the fact that other research in effective and ineffective schools emphasized the need to only survey teachers who had three or more years of experience in the respective building. All teachers included in this study had been in each respective building three or more years.

No significant differences were found between principals in the high and low achieving schools with regard to sex, race, training, experience and type of contract.

More principals, however, in the schools which had reading test scores which fell below the fiftieth percentile level had pursued training beyond the masters degree level than had principals in the high achieving schools.
This finding of principals and teachers in high and low achieving schools tends to shed more insight into the demographic make-up of staffs that comprise effective and ineffective schools. The fact that staff, including principals in both groups of schools, had similar demographic make-up tends to further support the notion that school process such as leadership, climate as opposed to imputs, such as, sex, race, experience, may have a great bearing on the school academic record of students. In other words, this finding does not negate the possibility that nature of school environment is an important consideration in whether a school is achieving at a high or low academic level.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOOLS

The seven elementary schools (K-8) classified as high achieving schools had a student income level which ranged 25.6% to 84% with a minority population that ranged from 24.5% to 96.5%.

The ten elementary schools (K-8) classified as low achieving had a student income level which ranged from 34% to 84.7% with a minority population that ranged from 27.2% to 98.4%.

The unit of analysis in effective schools research has generally been the school building rather than focusing on the classroom or district. In addition, other researchers within this body of literature have emphasized the need to report and if possible compare the academic record of low income students with that of students who are not eligible for free/reduced school lunch program. Hence, the fact that some schools were ranked using percentile scores as an arbitrary standard of effectiveness does not quantitatively support the premise that some urban schools such as the sampled effective schools did a better job instructionally with
poor students than the ineffective schools. Rather, the data can only suggest that since some sample schools did score at a higher percentile level than others, it can be inferred that the poor student did proportionally as well or better academically than a non-poor student.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS CORRELATES

The level of staff awareness regarding the effective schools literature base was perceived as greater among the low achieving (ineffective) school staff than perceived by the high achieving (effective) school staff.

The level of implementation with regard to staff inservice was perceived by staff to be significantly greater in low achieving schools than perceived by staff in the high achieving schools.

The effective school characteristic, emphasis placed on teaching basic skills, specifically language arts (reading, writing, listening and spelling), was perceived by high achieving staff as emphasized to a greater degree than perceived by staff in the low achieving schools. The high achieving school did have a clear mission to improve basic skills.

The effective schools characteristics Time on Task and Emphasis on High Expectations was perceived by staff as significantly higher in the low achieving schools than these characteristics were perceived by the high achieving schools.

There are several characteristics that have been identified with schools which are effective. The characteristics most often cited in the research are:

1. a sense of mission
2. emphasis on teaching basic skills
3. time on task
4. climate, orderliness
5. monitoring of pupil progress
6. high expectations of staff and students
7. instructional leadership.

While this investigation primarily focused on the sixth correlate leadership, defined as leader behavior, some data was collected on the other effective schools characteristics.
All of the school staff surveyed indicated that four of the above mentioned characteristics were operational to some degree in the seventeen schools. Unlike the trend to directly interview staff, which was a predominate research method used in other effective school research, this investigation used an indirect survey questionnaire-type instrument. This questionnaire was divided into three main parts:

- Level of Awareness
- Level of Implementation
- Level of Curricular Focus

The questionnaire items sought to gain the perceptions of staff regarding the Level of School Involvement in the Effective School's Movement.

LEVEL OF AWARENESS

Both items under Level of Awareness were found to be significant between the high and low achieving schools. Over 90% of the low achieving school staff were aware of the Effective Schools Movement compared to only 58% of the staff in the high achieving schools. Also 77.8% of the low achieving school staff had read articles on the topic compared to 62% of the staff in the high achieving schools. This finding suggests that the level of awareness among staff was greater in the low achieving schools and it also was unevenly distributed between both groups of schools.

This finding also suggests that perhaps if principals are committed to the Effective School premise, that more work needs to be devoted to bringing about a level of awareness among all staff rather than just a few. Awareness, as defined by this researcher, is a prerequisite to behavioral change, commitment and ownership of the idea.
LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION

Only one item under Level of Implementation was found to be significant between the high and low achieving schools. This item asked how many staff had been involved in building level inservice. More staff (80.9%) in the low achieving schools had participated in building level inservice than had staff (55.8%) in the high achieving schools. District Level Regional State Level as well as at the university level were perceived about at the same degree of implementation in both groups of schools.

The fact that more staff in the low achieving school were aware and had participated in building level meetings suggests that principals in the low achieving schools could have been more greatly influenced by the effective schools body of research and subsequently used this notion as a way to motivate staff to change the low academic standing of these schools. This finding suggests also that principals who find themselves in school settings characterized by low achieving students, appeared to devote more than just lip service to the effective schools ideas, thereby proceeded to get staff involvement.

LEVEL OF CURRICULAR FOCUS

A common thread interwoven throughout the Effective Schools research is the idea that these schools emphasize the teaching of basic skill areas to a greater degree than schools that are not effective academically. This investigation findings supports the growing body of research with regard to this trend. The subject of language arts, which includes reading, writing, listening and spelling, was emphasized to the .05 level of significance to a greater degree in the high achieving schools than in the low achieving schools as perceived by the staff. This
finding suggests that while the change strategies, i.e., inservice, may not have been implemented at a significant level of impact as perceived by high achieving schools, staff, the staff in the high achieving schools do to a higher degree perceive that the teaching and learning of the basic skill curricular area of language arts (reading, writing, spelling, listening) are the primary objective of effective schools.

OTHER EFFECTIVE SCHOOL CORRELATES

Time on Task, Frequent Monitoring of Pupil Progress, Parent Involvement and High Expectations are all perceived by staff in low achieving schools to be emphasized more than in the high achieving schools. In fact, Time on Task as well as Emphasis on High Expectations were considered to be significantly greater at the .05 level in low achieving schools compared to high achieving schools. Since this finding differs from the predominante views and findings in the effective schools research it suggests that more systematic research is necessary if the Effective School Research base is to remain stable and reliable. In addition, the validity of broad constructs such as Time on Task and Emphasis on High Expectation needs further explanation and definition. In other words, these characteristics may hold varying meanings for the sample respondent groups. Consistently in meanings are a crucial factor if the Effective School Research is to be a valid concept.

IV. PRINCIPAL LEADER BEHAVIORS

Teachers in the high achieving schools perceived that principals exhibited consideration leader behavior to a significantly higher degree than did teachers in low achieving schools. These behaviors were:
- friendly and approachable
- did little things to make it pleasant for the group
- treated all the members of the group as equals
- was willing to make changes.

All teachers in high/low achieving schools, when compared to all principals self perceptions, felt that principals leader behavior exemplified superior orientation leader behaviors. These behaviors were:

- gets along well with people above him/her
- is working for a promotion.

Teachers perceived principals in high achieving schools as exemplary multi-dimensional leader behaviors as compared to teacher perceptions of principals in low achieving schools that principals exhibited only one type or style of leader behavior.

Teachers perceived principals in high and low achieving schools as exhibiting initiating structure and persuasion leader behaviors to a similar degree.

These findings support the premise that leader behaviors differ between principals in effective and ineffective schools. This finding is particularly noteworthy in that it provides more clues into unknown "hidden dimensions," consideration of superior orientation. Until this time, these latter dimensions had not surfaced as a major topic of discussion in the growing body of effective schools research. While this investigation did not conclude that task structure was the sole variable that differentiated the effective from the ineffective school principals, it does not negate nor does it disprove the possible existence of this latter variable. This investigation hence suggests that a repertoire of skills are perhaps more frequently used among effective schools principals than among principals in the ineffective school.
IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For Practice

The finding that some schools in northeast Ohio have principals that are perceived as exhibiting multi-dimensional leader behaviors should not imply that the task, persuasion behaviors held by principals in non-achieving schools are negative. The principal ultimately must decide what "works best" for him/her in that given situation.

The behaviors principals use in situations generally are derived from prior knowledge about the people and the circumstances. Such gut level behavior, however, should not cloud or hamper him/her to try out newer behavioral techniques. An example of this might be when the principal and group members are from racially and socially different backgrounds. This knowledge is derived from this investigation coupled with findings from other effective school research should increase the opportunity for principals to consciously appraise their normal leader behaviors and add additional behaviors to their repertoire of leadership skills.

The finding that staff in low achieving schools had a greater knowledge of the Effective Schools Literature base suggests that perhaps the principals, and subsequently staff, of high achieving schools may be functionally without a sound theoretical foundation. Staff Development serves two important functions: it establishes a conceptual framework within which to better understand the...enterprise, and it distills to group members successful program...factors that work.

The principal is responsible for arranging inservice training. This investigation pointed out that the training can be indirect by using articles and other professional literature to encourage and enhance staff ownership. Similarly, direct inservice training at the building level via bringing staff together to discuss using established goals and objectives that affect the school's delivery of educational programs to students. Simply stated, if the correlates identified as characteristics of Effective Schools are valid, principals must consciously and relentlessly work to make them a part of the professional ethics and norm of the staff.
No school, regardless of its academic standing, should feel as if it is a viable professional entity of the enormous educational enterprise if its professional staff operates without purpose and direction.

**FOR THEORY AND RESEARCH**

Researchers who study the characteristics of effective schools agree that strong instructional leaders are the key ingredient. In most effective schools, researchers have found that the principal provides the leadership.

Although statements about leadership are repeatedly read in the literature base, the term is yet to build a prototype of the quality common to effective leaders.

This investigation has made a great contribution to building a prototype of qualities, surface and hidden. The state of the art, however, is still in its embryonic stage. This field of knowledge is what scientists label as a hypothetical construct level. What the interview and what the survey method does is report reflections of behavior. What is needed if the Effective School correlates in general and in particular the concept leadership is to gain a lasting goal of our professional pursuits is for researchers to build upon rather than create vague, ambiguous notions about the nature of leadership, teaching and learning.

**VI. OTHER SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS STUDY**

In analyzing the emphasis of human skills such as consideration recommendation for further study, it could be summarized under the general heading of Leader Behavior.
For Practice

1. Inservice training sessions with principals could be used by school officials to develop a better understanding of the important role human skills play in the administration of elementary schools. Principals in basket or simulations could be used as a vehicle to develop strengths in the human skills areas.

2. The philosophy/goals of the principal could be examined and compared to leader behavior skills. This may be used by superintendents in placing principals in different situations.

3. Develop principal-led teams as a strategy to bring about staff involvement in building decision-making.

For Research

1. Replication of this study is suggested using LBDQ correlated with other leader behavior instruments.

2. An ethnographic study could be developed to identify more closely the conflicts that affect working relationships in elementary school settings.
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Akron City Schools

Canton City Schools

Cincinnati City Schools
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East Cleveland City Schools
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Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII
Demographic Questions About Respondents Group
Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your principal. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your principal.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described as principal.

The term, "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please print. Complete all questions.

1. What is the name of your school district? _______________________

2. What is the name of your school? _______________________________

3. How many years have you taught school? ________________________

4. How many years have you taught at your present building? _______

5. Check whether you are considered a full-time or part-time staff.
   ______ A. full-time          ______ B. part-time

6. Check your sex: ______ male    ______ female

7. Check ethnic group with which you identify yourself.
   ______ A. White      ______ C. Hispanic     ______ E. Asian     ______ G. Other
   ______ B. Black      ______ D. American Indian ______ F. Chinese

8. Check the highest degree you currently hold.
   ______ A. Bachelors      ______ C. Specialist
   ______ B. Masters        ______ D. Doctorate
9. Check the age category which is appropriate to your age.
   ___ A. 20-24     ___ C. 30-34     ___ E. 40-44     ___ G. 50-54
   ___ B. 25-29     ___ D. 35-39     ___ F. 45-49     ___ H. 55-over
10. Check the class size most appropriate to your classroom.
    ___ A. 15-19     ___ C. 25-29     ___ E. 35-39
    ___ B. 20-24     ___ D. 30-34     ___ F. 40-over
11. Check the type of contract you had for the 1982-83 school year.
    ___ Limited     ___ Continuing
12. If you have a continuing contract, check whether you have tenure.
    ___ A. Yes     ___ B. No     ___ C. Not Applicable
13. Check whether you are aware of the Effective Schools Movement.
    ___ A. Yes     ___ B. No.
14. Check whether you have participated in any of the following which were devoted to the topic of Effective Schools.
    A. Building Inservice ___ Yes ___ No  C. Regional Conferences ___ Yes ___ No
    B. District Inservice ___ Yes ___ No  D. State Conferences ___ Yes ___ No
           E. University Academy ___ Yes ___ No
15. Check whether any of the following are emphasized as a part of your building mission statements.
    A. Reading ___ Yes ___ No  D. Social Studies ___ Yes ___ No
    B. Math ___ Yes ___ No  E. Language Arts ___ Yes ___ No
    C. Science ___ Yes ___ No
16. Check whether you read any articles during this school year on Effective Schools.
    ___ A. Yes     ___ B. No
17. Check whether your building has implemented any of the following Effective Schools characteristics into your school program this school year.
    A. Time on task ___ Yes ___ No  C. Frequent monitoring of pupil progress ___ Yes ___ No
    B. Parent involvement ___ Yes ___ No  D. Emphasis on high expectation for students ___ Yes ___ No
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (ABCDE) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

   A = Always          D = Seldom
   B = Often           E = Never
   C = Occasionally

  e. MARK your answer as shown in the examples below.

Example: Often acts as described.......................... A B C D E
Example: Never acts as described.......................... A B C D E
Example: Occasionally acts as described.................. A B C D E

1. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group.................. A B C D E
2. Lets group members know what is expected of them..... A B C D E
3. Is friendly and approachable............................ A B C D E
4. Gets along well with the people above him/her........ A B C D E
5. His/her arguments are convincing....................... A B C D E
6. Encourages the use of uniform procedures.............. A B C D E
7. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group........................................ A B C D E
8. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority......................................................... A B C D E
9. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view........ A B C D E
10. Tries out his/her ideas in the group.................... A B C D E
11. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.. A B C D E
12. Is working hard for a promotion........................ A B C D E
13. Is a very persuasive talker............................. A B C D E
14. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group............ A B C D E
15. Treats all group members as his/her equals........... A B C D E
16. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions................................................ A B C D E
17. Is very skillful in an argument........................ A B C D E
18. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done. A B C D E
19. Gives advance notice of changes........................ A B C D E
20. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position............... A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

21. Is not a very convincing talker........................ A B C D E
22. Assigns group members to particular tasks............ A B C D E
23. Keeps to himself/herself.................................. A B C D E
24. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members................................. A B C D E
25. Speaks from a strong inner conviction..................... A B C D E
26. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members...................... A B C D E
27. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members.A B C D E
28. His/her word carries weight with superiors............ A B C D E
29. Is an inspiring talker........................................ A B C D E
30. Schedules the work to be done............................. A B C D E
31. Is willing to make changes................................. A B C D E
32. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors... A B C D E
33. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage................................................. A B C D E
34. Maintains definite standards of performance.......... A B C D E
35. Refuses to explain his/her actions........................ A B C D E
36. Is working his/her way to the top........................ A B C D E
37. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project..................... A B C D E
38. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations............................................. A B C D E
39. Acts without consulting the group......................... A B C D E
40. Maintains cordial relations with superiors.............. A B C D E

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please return to the designated location

_____Return to me in the self addressed stamped envelope provided

_____Return sealed to your principal in the envelope provided

_____Return sealed to your Effective Schools Coordinator in your district
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Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
Scoring Instructions
APPENDIX C

Scoring Key

The subject indicates his response by drawing a circle around one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) following an item. As indicated on the Scoring Key, most items are scored:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
A & B & C & D & E \\
5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

A circle around A gives the item a score of 5; a circle around B gives it a score of 4; and a circle around E gives the item a score of 1.

The 20 starred items on the Scoring Key are scored in the reverse direction, as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
A & B & C & D & E \\
5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

In use at the Bureau of Business Research, the score is written after each item in the margin of the test booklet (questionnaire).
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