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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Why are some groups of teachers so very loyal to their schools, so anxious to remain on the staff, and so determined to work hard in order to make the schools a success, while other groups of teachers are not so enthusiastic?

This question is of importance since interested observers have been aware for many years that individual schools vary in their modes of operation (Havighurst, 1960; Corwin, 1975), their atmosphere (Owens, 1970) or "feel" (Halpin, 1966). Kalis (1980), aware of this differentiation among schools, asserted that although schools may look similar or function similarly, every school is unique. What makes each one different is organizational climate, described as the atmosphere or tone of the organization."

Schools

Two schools in the same community may be providing education for young children of a similar age range from within the community, but they might create entirely different impressions in the minds of observers, because the teachers at the schools act differently.

In studying the schools, an observer might notice that the teachers at one school arrive early for work, and go about their
business with enthusiasm. They seem to get on well with the principal, with one another, and with the students. On occasion during "break periods" a few of them might be seen on the playground watching students at play, or holding conversation with small groups of interested and eager students, who are asking questions, receiving answers, and passing comments of agreement or disagreement on answers which are given.

In the evenings after school, some of them might be seen joining students in clubs, debating societies, or other forms of co-curricular activity, in a businesslike, but less formal atmosphere than that which prevails in a typical classroom. It might even be apparent that some of these teachers have to travel some distance by road or rail to reach the school, and possibly could have been employed at a school either within or near their home communities, but seemed determined to undergo the costs in terms of finance and time of travel in order to remain on the staff of the school.

The observer might conclude that the teachers are very happy at the school and are deeply involved in its affairs.

A completely different situation might be occurring at the other school. Teachers might be seen to arrive much later for work, and leave the school premises rather quickly after school is dismissed. They go about their business with less enthusiasm, and are seldom seen on the playground during break periods, engaging in conversation with pupils or watching their games. Their relations with their principal might appear to lack genuine warmth, while an emphasis on
control might seem to characterize their relationships with the pupils. Their classrooms might seem to have a rigid and tension filled atmosphere, detracting somewhat from the excitement of learning. Some of them might complain about the administration, the students, and the school program; and might be willing to tell anyone interested enough to listen that the school was not a good place at which to work.

The observer might come to the conclusion that the teachers are not happy at that school.

Why would groups of teachers tend to behave so differently?

This study is an attempt to provide a possible explanation why some groups of teachers are happy, and tend to work with zest at some schools, while some seem to show signs of frustration when working at others.

The General Problem

The principal in the public elementary school system has, in general, greater opportunities than any other administrator within the educational system to ensure the composition and quantity of the learning experiences which are made available to the pupils in the school. He or she is able to work very closely with the teaching staff on account of the structure of the elementary school which makes no provision for an administrative head of department who may intervene between the principal and the teachers.

Gross and Herriott (1965) were aware of this situation and stated:
Of all the administrative officials of the complex bureaucracy, few have at their command greater potentialities for influencing directly the type and quality of education young pupils are to receive than the elementary school principal. (Gross and Herriott, 1965, p. 1)

The duties of the elementary school principal—like the duties of most other principals in the education system—are many. Lipham and Hoeh (1974) have noted that these duties include the identification, orientation, assignment, improvement and evaluation of the teachers; the planning and implementation of the curriculum for students; the monitoring of the school finances; and the analyzing of, and communicating with the community.

The effective principal sets out to provide and maintain an optimum learning environment which nurtures the cognitive, affective, social and aesthetic qualities of the students (Klopf, et al., 1982) and to foster the type of climate in which change would not be seen as threatening, and in which the creative capacities of the teachers and students would be nourished and expressed rather than stifled (Rogers, 1969).

The principal of the public elementary school is appointed to the post, and in order to carry out his or her contractual obligations, he or she relies on the cooperation and work efforts of the members of the teaching staff, and success is measured in terms of their productivity. As a leader, he or she is expected to consult with them as individuals and groups to find out the problems which they face at work, in order to make an effort to solve them, so that they may carry
out their duties of providing learning experiences for the pupils as effectively and efficiently as possible.

The level of motivation and dedication which the teachers as workers bring to their tasks would tend to be affected by the level of satisfaction which they derive from their achievements (Herzberg, et al., 1959; Friedlander, 1963), and rewards (Lawler, 1969) in teaching as a profession, and from the physical and social conditions under which the work is being performed (Cummings and Schwab, 1973). The principal is responsible for providing the type of environment, and the teachers' perception of his or her behavior as a leader and supervisor could play an important part in influencing their perceptions of the conditions as promoting satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Jackson, 1953).

Principals vary, however, in their patterns of behavior towards particular teachers and groups of teachers at different times and under different circumstances, though they may show a preference for a particular pattern over a period of time. The individual principal needs to analyze particular situations in the school, and by drawing on a repertoire of leadership competencies, apply the pattern of behavior which is considered appropriate to each situation (Klopf, et al., op.cit.), while at the same time trying to promote and foster the type of environment which would tend to develop in the teachers as a group a positive attitude towards the job.

The perceived leadership behavior of the principal as a supervisor can, as a result, be considered to be central to the development of the school as an organization.
If the leadership behavior of the public elementary school principal is important in helping teachers to obtain satisfaction in their jobs, there is some benefit to be gained in ascertaining the extent to which particular aspects of behavior influence teacher job satisfaction, and as a result, affect the overall development of the public elementary schools.

Many of the teachers in the public elementary school spend a large proportion of their lives at work. Ensuring their happiness and satisfaction in the working situation could be considered as a worthy end in itself.

The Specific Problem

This study is concerned therefore with the effect of the principal's leadership behavior as characterized by the perceived level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration, on the job satisfaction of teachers in the public elementary school.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will be used in the study.

Principal's Behavior

ALOOFNESS refers to behavior by the principal which is marked by the maintenance of a degree of social distance between the principal and the teaching staff. It "refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal or impersonal." He or she goes "by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to
deal with the teachers in an informal, face to face situation. The behavior, in brief, is universalistic rather than particularistic; nomothetic rather than idiosyncratic; more concerned with the organization as a whole rather than with the individual members who comprise it. To maintain this style the principal keeps himself or herself--at least, "emotionally"--at a distance from the staff (Halpin, 1966).

A high level of aloofness would be expressed by the utilization of staff meetings by the principal for the purpose of making his or her reports with very little discussion allowed from the members of the teaching staff, and by the making and implementation of rules and regulations to control aspects of school situations with little reference to the staff.

PRODUCTION EMPHASIS refers to behavior by the principal which is indicative of a preoccupation with the organizational tasks. It "refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He or she is highly directive and plays the role of a 'straw boss.' The communication tends to go in only one direction, and he or she is not sensitive to feedback from the staff" (Halpin, 1966).

A high level of production emphasis is inferred when a principal tries to get teachers to consistently work as hard as possible, and when he or she tries to schedule all the work for the teaching staff on his or her own initiative.
THRUST refers to behavior by the principal which is indicative of energetic and purposeful movement of the school in a planned direction. It "refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an evident effort in trying to 'move the organization.'" Thrust behavior is marked not by close supervision, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he or she personally sets. Apparently, because he or she does not ask the teachers to give of themselves any more than he or she is willing to give . . . , the behavior though starkly task-oriented" may be "viewed favorably the the teachers" (Halpin, 1966).

A high level of thrust is indicated when a principal deliberately undertakes to help the teaching staff overcome their difficulties in the classroom, and criticizes them with a view to encourage them to improve their performance.

CONSIDERATION refers to behavior by the principal which is indicative of a desire to treat each teacher with respect as a human person. It "refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers 'humanly,' to try to do a little for them in human terms" (Halpin, 1966).

A high level of consideration is shown when a principal indicates his awareness of individual teacher's problems and takes the staff's opinions into account in administering the school.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

JOB SATISFACTION refers to the extent to which an individual is happy in his or her job. It is defined as a pleasurable or
positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Locke, 1976), or a positive attitude toward one's job (Vroom, 1964).

A high level of teacher job satisfaction is inferred when the teaching staff indicate that they are enthusiastic about teaching, and that when involved in it, the working day seems to quickly come to an end.

**The Theoretical Framework**

The public elementary school principal has the duty and the responsibility of planning the development of the school unit within the guidelines set out by the Boards of Education. In carrying out this function it is in his or her interest and in the interest of the school as a whole to build a relatively stable work group of teachers, and make every effort to increase their productivity. One may concede that it is possible for a principal to build a stable work group for a short time without an increase in productivity, but it is not conceivable that productivity could be increased to any considerable extent over a period without a relatively stable work group.

The principal tries as a result to establish a pattern of leadership behavior which in his or her opinion would tend to motivate the teachers and make them eager for work. This may be achieved if teachers are of the opinion that they are experiencing high levels of job satisfaction by remaining on the staff.
As the leader appointed by the institution, the principal may adopt a pattern of behavior which is perceived by the teachers as making them aware of the status differences between them as subordinates and the principal as administrator. He or she may determine the goals for the particular school within the guidelines set by superior officers on his or her own initiative and direct that they be accepted without discussion. A pattern of communication may be established in which information flowed from the top downward, and teachers may not even be allowed discussion on the school reports which would be delivered at faculty meetings. On occasions even though teachers may be trying to give of their best for the good of the school, the principal may still complain that they did not give enough time and energy to the education of the students.

On the other hand, the principal may welcome ideas from the teaching staff on problems connected with their work, and do personal favors for them when considered necessary. They may be encouraged to ask questions even on matters relating to the method of supervision, and may be motivated to increase their level of competence after seeing the principal use his or her experience and expertise in teaching classes of students occasionally.

The behavioral style of the principal, as leader of the group of teachers, will affect the teachers' satisfaction (Reeves, 1970). If the teachers are enjoying high levels of job satisfaction at the school they would tend to remain on the staff, cooperate as fully as possible with the principal, and willingly contribute to making the
school a strong and resilient unit, which would be capable of meeting external and internal challenges with a great measure of competence and vigor.

Hypotheses To Be Tested

Major Hypotheses

The following are the major hypotheses which will be tested in the study.

$H_1$ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of aloofness and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

The principal of a public elementary school may use his or her position and experience to formulate and initiate rules and procedures without input from the members of the staff, and implement them without taking into account the feelings of the staff. He or she may consider it unnecessary to hold discussion with them on other important issues, and may even use the faculty meeting as a forum to inform them of the problems of the school as he or she sees them, to indicate what actions are proposed to be taken to deal with these problems. He or she may even give periodic reports on the school without hearing any suggestion which the teaching staff may want to make.

This pattern of behavior, characterized by the provision of little organizational information, and the prevention of open critical analysis would be denying them some form of participation in the administration of the school and would tend to foster some dissatisfaction among the teaching staff (Coch and French, 1953). They would
tend to feel that they have no responsibility for the effective functioning of the school. Lacking the feeling of psychological involvement in the school, they would experience a low level of job satisfaction.

\[ H_2 \] There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of production emphasis and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

In an effort to perform the duties of the office the principal may make up the schedules indicating when and where teachers would be on duty without consulting with the teachers themselves. Anxious to get the teachers to work to the limit of their capacity, he or she may indicate on occasion that more could be done for the pupils, for the school, and for the community as a whole if the teachers would put greater effort into their work.

The highly task-oriented principal may tend to concentrate on the organizational tasks to the neglect of the human side of the enterprise. In supervising teachers he or she may take note of the mistakes made by them and try to correct such mistakes at times which may cause embarrassment to the teachers involved. This pattern of behavior would tend to make the members of staff develop a high level of anxiety about their work, and they would experience a low level of job satisfaction.

\[ H_3 \] There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of thrust and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

When a principal shows the willingness to work hard on behalf of the school to the extent that material is taken home to be worked on
in his or her spare time, he or she tends to hold the respect of the teaching staff. If he or she involves them in the planning for the school, and utilizes their varying abilities for the good of the school (Vroom, 1964; Argyris, 1957), they would tend to feel a great sense of worth.

If in providing feedback on their work, criticisms are made for the purpose of improvement, and discussions are held with them on new and worthwhile ideas that were noted in readings, there is the tendency for them to feel a sense of belonging (Kalis, op.cit.) and they will experience a high level of satisfaction.

\[ H_4 \text{ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of consideration and the level of teacher job satisfaction.} \]

Most people like to be treated in as humane a manner as possible.

When a principal's behavior is warm and sympathetic, and he or she makes every effort to help the teachers solve their problems, they tend to be convinced that there is concern for their welfare. If while visiting classrooms in the process of supervising teachers' work in an effort to find out if they are facing difficulties with teaching materials or even disruptive students, the principal indicates a willingness to take immediate action to improve the situation, they would tend to experience a high level of job satisfaction.

**Minor Hypotheses**

The following minor hypotheses will also be tested in the study.
There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of aloofness, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.

In some schools the principals may be perceived to direct and control all the major activities, and to offer very little opportunity to the teaching staff to become involved in the school affairs. They may also be perceived to maintain their social distance and to interact rarely with the teaching staff. In such schools the level of teacher job satisfaction will be significantly lower than the level of teacher job satisfaction in schools in which there is perceived to be less control, but more interaction with the teaching staff.

There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of production emphasis, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.

The principals in some schools may be perceived by the teaching staffs to be consistently asking for more and greater efforts in carrying out their duties, and to be suggesting that the teachers are not doing enough for the students. In these schools the teaching staffs will find the job less interesting, and will have a significantly lower level of job satisfaction than the teaching staffs in schools in which there is perceived to be less consistent emphasis on production.

There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of thrust, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.
Principals may be perceived as setting an example of hard work for the teaching staffs to follow. These principals may also try to involve the teaching staffs more deeply in school affairs so that their vision of a good school may be achieved. Teachers at these schools will find that their work is challenging and rewarding, and they will have a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than teachers in schools in which the principals are not perceived to be setting examples of hard work.

H_8 There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of consideration, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.

Principals in some schools may be perceived to be warm in their relationships with their teaching staffs. They show that they are confident that the teachers do their jobs conscientiously. These principals also try to ensure that the social atmosphere is pleasant and that suggestions made by the teaching staff are acted upon. The teachers who work in these schools will have a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than teachers in those schools in which the principals are seen to be less considerate.

H_9 There is no significant difference between the contributions made to teacher job satisfaction by principal's perceived level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration.

Principals who are perceived to be considerate, treat their teaching staffs "humanely". They are seen to be trusting, and to provide opportunities for the teachers to use their abilities and
their innovativeness and creativity. The teaching staffs are also
given recognition for good work, and are offered encouragement when
their standard of work seems to be falling off. The perceived con-
sideration by principals will therefore contribute more to the satisfac-
tion of teachers than perceived thrust, production emphasis, or
aloofness.

Assumptions to be Made in the Study

The following assumptions will be made in the study:
1. The responses which are made by the teachers are truly indicative
   of their beliefs, attitudes and perceptions.
2. The effects of particular leadership behaviors on the part of the
   principal are greater in the public elementary school, on account
   of the more direct involvement of the principal with the teaching-
   learning processes in the school.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations will be placed on the study for the following
reasons:
1. The sample of schools chosen did not include those public elemen-
tary schools which (a) had pupils up to K-3 only, and (b) con-
tained less than 200 or more than 600 pupils. The findings may
not be applicable to these schools.
2. The researcher's knowledge of the Columbus public elementary
   schools is limited.
Significance of the Study

This study hopes to make some contribution in the area of school administration to the knowledge available on the public elementary school. Its significance is based on the conviction that if there is increased job satisfaction among teachers in these schools, the relationships between the participants at this level of education would improve and this would have a positive effect on the overall functioning of these schools.

The study should reveal how groups of teachers in these schools feel about the operations of their schools, and indicate some of the aspects of professional leadership which are associated with these feelings.

Knowledge gained from the study would be of benefit to administrators who are concerned with increasing their teachers' job satisfaction. It should make them more aware that their actions in their interpersonal relations may have differing interpretations among staff members, and may be having unintended effects on teachers' attitudes towards their jobs.

The study should encourage principals to discuss school problems in greater detail with their teachers, prior to taking action. It should also stimulate both principals and teachers to try to develop a mutually supportive school climate in which individual feelings would be aired, so as to reduce possible conflicts which might tend to hamper the goal achievement of the schools.
The findings should be of interest also to prospective principals, who would be provided with some ideas of possible teacher reaction to contemplated patterns of leadership behavior.

Possible Research

In this study particular aspects of teacher job satisfaction are not considered. It would be of interest, however, for researchers to investigate the extent of the influence of perceived aloofness, production emphasis, thrust or consideration on such particular aspects as satisfaction with pay, with co-workers, and with promotional opportunities.

Teacher job satisfaction may also be affected by aspects of the personal characteristics of the principal. Research might also be conducted to find out whether there are significant differences in the job satisfaction of teachers between schools in which the majority of the teaching staff is of a different social class from the principal, and schools in which the principal and the majority of the teaching staff are of the same social class.
Leadership and Leaders

Leadership of groups, which were defined as sets of individuals who share a common fate (Campbell, 1958) - has been observed as a pervasive and complex phenomenon (Ross and Hendry, 1957). Investigators have tried to explain it in terms of influence and social power (Stogdill, 1948; French and Raven, 1968), group interaction for the solution of problems (Hemphill, 1961), group transaction (Hollander and Julian, 1978), authority and the power to make decisions (Dubin, 1951; Bennis, 1959), and group syntality - defined as the overall performance and strengthening of the group (Cattel, 1951).

Stogdill defines leadership as the act of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward the setting and achievement of its considered aims and objectives. In his view the least possible conditions in which leadership could arise were two or more people, a common task or problem, and a differentiation of responsibilities.

Hemphill conceived of leadership as the initiation of actions which helped a group towards the solution of problems which affected the members, and defined it as the initiation of acts which resulted in a consistent pattern of group interaction directed toward the
solution of mutual problems. This definition was somewhat similar to the view held by Koontz and O'Donnel (1965) that leadership was the action of persuading people to cooperate in the achievement of a common objective.

French and Raven (op.cit.) discussed leadership in terms of the differential roles of the individual members of a group, and consequently of the differential power relations which exist with the group. In their judgment the influence of an agent, O, over an individual, P, was based on 1) reward power, 2) coercive power, 3) referent power, 4) legitimate power, and 5) expert power.

Reward power was considered to be operative if P perceived that O had the ability to mediate rewards for him; coercive power, if O had the ability to mediate punishment for him. Referent power operated if P wanted to identify with O; legitimate power, if O had a legitimate right to make demands on P, and he had to obey; and expert power, if O had some special skill which was seen as important by P, together with some experience, training or displayed ability.

Fiedler and Chemers (1974) also viewed leadership in terms of differential power relations which existed among the members of a group and suggested that leadership was a result of legitimate power and influence which were unequally shared between the various members.

Cattell (op.cit.) tended to concentrate on the leader rather than on leadership, and defined a leader as the individual who created the most effective change in the group's all round performance. This suggested that the leader, in Cattel's view, stimulated, motivated and
strengthened the group, while at the same time coordinating its activities and channeling its energies towards its goal achievement.

Zaleznik and Momen (1964) defined leadership as an interaction in which the conscious intentions of one person were communicated to another in verbal and non-verbal behavior, with the consequence that the other person wanted to, and did behave in accordance with the first person's intentions. They contended that leadership could only be identified when the intended influences were consummated. This perspective seems to be consonant with the ideas of Hemphill (1961) that the leadership function could be separated into attempted, successful, and effective leadership acts.

Attempted leadership acts were actions which were taken to effect leadership; successful leadership acts referred to actions which produced some change in the process of solving a problem; and effective leadership acts referred to actions which produced the change which eventually solved a problem.

Fiedler and Chemers (op.cit.) were also concerned with the manner in which a leader maintained his position in a group. They were of the opinion that the leader offered the followers the opportunity to enjoy the experience of being secure, of being able to do something unusual, and of reaching a common goal. The leader in return was awarded or compensated with additional status, and influence by the followers.

Homans (1950) tended to hold the view that the position of leadership was maintained if the leader adopted particular patterns of
behavior in carrying out the "job" of leadership. He suggested that
the leader should:

1. maintain his position;
2. live up to the norms of the group;
3. continue to lead;
4. refrain from giving orders that would not be obeyed;
5. use the established channels of communication when
giving orders;
6. refrain from thrusting himself on his followers on
social occasions;
7. refrain from blaming, or in general, from praising
a member of the group in the presence of other
members;
8. take into consideration the total situation;
9. be less concerned with inflicting punishment, than
with providing the conditions for the group to be
able to discipline itself;
10. listen, and often keep silent.

These "rules" suggest that a leader in an effort to maintain the
leadership position should try, among other things, to critically
examine the situations before action is taken. However, any action
to be taken should be within the norms held by the group, and should
neither bring embarrassment to members of the group nor to the leader-
ship position.
Appointed Leader

Fiedler and Chemers (op.cit.) and Gibb (1954) distinguished between a leader who arose from within an unstructured group, and a leader who was appointed by an institution. They acknowledged that the basic difference lay in respect of the source of power which was exercised by the appointed leader. They noted that the power which was held by appointed leaders was not granted as a result of the recognition by group members of the potential contribution which the incumbent had made or could make to the realization of group goals, but was given by the employing institution and so was from origins which were external to the group.

Appointed leadership in their view was more appropriately termed "Headship." It was not a voluntary position and was maintained through an organized system of roles. In such a situation the organizational goals were not determined by the group, but by higher management, and there was in general no shared feeling in the pursuit of these goals between the leader and the subordinates. A social gap was also maintained by the leader to indicate differences of status, and the gap could be used in an effort to coerce the group.

Fiedler and Chemers recognized, however, that the leadership functions of many groups, including organizations in industry were performed by persons who had been appointed to their posts. They made the observation that those persons holding positions of leadership within the organizations were not necessarily successful leaders of people. In holding this opinion they tended to support the view of
Gibb (op.cit.) who had suggested that leaders must manage and managers lead, but that successful management and leadership qualities did not necessarily coexist in the same individuals.

Hollander and Julian (op.cit.) were of the opinion that successful leadership lay in the ability of the leader to influence his followers. They asserted that the level of influence which would be exerted would depend to some extent on how the leader had achieved his position, or what he was perceived to be doing, and how his actions were viewed as contributing to the performance of the group's task. They concluded that the subordinates would be willing to accept and respond to the leader's assertions of influence, if they accepted him in his role as an authority, and considered him to be a legitimate leader.

Many definitions have been offered for leadership, and these have tended to vary with the researcher's particular point of view. Lipham and Hoeh, however, in trying to summarize the substance in these definitions, stated that leadership, as a function, initiated changes in the goals, objectives, configurations, procedures, inputs, processes, and ultimately in the outputs of social systems.

Leadership Traits

As the functions of a leader were realized to be of vital importance to the maintenance and productivity of a group, attempts were made to identify the elements of successful leadership from among the personal qualities of known leaders. The qualities investigated
ranged from physical ones such as height and age, to capacity factors such as intelligence or knowledge, and to personality factors like introversion, extroversion and dominance (Rutherford, et al., 1983). Results indicated some positive correlations between leadership and particular traits but the correlations tended to be low and were not always consistent.

Cowley (1928) suggested that there might have been certain traits which were common to leaders in all situations and which could have been considered as general traits of leadership. He conducted an experiment involving 112 subjects who were criminal leaders and non commissioned officers in the U.S. Army, and concluded that the personality traits for successful leadership in these situations included aggressiveness, self-confidence, emotional stability, finality of judgement, intelligence and intellectual honesty.

Stogdill (op.cit.) in a comprehensive review of the literature noted that all the traits studied by investigators could be subsumed under the dimensions of 1) capacity, 2) achievement, 3) responsibility, 4) participation, and 5) status. Capacity included intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality and judgement; Achievement included scholarship, knowledge, and athletic accomplishment. Responsibility included dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, and the desire to excell. Participation included activity, sociability, cooperation, adaptability and humor. Status included socio-economic position and popularity.
From his research Stogdill arrived at the conclusion that an individual did not become a leader because he or she possessed any combination of personality traits, but that the characteristics of the individual who would become a leader had to be relevant to the characteristics, the activities, and the goals of the group he or she wanted to lead.

Gouldner (1950) in his criticism of the trait approach stated that the members of a group never engaged in random, or unpatterned activities for any length of time, irrespective of how spontaneous or informal the group happened to be. He noted that the type of persistent activity in which a group indulged would set the limitations on the particular kinds of individuals who could lead it successfully. He suggested that the traits of individual leaders were to be found within the population from which the leaders were drawn, and that these traits would tend to vary with age, education, occupation, and sex, and were not universal. He noted also that physical prowess was necessary for the leaders of school athletes and height for the leaders of basketball players. He concluded that leadership did not reside in the individual, but in his functional relationship with the members of the group.

Weakness of the Trait Approach

The results of the investigations carried out under the trait approach to leadership were disappointing as no consensus on solutions were offered to the problem of identifying possible leaders from
non-leaders. The leadership traits themselves were only vaguely conceived and inadequately measured (Baird, 1977). Problems were faced on the determination of the proper combination of traits which would distinguish successful leadership, and as a consequence which traits were to be included in the studies and which were to be excluded. Another problem involved the implication that leaders were born and selected, and could not be developed and trained.

Eventually, reduced emphasis was given to personality traits as a useful way of distinguishing leaders. This reduction of emphasis was further influenced by the results of investigations which indicated that the situation within which the leader operated was far more influential than the traits themselves in identifying the successful leader.

**Leadership Styles**

The lack of progress in the trait approach encouraged investigators to examine the behavioral styles of leaders in an effort to discover the effects of particular leadership styles on subordinates. Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) carried out an experiment to test the reactions of groups of ten year old boys to leadership styles which were described as authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire climates.

The authoritarian climate was distinguished by the determination of all policy by the leader, who also dictated the tasks to be done, the techniques to be employed and the composition of each work group. The leader also offered praise and criticism on a personal
level, and remained aloof from active participation in the group's activities.

The leadership behavior differed greatly in the democratic climate. Policy was determined through group discussion and decisions were taken and acted upon only after exhaustive discussion. Alternate ways of accomplishing a task were suggested, and participants were offered a choice of various techniques. Praise and criticism were directed towards the task and not toward the individual, and the division of labor among the participants was made as the members thought appropriate. The leader involved himself in the group task, but not with the aim of accomplishing much of the group's work.

The laissez-faire climate was marked by chaos. Members were granted complete freedom of action on the tasks, and the leader made no effort to structure the task, provide guidelines for its completion, or attempt to appraise or regulate the course of events. Various materials were supplied however and the group was notified that information would be made available by the leader if it was requested.

The authoritarian climate tended to promote hostility among the members. The group showed turnover, and members exhibited both aggressive and submissive tendencies. Frustration and bottled up tension seemed to be fostered, and the flow of interpersonal conversation was curtailed.

In the democratic climate friendly ascendancy was characteristic of the group members. There was more jovial and confiding behavior, and mutual praise was heard more frequently than in the
The spontaneous sub-groups were larger, and group-minded words were used to a greater degree than in the authoritarian climate.

The boys in the laissez-faire climate showed disorganization. This situation was not structured and was less satisfying to the group.

The task performance of the boys varied between the groups. Production was highest in the authoritarian climate, but it was associated with inferior quality. A lower level of performance, associated with better quality, marked the democratic climate. A very low level of performance, and poor quality of work as well were characteristic of the laissez-faire climate.

White and Lippitt (1953) indicated a preference for the democratic climate based on the pattern of group decision, the majority vote, and the opportunity for each man to voice an opinion. They suggested that the leader in a democratic social climate was a catalyst who released energies that already existed within the group; who listened and drew out the less articulate or less vociferous members, and helped others to follow up their ideas while encouraging them to elaborate them and think them through.

The authoritarian climate was seen as generally providing barriers to the satisfaction of individual social needs. Even though the level of productivity tended to be higher than in other climates, there was no zest or spontaneity in the performance of the tasks that were undertaken, and the participation of the students declined and work tended to cease when the leader was not present.
The laissez-faire climate too did not provide any adequate structure which would allow the participants to carry out their tasks successfully. It represented a virtual abandonment of the leadership function, and was less efficient and less satisfying than the other types.

However, the behavior of ten year old boys in experimental situations controlled by trained experimenters in leadership styles cannot easily be compared with the behavior of adults in a work situation. Ten year old students have not acquired the knowledge and experience, have not yet taken on the responsibilities or been subjected to the social pressures of adult workers. These boys could not be dismissed or even threatened with dismissal for behavior which did not conform to the expectations of their supervisors or which was considered inimical to the satisfactory future state of a company at which they were employed. Their supervisors were not expected to submit reports on their performance to higher level supervisors, who themselves would have had the power to ask for improvement in the group's performance, or even threaten the security of tenure of the lower level supervisors if their actions were considered as not being in the best interests of the company. As there was little similarity between the situations of the ten year old boys and that of paid workers in industry, the applicability of the results of the experiments to the behavior of workers in industry could be questioned.
The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

At The Ohio State University researchers were engaged also in studies concerned with a more behavioral approach to the understanding of leadership. The studies focused on the observed behavioral patterns of leaders in particular situations as this aspect of leadership was considered to be useful to the practical individual, who, as leader of an organization, would be made aware of how things were seen to be happening within the organization.

Within this framework Hemphill and Coons (1957) developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which consisted of short descriptive statements on leadership behavior which varied from a concern with the friendship and trust of group members on one extreme to a structuring of tasks on the other. The LBDQ was designed to be completed by subordinates who were to check the frequency with which they observed their leaders exhibit the patterns of behavior described in terms of "always," "often," "occasionally," "seldom," and "never."

In analyzing data from a study of the leadership behavior of airplane commanders, Halpin (1954) found that "initiating structure" and "consideration" were the most significant factors in describing the differences in the behavior of airplane commanders.

"Structure" was seen to include

behavior in which the supervisor organizes and defines group activities and his relation to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead,
establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. (Fleishman and Harris, 1962).

"Consideration" included behavior indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This does not mean that this dimension reflects a superficial 'pat-on-the-back, first name calling' kind of human relations behavior. This dimension appears to emphasize a deeper concern for group members' needs and includes such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision-making and encouraging more two-way communication. (Fleishman and Harris, op.cit.).

The Social Situation

The trait approach represented the psychological approach to the study of leadership. Researchers also turned their attention to an analysis of the social situation, which was defined partly as the set of values and attitudes which were held by members of groups, and the patterns of routine behavior which they had learned, and which guided their interactional responses (Zaleznik and Moment, op.cit.). The focus was on the dimensions of particular groups, since these dimensions would influence the type of leadership behavior which would be adequate for the groups' maintenance and achievements.

In a study involving the representatives of 500 groups, Hemphill (1949) included in his descriptions of groups the dimensions of size, viscosity, homogeneity, participation, and dependence. He defined size as the number of members in a group; viscosity as the characteristic which differentiated a group from a collection of individuals; homogeneity as the similarity of membership; participation
as the individual member's relationship to the group; and dependence
as the relationship between each member and the group leader.

Hemphill envisaged a leader as an individual who was competent
in the performance of the task, and in social relationships with his or
her followers. From the study, he deduced patterns of leadership
behavior which could be considered as adequate for the leaders of the
groups with the particular dimensions with which he was concerned. He
came to the conclusion, however, that if individuals in a group were
satisfied, they considered that the leadership of the group was
adequate.

Effective Leadership

Fiedler and Chemers (op.cit.) and Fiedler (1967) in their
concern with the leader who had been appointed by an institution,
were interested in identifying the type of leader who would be effective
in maintaining the group and ensuring organizational productivity in
this situation.

In an effort to assess leadership potential, Fiedler devised
a scale to be completed by workers who were asked to describe their
Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC). The scale consisted of 16 items which
were made up of bi-polar adjectives to be scored on a eight point
continuum. The items included "friendly-unfriendly," "efficient-
inefficient" and "enthusiastic-unenthusiastic" and scores were arranged
from 8 points for a high score to 1 point for a low score. An indi-
vidual who made a high score on the LPC was considered to have the
potential to be a "human relations oriented" leader, while an individual with a low score was considered to be a potential "task oriented" leader.

Fiedler and Chemers suggested that low LPC leaders would be more effective in situations which were totally favorable or totally unfavorable, while high LPC leaders would be effective in those situations which were moderately favorable or moderately unfavorable. Favorable conditions were defined as conditions in which the leader was well liked, while unfavorable conditions indicated that the leader was disliked.

Fiedler (1978) also suggested that effective leadership in terms of the leader's influence over his subordinates is likely to be affected by

a. the personal relations with members of the group;
b. the power and authority which the position provides; and
c. the degree of structure in the task which the group has been assigned to perform.

The personal relations between the leader and the followers may be the most important factor in the situation. The liked and accepted leader influences a group to a greater degree than one which is disliked. As a consequence, the liked leader can obtain compliance to a much greater extent, and can therefore act more decisively, and be more effective.

The power and the authority vested in the position indicate the extent to which the leader can confer rewards and sanctions to the
followers and the degree to which the leader is supported by the overall organization. When the position is strong, the leader can enforce compliance even if he or she is disliked by the members of the group.

The structure of a task refers to its clarity or to its ambiguity. In routine tasks the influence of a leader tends to be great. However, in situations in which a task could not be programmed, the leader could not readily order any of the followers to execute it in any specific manner, and as a result the level of influence tended to be of a lesser degree.

The Elementary School

The leadership behavior of principals in dynamic interaction with the teaching staffs of elementary schools was analyzed by Halpin and Croft (1963). Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as a base, the researchers devised the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to assess the "atmosphere" or "feel" which prevailed in elementary schools in U.S.A., as a consequence of the principals' behavior as perceived by the staff, and their behavioral response as a group.

The principal's interpersonal behavior was analyzed along a continuum which indicated a focus on the needs of the organization on one extreme, to the needs of the individual teachers on the other, and varied from an approach of "aloofness," through "production emphasis" and "thrust," to "consideration." The teachers' behavioral response was analyzed in terms of disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy.
Aloofness on the part of a principal referred to behavior which was characterized as formal or impersonal.

Production emphasis referred to behavior which was characterized by a high level of direction and close supervision.

Thrust referred to behavior which indicated an effort to "move the organization" by the setting of a personal example of hard work.

Consideration referred to behavior which showed an inclination to treat the teachers in as humane a manner as possible.

Disengagement referred to teachers' behavior which indicated a lack of involvement in their work.

Hindrance referred to behavior which indicated that the teachers felt that they were prevented from doing their work as expeditiously as possible.

Esprit referred to behavior indicating that both the teachers' social needs, and their need for accomplishment were being met in their job.

Intimacy referred to behavior which, in the main, indicated that only their social needs were being met.

In a sample of schools across the U.S.A. Halpin and Croft identified six particular school profiles which were designated as climate types. These were described in terms of:

1. Open climate
2. Autonomous climate
3. Controlled climate
4. Familiar climate
5. Paternal climate

6. Closed climate

Within the open climate on the one extreme the principals had high levels of consideration, low levels of production emphasis, and average aloofness and thrust. Teachers were high on esprit, low on hindrance and disengagement, and average on intimacy. In the closed climate on the other extreme, the principals were high on aloofness and production emphasis, but low on thrust and consideration, while teachers were high on disengagement and hindrance, low on esprit, and average on intimacy (Halpin and Croft, op. cit.).

Hall and Rutherford (1983) considered the leadership behavior of elementary school principals involved in facilitating change within their schools, and described them in behavioral terms of the Responders, the Initiators, and the Managers.

They categorized Responders as those principals who placed heavy emphasis on allowing the teachers and others to take the lead. These principals perceived their primary role as being administrators and believed that the teachers were professionals who could carry out their instructional role with little guidance. Responders emphasized the personal side of their relationships with teachers and others, and before they made decisions, often gave everyone an opportunity to have input so as to weigh the feelings of others, or to allow them to make the decisions.

Initiators were principals who seized the lead and made things happen. They tended to have strong beliefs about what good schools
and good teaching should be like and worked intensely to attain that vision. Decisions were taken by Initiators in relation to the goals of the school and what was best for the students, and not with the idea of what was easiest or would have made the teachers happiest.

Managers were considered to be those principals who did not have a fixed pattern of behavior, but tended to act like Responders at some times, and like Initiators at other times. They tended to keep teachers informed and were sensitive to their needs. If the central office wanted something to happen in their schools, they certified that it was done. However, they did not as a rule initiate attempts to go beyond what was asked of them, although when a particular innovation was given priority, they could become very involved with their teachers in making it happen. On the whole principals who were characterized as Managers tried to ensure that the basic work of the schools was being done.

Hall and Rutherford (op.cit.) suggested that in terms of facilitating the change process to improve their schools, Initiators made it happen, Managers helped it happen and Responders let it happen.

Comment on Leadership

Leadership has been acknowledged as the critical factor for stimulating, motivating and influencing a group to maintain itself and to increase its level of productivity. Leadership functions are the functions of the group, and have to be performed, but they have not necessarily to be performed by one particular individual. Depending on the problems which a group faces, it may be necessary even for an
appointed leader to become a follower for a period, while another member of the group initiates acts of leadership in an effort to solve some problem.

Within a school therefore, a principal has the duty of providing a leadership climate in which the members of the teaching staff could attempt acts of leadership which may be geared towards the improvement of the learning experiences which are made available to the students.

The principal as the manager of the school unit also has the obligation to ensure that the teachers carry out their duties faithfully. At the same time, it is in his or her interest to try to help them satisfy their needs as far as possible.

In the schools, personality traits are of some importance to the leadership function. A group of elementary school teachers in Ohio public schools indicated that the traits they considered appropriate for their ideal principal included being adventurous, enthusiastic, aggressive, ambitious, decisive, determined, discerning, forceful, humorous, relaxed, stimulating and well read (Chamberlain, et al., 1980). Possession of a collection of personality traits alone cannot guarantee effective leadership. The traits have to be appropriate to the situation as analyzed by the leader so that the particular type of leadership behavior suitable for the occasion may be practiced (Hill, 1973).

The principal therefore has to be aware of and take into account his or her own personality, the personalities of the teaching staff and
their behavioral responses as a group, and the demands of the situation as he or she analyzes it (Hill, op.cit.).

If the analysis of the situation is relatively correct, and he or she is able to respond to it by providing directive or considerate leadership as the occasion warrants, the teachers as a group will tend to be satisfied. As a consequence they will tend to accept assertions of influence without objection and be prepared to work hard to promote the development of the school as an organization.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is defined in the literature in general terms as "an effective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they at present occupy" (Vroom, 1964), or as "the affective response of individuals which is reflected in the evaluation employees make of all the salient aspects of their work" (Schneider and Snyder, 1975).

From a psychological standpoint Keller and Szilagyi (1978) define job satisfaction as the "degree to which an individual's needs, desires, and expectations are fulfilled by employment in an organization."

**Measurement of Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction has been measured by interviews and questionnaires in which the workers were asked to indicate whether they liked or disliked their jobs or specific aspects of them. The level of satisfaction was determined by the scores given to the responses
made to the various items on the questionnaire, and by the answers given to questions asked in the interview.

Various instruments have been constructed by investigators to measure job satisfaction. As these instruments have differed widely, the comparability of results was not possible. Two instruments which have been widely used, however, were the Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction (1951), which measures general or global job satisfaction, and the Job Description Inventory (JDI) which was the result of an impressive program of research carried out by Smith and her co-workers at Cornell University (Vroom, 1964).

Studies on Job Satisfaction

An early comprehensive study of job satisfaction was made by Hoppock (1935) who, in investigating 500 teachers on different aspects of their occupation, found that there was a significant difference between those who were most satisfied, and those least satisfied. He noted that external factors including satisfaction with life in general tended to affect the level of a teacher's job satisfaction.

Maslow (1943) viewed satisfaction within the context of the fulfillment of needs. He suggested that individuals possessed needs which were arranged in hierarchical order beginning with physiological needs at the lowest level, and through the stages of safety needs, the need for affection, the need for esteem, to, finally, the need for self actualization. In his perspective when lower order needs came close to being satisfied, needs of a higher order become prepotent,
and occupied much of the individual's conscious thoughts. The gradual reduction in the strength of a need created satisfaction, and the lack of fulfillment created dissatisfaction.

Maslow's ideas of a hierarchy of needs which motivated individuals to join an organization, stay in it and contribute towards its goal achievement has been accepted by administrators in various fields including business organizations (Owens, op.cit.). However, there is really no proof that human needs are arranged in hierarchical fashion.

Herzberg, et.al., (op.cit.) investigated job satisfaction within the context of a worker's motivation to do his or her job. In studying a group of engineers and accountants employed at a large manufacturing plant in the Pittsburgh area, the researchers asked respondents to recall sequences of events in their work history in which they felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad.

From the responses which were obtained the investigators deduced that the factors which were most important in promoting a positive attitude to the job were:

1. Achievement, which was explained as an advance in skill;
2. Recognition from one's superior, some other individual in management, or management itself as an impersonal force, a client, a colleague, or the general public;
3. The work itself;
4. Responsibility, which was described as working without supervision, or being responsible for one's own efforts; and

5. Advancement, which was viewed as an actual change in status.

Of lesser importance were such factors as:

6. Salary;

7. Possibility of growth;

8. Interpersonal relations with subordinates;

9. Status;

10. Interpersonal relations with superior;

11. Interpersonal relations with peers;

12. Supervision;

13. Company policy and administration;

14. Working conditions, which were explained as the physical conditions of the work, the amount of work, and the facilities;

15. Personal life; and


Herzberg, et al., contended that long term positive attitudes towards the job were fostered by the work itself, by responsibility and by advancement, but that company policy and administration were the most important factors in promoting bad feelings about a job. They suggested too that the "content" factors like achievement and recognition led to positive job attitudes on account of their satisfying the
individual's need for self-actualization or self-realization," and, as a consequence, were "motivators" or "satisfiers." On the other hand, such factors as salary, interpersonal relations, and job security were inherent in the conditions surrounding the job and, as "hygienes," helped the individual to do the job, but did not provide the self-actualization that the individual needed. These factors had a greater potentiality for leading to job dissatisfaction rather than job satisfaction.

From the study Herzberg concluded that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were on different continua and arose from different types of factors within the job situation.

The findings of Herzberg have not been supported by many researchers. Some investigators have indicated that the findings are only corroborated when the identical "critical incident" method is used, and consequently have suggested that Herzberg's findings are "method bound" (Gordon, Pryor, and Harris, 1974; Ewen, 1964). They noted that no criteria for validity and reliability for the study have been advanced, and only two occupations have been investigated. However, the influence of the study has been widespread and has tended to encourage a greater analysis of the characteristics and content of work (Vroom, 1964).

Brayfield and Crockett (1955) suggested that individuals experienced job satisfaction when they had achieved the goals for which they had been striving. Vroom accepted this view and added that satisfaction in the job was experienced if the goal had positive
"valence" or worth for the individual. He noted that there were many possible outcomes from a job which were not satisfying in themselves, but that the willingness of the individual to accept them was based on the anticipated satisfaction or dissatisfaction to which they would lead. An individual would then experience satisfaction if he felt that he could do a job, and that successful completion of it would be instrumental in leading to promotion, or to some goal which was of value to him.

Vroom also suggested that certain personality characteristics of particular individuals might condition their reactions to jobs. He suggested that persons who had adapted to the work situation would tend to experience job satisfaction, while some others would be satisfied if the jobs met only the minimum requirements which they expected.

Cummings and Schwab (op.cit.) also viewed job satisfaction in the context of worker motivation. They considered that job satisfaction was experienced as a result of the achievement of personal goals which had been obtained from successful performance on a task.

Friedlander (1963) investigated the sources underlying job satisfaction among a group of 600 subjects comprising engineering, supervisory, and salaried employees. The findings indicated that both intrinsic or "content" factors and extrinsic or "hygiene" factors were sources of job satisfaction. In a later study involving 80 students undergoing an evening course in Psychology, he concluded that the intrinsic factors in the job were more important for both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, while extrinsic factors were less
important. A similar finding was reported by Centers and Bugental (1966) in a study involving 692 subjects.

The level of job satisfaction was also affected by the degree of role conflict and ambiguity involved in one's work. Johnson and Stinson (1975) found a negative correlation between job satisfaction and role conflict and ambiguity for individuals who had a high need for achievement. It is likely that individuals would encounter great difficulty in accomplishing goals which depended on successful task achievement if they did not have a clear understanding of what they were to do, and how they were to act in particular situations connected with the job.

The job satisfaction of subordinates in an organization was also seen to be influenced by the behavioral style of the leader, and the size of the work group. Pelz (1952) found that groups of ten or more persons indicated a higher level of satisfaction if the leader's behavior was characterized by a high degree of initiation of structure. Filley and House (1969) noted, on the other hand, that leaders who showed a high level of consideration tended to have more satisfied employees. This was supported by the findings of Fleishman and Harris (1962) which indicated that supervisors who were high on consideration and low on initiation of structure had employees who exhibited a lower level of grievances and turnover than if the level of consideration was low and the level of initiation of structure was high. This was also partly borne out by Sadler (1970) who found that job satisfaction was
fostered by a consultative style on the part of managers, rather than by a style which was considered as being directive.

**Satisfaction in the Elementary School**

In the context of the public elementary school, investigations have been conducted into the relationships between the leadership behavior of principals, the organizational climate of schools and the level of the teachers' satisfaction.

Espy (1976) discovered no relationship between the principal's leadership style and the job satisfaction of teachers in a selected urban school district. Byrnes (1972) found that in schools where the supervisory style was perceived by the teachers to be more participative, there was a higher level of satisfaction than in schools in which the supervisory style was perceived as being less participative. Henderson (1976) found a positive relationship between participative decision making in schools and the level of job satisfaction.

Schleiter (1971) found that there was no significant difference in satisfaction between teachers in schools with open climates and those in schools with closed climates. Turner (1966), on the other hand, had found that teachers in those schools with open climates were more satisfied in some areas than those in schools with closed climates.

Inconsistencies in the findings relative to the association between organizational climate and the job satisfaction of teachers may be due to the use of the global dimensions of the organizational climate as given on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.
(1966). Organizational Climate on the OCDQ might already have contained aspects of satisfaction in the teachers' behavioral responses of "esprit" and "intimacy," and aspects of dissatisfaction in the responses of "disengagement" and "hindrance."

Thomas (1976) in reviewing studies in connection with the OCDQ concluded that it had proved more profitable to use the individual dimensions of the instrument rather than the global categories. It is possible that more consistent relationships might have been found if the individual dimensions or subtests were used in the studies and were related to the level of teacher job satisfaction.

Comments

The job satisfaction of employees within an organization is of importance to managers, supervisors, and employers on account of its association with critical employee behaviors including absence from work (Porter and Steers, 1973; Gupta, 1980), general life satisfaction (Hoppock, op.cit.), and health (Kornhauser, 1965).

In the public elementary school the job satisfaction of teachers might be of great value to a school's success. The professional nature of the teacher's role, the high indeterminacy of the product, and the great visibility of the teacher to the student may contribute to making of job satisfaction crucial to the performance of teachers to a greater extent than their counterparts in industrial settings (Gross and Herriott, op.cit.).

Teachers with a high level of job satisfaction might tend to remain and contribute to the development of the school, while those who
derive little satisfaction might tend to absent themselves occasionally for short periods, possibly finding the attractions off the job more powerful than those on it (Gruneberg, 1979).

Job satisfaction also helps to promote a positive self image, and teachers who are experiencing high levels of satisfaction would tend to feel more competent and confident. Dissatisfied teachers, like other dissatisfied workers, might be more likely to do their work badly, to waste time on the job and to spread rumors about the school as an organization (Greene, 1975).

Principals in public elementary school have therefore to analyze the situations in the schools and consider the appropriate pattern of leadership which would foster a high level of job satisfaction among the members of the teaching staffs in their schools.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study proposed to investigate the extent to which the principal's perceived leadership behavior influenced the job satisfaction of the teaching staffs in the public elementary school.

Target Population

The target population for the study consisted of groups of teachers in those public elementary schools having a student population between 200 and 600 in the school district of Columbus, Ohio, United States of America. All of the schools chosen provided education for students up to the age of eleven years. The size of the schools was arbitrarily determined by the researcher on the grounds that the principal of a school of over 600 students might have to use an authoritarian pattern of leadership behavior. It was assumed therefore that the scores from the teaching staffs in these schools would tend to heavily bias the mean scores of schools in the direction of perceived aloofness.

Sample

A cluster sample of 36 public elementary schools in the Columbus school district having between 200 and 600 students was selected for
The total number of teachers was 539 as provided by information gathered from the Ohio Schools Directory 1933.

The list of schools, the number of members of the teaching staff, and the number of students of each school are indicated in Appendix A.

Preliminaries

At an early stage in the planning of the study, discussions were held between officers of the Division of Elementary Schools of the Columbus Public Schools system, the University Adviser, and the researcher, in order to obtain permission to enter the schools to conduct the study. Copies of the proposal were submitted to the Division of Elementary Schools for perusal and analysis. Permission was granted after favorable consideration of the proposal by the Division and the Association of Elementary Principals.

The Columbus branch of the Ohio Education Association also gave a favorable response for the study to be undertaken.

The researcher was asked to note, however, that:

1. the completion of questionnaires by members of the teaching staffs would be purely voluntary; and
2. the research findings should not in any way identify any particular school by name.

Instrumentation

In order to assess the teachers' perceptions of particular aspects of the principals' leadership behavior, the Organizational
Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) 1963, designed by Halpin and Croft, was used. This instrument was based on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Hemphill and Coons, 1957), and was constructed in an effort to assess the organizational climate of elementary schools in the United States. Halpin collected the responses of 1151 individuals in the development of the OCDQ and contracted the initial 2000 items into 64. Items dealing with the perception of principals' behavior were arranged into subtests along the dimensions of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration. The teachers' behavioral responses were measured on the dimensions of disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy.

The coefficients of reliability for the subtests on principal behavior were given as follows: aloofness .26, production emphasis .55, thrust .84, consideration .59 (Halpin and Croft, op.cit.).

The coefficient of reliability for the questionnaire used in this study is -0.06.

The use of the OCDQ by investigators in over 200 studies (Lipham and Hoeh, op.cit.), is an indication of its value for providing feedback on aspects of the functioning of elementary schools.

In order to render the subtests on principal behavior more appropriate to the study, a number of adjustments were made to the items.

As some principals of the public elementary schools were female, "he" was replaced by "he/she," "his" by "his/her," and "himself" by "himself/herself."
In the subtest on production emphasis, the item "The principal checks the subject matter ability of teachers" was replaced by "The principal checks the subject matter being taught by teachers;" and "The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity" was changed to "The principal tries to get teachers to work as hard as possible."

In the subtest on thrust, the item "The principal is in the building before the teachers arrive" was replaced by "The principal meets teachers when they arrive."

In the subtest on consideration the following items have been changed:

"The principal helps teachers solve personal problems"
"The principal does personal favors for teachers"
"The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work."

These items have been replaced by:

"The principal is sensitive to teachers' personal problems"
"The principal does personal favors for teachers when necessary," and
"The principal encourages teachers if their standard of work seems to be falling off" respectively.

In addition, the item "The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers" has been omitted as the salaries of teachers at the present time are the result of negotiations conducted between the School Board and the Teachers' Association.
For the measurement of teacher job satisfaction, Brayfield and Rothe's "Index of Job Satisfaction" (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951) was used. This 18 item instrument was considered to be appropriate since an overall measure of the level of teacher job satisfaction, rather than specific aspects of the variable, was being investigated.

Construction of the "Index of Job Satisfaction" was made with the cooperation of 177 subjects at the University of Minnesota. The coefficient of reliability computed from the responses of a sample of workers was 0.77. This score was increased to 0.87 when adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula.

The validity of the Index is based on the nature of the items, the method of its construction, and its differentiating power when applied to two groups which could reasonably be assumed to differ on levels of job satisfaction. The obtained means of the responses of two groups of night school students were 76.9 and 65.4, with a standard deviation of 8.6 and 14.2 respectively. The two groups differed significantly on their levels of job satisfaction at the .01 level of significance (Brayfield and Rothe, op.cit.).

In order to make the "Index" more appropriate for the study, minor adjustments were made by replacing the words "my job" by "teaching" in the following items:

1. My job is like a hobby to me.
2. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.
3. I consider my job to be rather unpleasant.
4. I am satisfied with my job for the time being.

5. I feel that my job is no more interesting than other jobs.

6. I just love my job.

The adjustments which were made to the subtests of the OCDQ, and to the Index of Job Satisfaction were not considered to significantly affect the reliability of the instruments.

Instruments were also designed to collect personal information regarding the age, sex, tenure, qualifications, and status of the teachers taking part in the study.

**Questionnaire**

The data for the study have been collected by the method of the written questionnaire. This method was considered suitable since it offered wide coverage at minimum expense in terms of money and effort (Miller, 1973).

Other advantages to be derived from the use of the written questionnaire included:

1. It permitted more considered answers.
2. It was more adequate if the respondent had to check the information.
3. It was more appropriate where group consultations would provide more valid information.
4. It gave to the respondent a sense of privacy.
5. The effect of an interviewer was removed.
6. it allowed greater uniformity in the presentation of the items.

The disadvantages of this method were considered to be:

1. There was possible misinterpretation of some items.
2. There was no follow through on misunderstood items.
3. The validity depended on the willingness of the respondents to provide the information.
4. The respondents might differ significantly from the non-respondents.
5. There would be respondent bias.
6. Some individuals might not return the questionnaires.

A pretest of the questionnaire was undertaken to identify items which were ambiguous.

In an effort to reduce the incidence of non-return of the questionnaires, at least two visits were made to each school. These were supplemented by letters and telephone calls.

With respect to the biases of respondents, the assumption was made that the responses of those respondents who were biased in favor of the principal would be offset by the responses of those who were biased against him or her.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections. Section one comprised a cover letter which requested the help of the teachers, and which promised complete confidentiality. It also indicated the possible time needed to complete the questionnaire. (Please see Appendix B).
Section two comprised 30 items for assessing the teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior. Items 1-9 determined the perceived level of aloofness, 10-16 the perceived level of production emphasis, 17-25 the perceived level of thrust, and 26-30 the perceived level of consideration.

Section three comprised items 31-54. These were used to assess the level of teacher job satisfaction.

Section four comprised 5 items which were used to gather the personal information of the teacher respondents.

Administration

Subsequent to the granting of permission to enter the schools to conduct the study, the questionnaire was pre-tested in one of the public elementary schools with a staff complement of 28 teachers in the Columbus school district.

No changes were necessary as a result of the pre-test.

A copy of a letter from the Division of Elementary Schools (See Appendix C), and a letter from the researcher (See Appendix D) were sent to the principals of the selected schools. A note which followed informed them that the questionnaire would be delivered within two weeks. Telephone calls were also made to each principal to inform him or her about the study.

The members of the teaching staff of one school, however, were unable to participate in the study on account of the pressure of work which they were undergoing at that time.
The questionnaires were delivered by hand either to the principal or to the secretary in each of the 35 schools involved in the study. These schools were coded from 001 to 035, and the teachers in each school were coded from 01.

Owing to the large area to be covered to reach the schools, and the occasionally bleak and wet days of late autumn, the distribution and collection of the questionnaires were completed within a period of 21 days. Some schools were visited on three occasions. One school forwarded all of its completed questionnaires to the researcher after the researcher's second visit, while five other schools forwarded between one and four completed copies after the researcher's third visit.

Of the 525 copies of the questionnaire delivered to the schools, only 264 or 50.3 percent were returned fully completed. The percentages varied between schools from a high of 79 percent to a low of 18 percent. The percentages and the number of schools involved are indicated in Table 1.

In considering completed returns to questionnaires, Babbie (1973) has suggested that in survey research a return of 50 percent of delivered questionnaires which are usable is considered adequate for conclusions to be drawn. However, of the 35 schools which participated in the study 19 or 54 percent returned 50 percent of their questionnaires completed. This number of schools was considered to be low, and to increase the statistical power of the sample, schools which
TABLE 1. TABLE SHOWING THE PERCENTAGES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED COMPLETED, AND THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS INVOLVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages of Questionnaires</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-20 percent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 percent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 percent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 percent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 percent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-60 percent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 70 percent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

had reached a 45 percent rate of return were included in the study. This increased the number of schools to 28, which was 80 percent of the selected schools and an increase of 25 percent.

**Scoring**

Items on the subtests for principal's perceived aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration were scored on a Likert five point scale indicating the respondent's intensity of agreement or disagreement with each item. The intensity ranges were strongly agree (SA), moderately agree (MA), undecided (U), moderately disagree (MD), and strongly disagree (SD). Points were allocated in the order of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 when the items were scored positively, and in the reverse when the items were scored negatively. A score of 5 for a positively scored item indicated a perception of a high level of the aspect of the
variable measured by the item, while a score of 1 indicated a low level of the aspect of the variable. For those items which were scored negatively, the reverse conditions were indicated by the scores.

This method of scoring differed from the range of "rarely occurs," "sometimes occurs," "often occurs," and "very frequently occurs," used by Halpin for the OCDQ, but was not considered to adversely affect the validity and reliability of the subtests.

A similar method of scoring using the 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 for a positively scored item and the reverse for a negatively scored item was utilized for the scoring of the Index of Job Satisfaction. This method was identical to the method which was used by the constructors of the instrument.

The items on the adjusted Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, with the exception of those numbered 7, 8, and 9 were positively scored. Items numbered 31, 32, 35, 37, 39, 42, 43, 45, and 47 on the adjusted "Index of Job Satisfaction" were also positively scored. The other items were scored negatively.

The list of the main independent variables, the dependent variable, the number of items for each variable, the possible range of scores for each variable, and the mean item scores are indicated in Table 2.

The number of responses from the 28 schools are in Table 3.

The item scores for the individual teacher's perception of the principal's level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration, were summed and averaged to provide the individual mean
TABLE 2.  TABLE SHOWING THE INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES, THE NUMBER OF ITEMS, THE RANGE OF SCORES, AND THE MEAN ITEM SCORE FOR EACH VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean Item Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18-90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

score on each of the variables. The individual mean scores on each variable were then summed and averaged to provide the school's score. A mean score in excess of 3.0 was considered high, while a score of less than 3.0 was considered low.

The mean item scores on job satisfaction for the individual teachers at a particular school were summed and averaged to provide the school's score on this variable. For this variable also, a score in excess of 3.0 was considered high, and a score of less than 3.0 was considered low.

Computations

The Spearman "r_s" coefficient of correlation was computed for each of the independent variables and job satisfaction. The level of significance was set up at alpha = .05 and .10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Number of Teacher Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list of scores on aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration for the various schools were arranged in descending order. A weighted mean score was computed from the scores on teacher job satisfaction corresponding to those of the 7 highest and the 7 lowest scores on these variables. A two-tail "t" test was computed between the means to ascertain whether a significant difference on teacher job satisfaction existed between those schools whose principals were perceived to have high levels of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration, and those whose principals were perceived to have low levels of these aspects of leadership behavior.

The level of significance was set at an alpha level of .05 and .10.

**Regression Analysis**

Stepwise regression analysis using the technique of forward selection was performed on the data in order to assess the contribution of each of the independent variables to the variance of teacher job satisfaction. The variable which made the highest correlation with job satisfaction was entered first into the regression. The second variable to enter made the next highest contribution to the variance as shown by the size of the increase in the R square. The process was repeated until the variables which remained made no significant contribution to the R square as determined by the alpha level of .10.
The Computer Center

All of the statistical computations were done with data processing equipment and the SAS and SPSS programs of The Ohio State University's Computer Center.

Invaluable help was also rendered by the consultants at the Center.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

This study is concerned with the influence of the principal's perceived leadership behavior as expressed by the perceived level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration, on the level of job satisfaction of the teaching staffs in a sample of public elementary schools in the Columbus School District of Ohio.

The findings of the study, based on an analysis of the data are presented in this chapter.

School Scores

The individual school's mean scores on the principal's perceived level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration, on teacher job satisfaction, and on the sex, age, tenure, qualifications, and status of the teaching staffs are shown in Table 4.

The means, standard deviations, and maximum and minimum scores for the dependent and independent variables are shown in Table 5.
### TABLE 4. SCHOOL MEAN SCORES ON PRINCIPAL'S PERCEIVED BEHAVIOR, TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION, SEX, AGE, TENURE, QUALIFICATIONS, AND STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** Al=Aloofness; P=Production Emphasis; Th=Thrust; C=Consideration; J=Job Satisfaction; S=Sex; A=Age; T=Tenure; Q=Qualifications; S=Status
TABLE 5. THE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM SCORES OF THE INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES IN THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aloofness</th>
<th>Production Emphasis</th>
<th>Thrust</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Score</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Score</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 28

Perceived Aloofness

The data reveal that the groups of teachers in the sample of public elementary schools in the Columbus school district perceive that, in general, their principals exhibit a pattern of behavior which is characterized by a low level of aloofness. The low mean score of 2.56 seems to indicate that the teaching staffs consider that staff meetings are not used mainly as opportunities for the purpose of hearing the principal's reports but that the teachers themselves place items on the agenda for meetings, and provide input for, and offer criticism on, matters to be discussed at these meetings. It seems to indicate, too, that principals are seen as members of the work team and do not utilize the position of high status in an effort to coerce the members of the teaching staff.
The standard deviation score of 0.36 indicates that between the minimum score of 1.67 and the maximum score of 3.20, approximately 68.26 percent of the scores fall between 2.20 and 2.92.

**Perceived Production Emphasis**

The principals are also seen to be above average on production emphasis. The mean score of 3.09 suggests that the principals are perceived to urge their staffs to greater efforts and productivity occasionally. There is no excessive concentration on the organizational tasks of establishing and maintaining the specific policies and goals of the schools without the consideration of their impact on the teachers, and though there is some close monitoring of the teachers' work, it is not considered to be too excessive as to promote anxiety. The score also suggests that the principals, on the basis of their experience and position, would tend to be directive in their behavior on occasion, and to make slight changes in school operations on account of feedback from the teaching staffs.

The standard deviation score of 0.36 indicates that between the minimum score of 2.94 and the maximum of 3.93, approximately 68.26 percent of the scores fall between 2.73 and 3.45.

**Perceived Thrust**

The high mean score of 4.09 on perceived thrust implies that principals are perceived as making a great and consistent effort to mold their schools into more dynamic and purposeful units. They are seen as setting examples as hard and devoted workers, who prepare
themselves by doing their homework and passing on to their staffs innovative ideas which they notice in their readings. The high level of thrust on the part of the principal suggests that they try their best to motivate their teaching staffs so as to raise or to maintain the standard of their schools.

The standard deviation of 0.45 indicates that between the minimum a score of 3.18 and the maximum score of 4.81, approximately 68.26 percent of the scores fall between 3.64 and 4.54.

**Perceived Consideration**

The high mean score of 3.81 on the principal's perceived level of consideration suggests that in the Columbus public elementary schools the teachers are treated humanely by their principals. It indicates that the principals are sensitive to the personal problems of the teaching staff, offering advice when necessary, and commiseration when the occasion warrants. The principals try to settle minor differences among teachers before they develop into major episodes which can become dysfunctional to the progress of the schools.

The standard deviation score of 0.51 indicates that between the minimum score of 2.58 and the maximum score of 4.81, approximately 68.26 percent of the scores fall between 3.30 and 4.32.

**Teacher Job Satisfaction**

The high mean score of 4.20 on teacher job satisfaction is an indication that the teaching staffs in these schools are experiencing high levels of job satisfaction. This high level of job satisfaction
suggests that they find their work quite interesting and rewarding, and are not bored by it. It also suggests that while on the job they become so involved that the working day seems to pass away too quickly.

The standard deviation score of 0.22 indicates that between the minimum score of 3.37 and a maximum score of 4.49, approximately 68.26 percent of the scores fall between 3.98 and 4.42.

**Relationships Between the Variables**

The Spearman Rho correlations between the criterion variable, job satisfaction, and the major independent variables perceived aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration, are indicated in Table 6.

The minor independent variables of sex, age, tenure, qualifications and status are also included in Table 6.

Teacher job satisfaction (TJS), the criterion, shows a statistically significant and positive relationship \( r_s = .37 \) with principal's perceived level of aloofness (PLA). It shows no relationship of significance, however, with principal's perceived level of production emphasis (PLPE), principal's perceived level of thrust (PLT), and principal's perceived level of consideration (PLC), with which it correlates \( r_s = -.18 \), \( r_s = -.04 \) and \( r_s = -.06 \), respectively.

The independent variables show significant relationships also among themselves. Principal's perceived level of aloofness is positively associated \( r_s = .44 \) with principal's perceived level of production emphasis, but negatively associated \( r_s = -.57 \) with
TABLE 6. ZERO ORDER CORRELATIONS OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES AND THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES IN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>TJS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>PLPE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>PLT</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.57*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>PLC</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.65*</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Qual.</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sta.</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 26  
N = 28

* = significant at alpha .10
Correlations are significant at \( r_s = .32 \)

**KEY**

TJS = Teacher job satisfaction  
PLA = Principal's perceived level of aloofness  
PLPE = Principal's perceived level of production emphasis  
PLT = Principal's perceived level of thrust  
PLC = Principal's perceived level of consideration  
Ten. = Tenure;  
Qual. = Qualifications;  
Sta. = Status
principal's perceived level of thrust, and $(r_s = -0.65)$ with principal's perceived level of consideration. Principal's perceived level of thrust shows a highly significant positive association $(r_s = 0.90)$ with principal's perceived level of consideration. Tenure shows a positive relationship $(r_s = 0.47)$ with principal's perceived level of thrust $(r_s = 0.48)$ with principal's perceived level of consideration, and $(r_s = 0.57)$ with age, but a negative relationship $(r_s = -0.39)$ with principal's perceived level of aloofness.

**Discussion**

**Perceived Aloofness and Teacher Job Satisfaction**

$H_1$ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of aloofness and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

The Spearman "$r_s$" correlation coefficient of 0.37 showing a positive association between the perceived level of aloofness on the part of the principal and the teachers' job satisfaction indicates a positive, and statistically significant relationship between the principal keeping himself aloof from the members of the teaching staff and their level of job satisfaction. There is the likelihood that the more the principal relies on the rules and regulations to control the teaching staff's activities, the more their positive feelings towards the job are enhanced.

The rather moderate relationship indicates the likelihood that teachers tend to be less satisfied if they are distracted from their classroom activities in order to be provided with information regarding
the results of a visit by a school supervisor, or being interrupted during the course of a lesson to be told that the principal was visiting their classrooms. They are likely to be more satisfied by not questioning the rules which the principal has found necessary to make to control behavior in the school, since the smooth functioning of the school is within the contractual obligations of the office.

The teachers in the public elementary schools in the Columbus school district are well qualified for their posts. All of them hold B.S. degrees from institutions of higher education, and some of them are pursuing academic studies at a higher level. They are competent to carry out their tasks as professionals, and seem to prefer the principal to maintain the high status position, impartially enforce the rules, set up the appropriate structures, and provide the facilities for them to perform their tasks successfully.

The hypothesis is therefore rejected.

In being aloof, the principal shows greater concern for the organization than for the individual teachers. As the average number of teachers on a staff in the sample of schools is 15, the finding, therefore, seems in agreement with the finding of Pelz (1952) that work groups comprising ten or more persons prefer leaders who are more supportive of the organization as a whole rather than of the individual members.

**Perceived Production Emphasis and Teacher Job Satisfaction**

\[ H_2 \] There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of production emphasis and the level of teacher job satisfaction
The very low level of association as shown by the correlation coefficient $r_s = -.18$ between the perceived level of the principal's production emphasis and the level of the teachers' job satisfaction indicates that in the Columbus public elementary schools there is no significant relationship between the principal's level of production emphasis and the level of the teachers' job satisfaction. It suggests that the actions of a principal in making up the schedules of work for the teaching staff, conspicuously placing notices of extra duties, closely supervising the teachers' work, and drawing attention to their mistakes have no relationship of consequence to their positive attitudes towards the job.

The correlation coefficient of -.18 between teacher job satisfaction and the principal's perceived level of production emphasis is less than the -.32 required for significance at the alpha level of .10. The hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Leadership behavior which is characterized by close supervision and consistent pressure for increased production can be considered to be "directive." This pattern of leadership behavior restricts subordinate participation in the decision making process of the organization. Vroom (1959) has found that a high level of psychological participation promotes a significantly higher level of job satisfaction ($r = .55$) for persons who have a high need for independence than for those persons who have a low need ($r = .13$). It would, therefore, be reasonable to suggest that those persons with a low need for independence would tend to be more satisfied, or less dissatisfied, with this "directive" type
of leadership behavior than those persons who have a high need for independence. This study shows, however, that this type of perceived leadership behavior has no significant influence on the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of teachers in the selected sample of schools, and in consequence, does not give support to Vroom's reported findings.

**Perceived Thrust and Teacher Job Satisfaction**

$H_3$ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of thrust and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

The lack of a significant relationship between the principal's perceived level of thrust and the level of the teachers' job satisfaction indicates that there is no relationship between these two variables. Thrust on the part of a principal is shown when he or she goes out of the way to help teachers achieve a greater measure of success in their work by offering them new and workable ideas which might present novel approaches to their teaching. It is shown too, by the principal setting an example of hard work, and by the use of constructive criticism in an effort to improve teaching techniques and make the expenditure of effort more rewarding. This pattern of behavior on the part of a principal in the Columbus public elementary school has no effect on the job satisfaction of the teachers.

The correlation coefficient of -.04 between principal's perceived level of consideration, and teacher job satisfaction is less than the -.32 required for significance at the alpha level of .10. The hypothesis is therefore accepted.
The finding seems to be in contrast to the finding of Friedlander and Margulies (op.cit.) who found that employees have high levels of job satisfaction when there is a high level of thrust on the part of management.

**Perceived Consideration and Teacher Job Satisfaction**

$H_4$: There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of consideration and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

The lack of a significant correlation between the principal's level of consideration and the job satisfaction to the teaching staffs, indicates that there is also no association between these variables. Considerate behavior by a principal is shown by the demonstration of friendship and trust, by encouraging participation in the affairs of the school, and helping to resolve conflict between teachers.

This pattern of behavior has no appreciable effect on the job satisfaction of the teaching staff.

Since the correlation coefficient of -.06 falls short of the .32 needed for significance, the hypothesis is therefore accepted.

The finding, however, seems to be in contrast to the finding of Greene (op.cit.), Sadler (op.cit.), and Michaels and Spector (1982), that consideration on the part of supervisors promotes satisfaction among employees.
Minor Independent Variables

The minor independent variables of sex, age, length of service, qualifications, and status are not significantly associated with teacher job satisfaction.

These results are partly supportive of the findings of Herman and Hulin (1972) and Herman, Dunham and Hulin (1975) that the demographic variables of sex, age, years of experience, and education are not significantly related to job satisfaction.

Differences Between Groups of Schools

The scores on teacher job satisfaction corresponding to the scores on principal's perceived aloofness for 7 schools with the highest, and 7 with the lowest scores, together with the weighted means, standard deviations, and "t" values, are indicated in Table 7. Similar statistical computations for principal's perceived level of production emphasis, thrust and consideration are to be found in Tables 8, 9, and 10 respectively.

Perceived Aloofness and Teacher Job Satisfaction

H₅ There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of aloofness, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.

Table 7 shows that the weighted mean score on teacher job satisfaction for the 7 schools with the highest scores on principal's perceived level of aloofness of 0.24 higher than the mean score for the 7 schools with the lowest scores.
TABLE 7. LIST OF SCORES ON JOB SATISFACTION TOGETHER WITH THE FREQUENCIES, WEIGHTED MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND "t" VALUE CORRESPONDING TO THE SCORES OF THE 7 SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST AND LOWEST SCORES ON PRINCIPAL'S PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ALOOFNESS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORES</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 4.32  
Standard Deviation 0.17

"t" value 1.76 NS

NS = Not Significant
N = 14
df = 12

A = Mean Scores and frequencies of 7 schools with highest scores on principal's perceived level of aloofness.

B = Mean Scores and frequencies of 7 schools with lowest scores on principal's perceived level of aloofness.

The "t" value of 1.76 is not significant at the .10 level of significance which is 1.78 for a two tail test with 12 degrees of freedom. This shows that there is no significant difference between the means of the groups. The finding indicates that there is no significant
difference in job satisfaction between groups of teachers in which
the principal's perceived level of aloofness is highest and those in
which the perceived level is lowest.

The hypothesis is accepted as a result of the finding.

Perceived Production Emphasis and
Teacher Job Satisfaction

TABLE 8. LIST OF SCORES ON JOB SATISFACTION TOGETHER WITH THE
FREQUENCIES, WEIGHTED MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND
"t" VALUE, CORRESPONDING TO THE SCORES OF THE 7 SCHOOLS
WITH THE HIGHEST AND LOWEST SCORES ON PRINCIPALS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF PRODUCTION EMPHASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCORES</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
<td>SCORES</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"t" value = -.91 NS

NS = Not Significant

A = Mean scores and frequencies of 7 schools with highest scores on principal's perceived level of production emphasis.

B = Mean scores and frequencies of 7 schools with lowest scores on principal's perceived level of production emphasis.
There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of production emphasis, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.

Table 8 shows that the weighted mean score on teacher job satisfaction for the 7 schools with the lowest scores on principal's perceived level of production emphasis exceeds the weighted mean score of the schools with the highest scores by .13.

The "t" value of -.91 is not significant at the alpha level of .10 as it is below the 1.78 which is required for significance.

This finding indicates that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between the teaching staffs in these two groups of schools.

The hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Perceived Thrust and Teacher Job Satisfaction

There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of thrust, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.

Table 9 shows that the weighted mean score on teacher job satisfaction for the 7 schools with the lowest scores on principal's perceived level of thrust is higher by 0.03 than the weighted mean for the 7 schools with the highest scores.

The "t" value of -0.22 is not significant and indicates that there is no significant difference between the means.
The results indicate therefore that the teaching staffs in these two groups of schools are not significantly different in their level of job satisfaction.

The hypothesis is accepted as a result.

**TABLE 9.** LIST OF SCORES ON JOB SATISFACTION TOGETHER WITH THE FREQUENCIES, WEIGHTED MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND "t" VALUE, CORRESPONDING TO THE SCORES OF THE 7 SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST AND LOWEST SCORES ON PRINCIPAL'S PERCEIVED LEVEL OF THRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 4.24, 4.27
Standard Deviation: 0.19, 0.19

"t" value: -0.22 NS

NS = Not Significant
N = 14
df = 12

A = Mean scores and frequencies of 7 schools with highest scores on principal's perceived level of thrust.

B = Mean scores and frequencies of 7 schools with lowest scores on principal's perceived level of thrust.
Perceived Consideration and Teacher Job Satisfaction

TABLE 10. LIST OF SCORES ON JOB SATISFACTION TOGETHER WITH THE FREQUENCIES, WEIGHTED MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND "t" VALUE, CORRESPONDING TO THE SCORES OF THE 7 SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST AND LOWEST SCORES ON PRINCIPAL'S PERCEIVED LEVEL OF CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORES</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
<td>SCORES</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean     4.25           4.27
Standard Deviation 0.19      0.19

"t" value -0.22 NS

NS = Not Significant
N = 14
df = 12

A = Mean scores and frequencies of 7 schools with highest scores on principal's perceived level of consideration.

B = Mean scores and frequencies of 7 schools with lowest scores on principal's perceived level of consideration.
H₈ There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which the principals obtain high scores on perceived level of consideration, and those in which the principals obtain low scores.

Table 10 shows that there is a difference of .02 between the weighted means of the 7 schools with the highest scores on principal's perceived level of consideration, and the 7 with the lowest scores. The "t" value of -.22 is not significant, since it is less than the 1.78 required for significance, indicating the lack of a significant difference between the means. There is, therefore, no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between the teaching staffs in the two groups of schools.

This also shows that the principal's perceived level of consideration is not related to the job satisfaction of the teaching staff in the schools.

The hypothesis is therefore accepted.

**Contributions to Teacher Job Satisfaction**

H₉ There is no significant difference between the contributions made to teacher job satisfaction by principal's perceived level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration.

Contrary to the hypothesis, the principal's perceived level of aloofness made the greatest contribution to the variance in teacher job satisfaction.

The regression coefficient (b value), the contribution to the variance (R square), and the F value of perceived aloofness, are shown in Table 11.
The regression coefficients, R square, and the F values for perceived aloofness and perceived production emphasis in combination are shown in Table 12.

Perceived thrust and perceived consideration did not reach the required alpha level of .10 for inclusion in the regression.

Perceived Aloofness

Table 11 shows that principal's perceived level of aloofness accounts for 13 percent of the variance in teacher job satisfaction as indicated by the R square of 0.13. The value of the regression coefficient as shown by the b value is 0.22. The F value of 4.03 indicates that the contribution is significant at the alpha level of .10. since the critical value for F with a numerator having 1 degree of freedom and a denominator with 26 degrees of freedom at an alpha level of .10 is 2.91.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b Value</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4.03$^s$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df, Regression: 1
Error: 26
Total: 27
Interpretation

The teaching staffs in the Columbus public elementary schools attached some importance to behavior which is indicative of aloofness on the part of their principals. There is likely to be an increase in their job satisfaction if principals increase their reliance on the rules and regulations, and indicate and clarify the procedures which are to be followed in the line of duty. A more positive attitude towards the job is likely when the teaching staffs are allowed to carry out their obligations with a minimum of intervention.

The impact of this pattern of principal behavior on the job satisfaction of the teaching staff, however, is not great since it accounts for only 13 percent of the variance in teacher job satisfaction. This result leaves 87 percent of the variance to be accounted for.

Perceived Aloofness and Production Emphasis

TABLE 12. TABLE SHOWING THE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS (b VALUES), THE R SQUARE, AND THE F VALUE FOR THE COMBINATION OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: PRINCIPAL'S PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ALOOFNESS, AND PRINCIPAL'S PERCEIVED LEVEL OF PRODUCTION EMPHASIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b Value</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.49s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4.93s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df: Regression 2
Error 25
Total 27
N = 28
S = Significant
F is Significant at 2.53
Table 12 shows that principal's perceived level of aloofness, in combination with the principal's perceived level of production emphasis, account for 28 percent of the variance in teacher job satisfaction. Principal's perceived level of aloofness when entered alone into the regression contributed 13 percent to the variance, and had a regression coefficient of 0.22 and an F value of 4.03. In combination with principal's perceived level of production emphasis, however, the value of the regression coefficient rises to 0.34, and the F value increases to 8.49.

Both contributions are significant in the regression since the critical value for F with a numerator with 2 degrees of freedom, and a denominator with 25 degrees of freedom is 2.53.

Principal's perceived level of production emphasis correlates $r_s = -.18$ with teacher job satisfaction, and $r_s = .44$ with perceived level of aloofness. As a single independent variable perceived level of production emphasis would contribute 3 percent ($(-.18)^2$) to the variance in teacher job satisfaction. In combination with perceived level of aloofness the contribution is 15 percent (28-13) to the variance. It has a negative regression coefficient of -.25 and an F value of 4.93, which is significant at the alpha level of .10.

**Explanation**

Perceived level of aloofness, in spite of its making a positive correlation with teacher job satisfaction, has some variance in it which correlates zero or even negatively with teacher job satisfaction.
This same variance prevents perceived level of aloofness from correlating as highly as it might with teacher job satisfaction. Perceived level of aloofness also correlates with perceived production emphasis because they have in common variance which is not shared by teacher job satisfaction. In such a situation perceived level of production emphasis acquires a negative regression coefficient, and is a suppressor variable (Guildford and Fruchter, 1973; Cohen and Cohen, 1983). In the regression analysis perceived production emphasis suppresses the unwanted variance in perceived level of aloofness, and consequently allows it to make a much greater contribution to the variance in teacher job satisfaction.

Interpretation

In the Columbus public elementary schools, the patterns of a principal's behavior which are seen as indicative of a reliance on the rules, regulations and standard operating procedures are interspersed with behavior which shows some concern for the wellbeing of the individual members of the teaching staff. The interjection of perceived considerate behavior is in strong contrast to the principal's aloof behavior, and tends to depress the level of teacher job satisfaction.

However, the principal is also perceived to reduce the effects of such considerate behavior by closely supervising the work of the teaching staff, by correcting their mistakes, and by making persistent calls for greater application to their jobs. The effects of the perceived considerate behavior are submerged by this emphasis on
increased production and, as a consequence, the pattern of aloof behavior more positively influences the job satisfaction of the teaching staff.

The findings suggest that the level of teacher satisfaction can partly be explained by the level of perceived aloofness on the part of the principal.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The Principal and Leadership

As an appointee of the Columbus Board of Education, the principal of a public elementary school, as the leader of his or her work group, has at his or her disposal reward power, coercive power, and legitimate power. These types of power help him or her to demand minimum acceptable compliance from members of the teaching staff so as to effect those changes in their role behavior which would be conducive to the attainment of the school's goals.

The possession of the power to reward allows the principal to reinforce positively behavior which, in his or her opinion, is in the interest of the school. It also negatively reinforces behavior which is perceived to militate against the progress of the school's declared objectives of providing educative experiences designed to instill positive social attitudes and values in the student clients, and to extend their knowledge. The possession of the power to coerce members allows the principal to punish those members whose behavior is considered on occasion to detract from the wellbeing of the school as a whole, and to encourage them to desist from indulging in this pattern of behavior. The possession of legitimate power enables the principal to have
confidence that the directives which he or she issues will be obeyed by all the members of the teaching staff, since he or she has the right to issue them (Ivancevich and Donnelly, 1970), and he or she alone has the authority to guide the members as a group (Koontz and O'Donnell, op.cit.). Additional types of power possessed by the principal, but which neither depend on the organization, nor are prescribed by the organizational rules, include "referent power" which determines the extent to which the members of the teaching staff comply with the principal's directives because of the respect which they have for him or her—and a consequent desire to refrain from hurting him or her. There is also "expert power" which determines the extent to which they obey the directives because they respect and value the principal's experience, training, and overall astute judgment (Ivancevich and Donnelly, op.cit.).

If the principal has a need for power, he or she can make use of coercive, reward, and legitimate power to adopt the pattern of leadership behavior of an inconsiderate supervisor. He or she can remain extremely aloof; openly criticize the members of staff; treat them without consideration of their feelings; "ride" them for making mistakes; lower their self-esteem by refusing to accept any suggestions which they may offer; and provide no explanation for any course of action which he or she has had to follow in the course of their duties (Fleishman and Harris, op.cit.). If this pattern of leadership behavior is seen by the teaching staff as part of the role of the principal, they would accept it (French, Morrison and Levinger, 1960), but it would tend, in general, to foster hostility between the principal and the teaching
staff (Bass and Barrett, op.cit.), make teachers overly dependent (Raven, 1965), and promote alienative involvement (Etzioni, 1961), in school affairs.

Within the framework of power, too, the principal can also make use of his or her knowledge and experience in the profession; of the training which he or she has undergone; and of the position of high status which he or she occupies to persuade the members of the teaching staff to follow his or her example. The teaching staff might be persuaded to accept the suggestions without critical analysis, since they may acknowledge him or her as an expert; or may see him or her as a referent or as a model to be imitated. They may also accept because they are in positions of low status and are influenced by the position of high status in which the principal is placed (Bass and Barrett, op.cit.). However, directive leadership which is exerted through referent, expert and legitimate power, does not necessitate the use of close supervision (Raven, op.cit.).

Consideration

The principal can also adopt a different style of leadership behavior. He or she can show appreciation to the staff for work of high quality. He or she can strengthen the self-esteem of the members of the staff by treating them as equals, and by being approachable and accessible rather than indulging in behaviors which stress aloofness and the maintenance of social distance. He or she may also make use of the suggestions which they may offer in an effort to contribute to the solution of problems which affect the school. He or she can endeavor to
keep members of the staff in good standing with the higher officials in the education system in an effort to reinforce their feelings of security, and to consider their satisfactions while making changes which affect the operations of the school. He or she can even use the power vested in them to allow the members of the staff to use their abilities in helping to administer the school.

Initiating Structure

This pattern of humane leadership behavior can be complemented by the setting up of structures by the principal in order to help the members of the staff attain a sense of achievement. He or she can explain the role which he or she expects each member of the teaching staff to assume; assign the various tasks; and as far as possible, establish standard procedures. The pattern of behavior which combines "consideration" with "initiating structure" can be instrumental in developing positive attitudes towards the job. The principal needs to remember, however, that if the teaching staff perceives that there is too high a level of initiation of structure coupled with too low a level of consideration, there is the likelihood that the response on the part of the teaching staff might indicate a decline in the level of job satisfaction by an increase in the level of grievances (Fleishman and Harris, op.cit.).

School Renewal

Any consistent pattern of leadership behavior which a principal tries to adopt will have to be adjusted in the light of changing
circumstances. A public elementary school as an organization receives inputs from the environment mainly in the form of human resources, materials and information (Pugh, 1972) and sends outputs into the community in the form of students who are to continue to attend at other schools. Social and economic changes in the environment affect the school. As the formal leader of the school, however, the principal can try to anticipate these changes and take action with his or her staff to enable the school to adapt to, and to cope with the environmental changes. The school also needs self renewal at various times so that it can remain a healthy organization competent to achieve its goals, maintain itself, and adjust to the environment. This self renewal necessitates changes in, among other things, the time the students spend on tasks, the expectations of teachers for the students' learning, the involvement of parents and the community, and the general school climate. Self renewal changes may seem to threaten the stability and continuity of programming which the school requires to carry out its mission, but the principal and staff can plan an appropriate strategy to upgrade and restructure the school's operations without adversely affecting the school's standards. It might be necessary at times for the principal to behave in a directive manner. He or she may insist that all involved in school affairs give priority to teaching and learning. He or she may establish, clarify and model the norms for the school and keep demands on teachers for effective implementation of decisions while monitoring closely the teachers' efforts through classroom observations (Hall and Rutherford, op.cit.). If the members of
the teaching staff consider that the situation demands such an approach, they may accept directive leadership behavior for the period.

The principal, to be an effective leader, therefore needs to adopt a flexible pattern of leadership behavior, so that if directive leadership is in order, he or she is able to direct; and if participative freedom is called for, he or she is able to provide such freedom (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1958).

Irrespective of the pattern of leadership behavior which the principal adopts, he or she must obtain the voluntary cooperation of the members of the teaching staff (Castetter, 1971) in helping the organization to achieve its goals. His or her success, and the success of the organization, depend on their performance, which in turn depends on their level of motivation (Vroom, 1964). The principal, therefore, has to be concerned with the extent to which the members of the teaching staff are experiencing satisfaction in their jobs, as their feelings of job satisfaction are related to their motivation, development, personal effectiveness, and overall mental and emotional health (Zaleznik and Moment, op.cit.; Kornhauser, op.cit.).

The Study

This study was undertaken therefore with the view to provide some answers to the question of why some teachers at some schools are keen, enthusiastic, and happy in their jobs while some others were not so happy at other schools. It set out to shed some light on the extent to which the principal's leadership behavior, characterized by
the perceived level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration influenced teacher job satisfaction in particular public elementary schools in the Columbus School District of Ohio.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses which have been tested in the study are:

$H_1$ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of aloofness and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

$H_2$ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of production emphasis and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

$H_3$ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of thrust and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

$H_4$ There is no relationship between the principal's perceived level of consideration and the level of teacher job satisfaction.

$H_5$ There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which principals obtain high scores on perceived level of aloofness and those in which principals obtain low scores.

$H_6$ There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which principals obtain high scores on perceived level of production emphasis and those in which principals obtain low scores.

$H_7$ There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which principals obtain high scores on perceived level of thrust and those in which principals obtain low scores.

$H_8$ There is no significant difference in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which principals obtain high scores on perceived level of consideration and those in which principals obtain low scores.
There is no significant difference between the contributions made to teacher job satisfaction by principal's perceived level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration.

The results of the study show that teacher job satisfaction is significantly and positively related to principal's perceived level of aloofness ($r_s = .37$), but is not related to principal's perceived level of production emphasis ($r_s = -.18$), thrust ($r_s = -.04$), and consideration ($r_s = -.06$). No significant difference is found to exist in teacher job satisfaction between schools in which principals obtained high scores on perceived levels of aloofness ("t" = 1.76), production emphasis ("t" = -.91), thrust ("t" = -.22) and consideration ("t" = -.22), and those in which the principals obtained low scores. Principal's perceived level of aloofness, in combination with the perceived level of production emphasis contributes 28 percent of the variance in teacher job satisfaction. In addition, the principals are perceived to have a low level of aloofness ($\bar{X} = 2.56$), an average level of production emphasis ($\bar{X} = 3.09$), a high level of thrust ($\bar{X} = 4.09$), and a high level of consideration ($\bar{X} = 3.81$), while the teaching staffs have a high level of job satisfaction ($\bar{X} = 4.20$).

Caution

In considering the interpretation of the results of the study, one must be aware that a significant number of teachers did not complete the questionnaire. This action may have been prompted by the perception that some principals viewed the study as an evaluation of their role behavior by their subordinates, and as a consequence, did not show any
great enthusiasm for it, though all those principals whose schools participated, were very cooperative and willingly distributed and collected the completed questionnaires. It is possible that those teachers who responded held significantly different views on the principal's level of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration from those who did not respond. This factor should be kept in mind in any evaluation of the findings.

One may also take note that the researcher's knowledge of the Columbus school system is very limited.

Theories of Supervision and Job Satisfaction

Investigators have studied job satisfaction in an effort to understand it and because of its importance to employers through its relationship with employee performance (Vroom, 1964), grievance and turnover (Fleishman and Harris, op.cit.).

Herzberg's Two-factor Theory

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman considered job satisfaction within the context of the fulfillment of the worker's needs. They supported the view of Maslow (op.cit.) that human needs were arranged in an ascending hierarchy beginning at the lowest level with the physiological needs, and ending, at the highest level, with the ego needs. They differed with Maslow, however, by suggesting that the highest order needs, rather than those of the lowest order, were the motivators. In their study of accountants and engineers in the industrial plants in the Pittsburgh area they concluded that the "context factors" or
"motivators" including achievement, advancement and recognition were more important in promoting satisfaction. The "context factors" or "hygienes" including relations with the supervisor, working conditions, and job security were more important in the avoidance of dissatisfaction. Herzberg concluded at a later period that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not opposite ends of the same continuum, but were on two different continua and were related to two different types of factors connected with the job. Herzberg suggested also that the motivators or "satisfiers" could be increased by the institution of such practices as: a) increasing the accountability of individuals for their own work; b) granting additional authority to an employee in his activity; and, c) introducing difficult tasks not previously handled (Herzberg, 1974).

**Supervisory Style**

McGregor (op.cit.), Fleishman and Harris, (op.cit.), Lewin, Lippitt and White (op.cit.) and other investigators studied job satisfaction from another perspective and considered job satisfaction in the context of leadership theory. They studied the effects of different supervisory styles on the job satisfaction of the worker. The styles which were described as being either autocratic (Owens, 1970), authoritarian (Lewin, Lippitt and White, op.cit.), initiating structure (Halpin and Croft, 1963), or task-oriented (Fiedler, 1978), focused mainly on the organization. They indicated a concern with the power and authority of the supervisor to control the subordinate and were characterized by a very low level of participation by employees in the decision making
processes of the organization. These styles were seen to affect the worker by promoting dissatisfaction which was expressed by increases in grievances, absences and withdrawals (Fleishman and Harris, op.cit.), by interpersonal hostility (Bass and Barrett, op.cit.), and by other forms of behavior which adversely affected the goal achievement of organizations in which the tasks were not highly structured. On the other hand, supervisory styles which tried to meet the needs of employees and were designated as either democratic (Lewin, Lippitt, and White, op.cit.), employee centered (Likert, op.cit.), or considerate (Halpin and Croft, op.cit.) were seen to promote job satisfaction, since opportunities were provided for the subordinate to use his abilities, to obtain recognition for good work, and to experience a sense of achievement.

The Power of the Public Elementary School Principal

The theories on the influence of supervisory leadership on the job satisfaction of employees were developed, for the most part, in industrial situations in which the supervisor and the manager tended to be different individuals. In such settings the power of the supervisor was, and is, in general, limited to ensuring that the employees carry out their duties with a high level of efficiency. The principal of a public elementary school, on the other hand, has much power vested in him or her. He or she, among other duties

a) establishes an appropriate and accepted level of conduct, behavior and discipline;
provide, allocates and assigns the staff to accomplish instructional goals;

c) identifies those aspects of a teacher's performance that need development, and suggests alternate approaches;

d) helps recruit and select staff;

e) orders supplies and equipment;

f) delegates appropriate responsibilities and tasks to members of the teaching staff; and

g) evaluates teachers and recommends retention, transfer, and dismissal (Klopf, et al., op. cit.).

Many of the tasks are performed in the schools in the sample, within guidelines set by the Columbus Board of Education, and within the collective agreements negotiated between the Board of Education and the Teachers' Associations. With so much authority, however, the principal, as a leader, has numerous ways in which he or she can affect the job satisfaction of the teaching staff (Castetter, op. cit.).

Aloofness and Production Emphasis

The positive and significant relationship ($r_s = .37$) between principal's perceived level of aloofness and teacher job satisfaction implies that the teaching staffs in the public elementary schools in the Columbus School District are likely to favor a lower level of participation in the affairs of the schools. This implication is reinforced by the finding that the principal's perceived level of aloofness and production emphasis contribute 28 percent of the variance in teacher job satisfaction. The teaching staffs seem likely to
appreciate a more directive pattern of leadership behavior, reduced concern on their behalf, and the maintenance of social distance between the principal and themselves.

Job satisfaction has been considered as being dependent, in part, on an individual's achievement in the job (Herzberg, et al., op.cit.), but Chase (1976) has noted that achievement in one's work is possible when the work is carried out under favorable conditions. The realization that the conditions are provided to a great extent by the supervisor has led some investigators to conclude that job satisfaction is a consequence of the leadership behavior of the supervisor.

The positive relationship between principal's perceived aloofness and teacher job satisfaction in the Columbus public elementary schools also suggests that favorable conditions are likely to prevail when the principal is directive. Directive leadership was noted by Vroom (1959) to promote satisfaction among individuals who have a low need for independence, and who hold authoritarian values as measured on the California (F) Scale (Adorno, et al., 1950).

Sanford (1950) has intimated that individuals with authoritarian values tend to prefer leaders who have high status, and are strongly directive. They take a calculative approach to leadership, and consider that the best leaders bring benefits to individual followers. They tend to have no sympathy for leaders who show warmth, or who are responsive to the concerns of their followers; and they show an undisguised hostility to leaders who are perceived to be weak. They tend to feel secure by adhering rigidly to the conventional values of their
particular groups, and expect and demand that others behave as they do. Since authoritarian values are facets of the personalities of some people, it might be reasonable to expect that some of the teachers in the Columbus public schools may have authoritarian values and can find job satisfaction under the directive leadership of the principal.

Principal's perceived level of aloofness contains partial criteria indicative of leadership behavior which emphasizes production. In placing emphasis on production, a principal would act to encourage teachers to work overtime, check on the subject matter being taught by the teachers, and correct their mistakes. Principal's perceived level of aloofness has correlated significantly ($r = .44$) with principal's perceived level of production emphasis. Production emphasis in turn has been considered to contain partial criteria indicative of behavior which characterizes "initiation of structure" and has been found to be significantly related ($r = .64$) with it (Stogdill, Goode, and Day, 1963). As initiation of structure has been shown to correlate .25 (Halpin, 1957), and .47 (Fleishman, Harris and Burtt, 1955) with the proficiency ratings of supervisors, it is not surprising that teaching staffs in the public elementary schools being studied are experiencing some job satisfaction on account of principal's behavior which is perceived as facilitating their work efforts and enabling them to carry out their jobs more efficiently.

The positive association between aloofness and job satisfaction indicates, too, that the teaching staffs are likely to respond favorably if the principals make more use of the coercive, reward and
legitimate powers which are vested in the position. This, however, would be in contrast to the findings of Guditis and Zirkel (1979) which show that teachers' job satisfaction is positively associated with the principal's use of referent power ($r = .76$) and expert power ($r = .72$), but negatively associated with his or her use of coercive power ($r = -.72$), reward power ($r = -.58$), and legitimate power ($r = -.28$).

**Thrust and Consideration**

The lack of a relationship between principal's perceived level of consideration and teacher job satisfaction implies that the positive relationships suggested by the theory and supported by the findings of Likert (op.cit.), Halpin and Winer (1957), and Argyle, Gardner and Cioffi (1958), cannot be generalized to include all types of organizations under all conditions. Individuals whose job satisfaction is associated with the perceived considerate behavior of supervisors are considered to be egalitarian in their values. Sanford (op.cit.) has suggested that such individuals generally reject strongly directive behavior on the part of a leader. They select humanists and liberal minded persons as heroes and assess their leaders in terms of the leaders' concern for the welfare of subordinates. In times of emergency, when there is the need for the making of rapid decisions and the taking of immediate action, they, like most people, would tend to accept directive leadership.

Perceived leadership behavior which is indicative of thrust is not identical with perceived considerate behavior. Operationalized
thrust behavior contains criteria, however, which can be construed as pertaining to considerate behavior since they refer to a concern for the welfare of subordinates. This is shown, for example, by the item "the principal looks out for the physical welfare of teachers."

Perceived thrust has been shown in this study to be strongly related ($r_s = .90$) to perceived consideration, and like perceived consideration, shows no relationship with teacher job satisfaction. It may be concluded, therefore, that these two variables are conceptually similar.

It is worthy of note that there are no significant differences in teacher job satisfaction between schools, irrespective of the principals' perceived levels of aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration; and that principal's perceived level of aloofness is low, perceived level of production emphasis is average, and perceived levels of thrust and consideration are high. The positive association between the perceived level of aloofness and teacher job satisfaction seems to suggest that the principals in these schools may have established a social climate which over time has been perceived as supportive, expressive of thrust and concern, and has promoted the high level of teacher job satisfaction. As a result, the teaching staffs are now likely to accept conditions in which the principal introduces a higher level of structure, as they may see this as not threatening, but as being more supportive and more helpful (Fleishman and Harris, op.cit.).

The theories on the positive relationship between the perceived considerate behavior on the part of supervisors and the job satisfaction
of subordinates as suggested by Likert (op.cit.), Fleishman and Harris (op.cit.), Halpin and Winer (op.cit.), and others, need therefore to be adjusted. Account has to be taken of the personalities of the subordinates, the possibility of favorable credits being built up by supervisors who have maintained a climate of consideration over a period of time, and the possible development of crisis situations within the life of an organization. These factors may help subordinates to obtain job satisfaction under directive leadership for some period of time.

The conclusions, however, should be treated with caution since the number of schools in the sample is small (N = 28) and the coefficient of reliability for the entire questionnaire is very low (-.06).

Recommendations

The conclusions reached in this study have shown that principal's perceived level of aloofness and production emphasis contribute significantly to the job satisfaction of the teaching staffs. It is suggested, as a consequence, that in order to increase the level of teacher job satisfaction, the principal's perceived level of aloofness can be increased.

In an effort to increase teacher perception of the level of aloofness, a principal may be advised to act in ways which would lower the level of teacher participation in the important affairs of the school, reduce the level of communication between the teachers and himself or herself, and curtail other patterns of behavior which indicate that he or she is concerned for the welfare of the teaching staff.
Since the validity of advice of this nature would still be open to question, it is recommended that other investigations on the relationship between the behavior of principals and the job satisfaction of teachers be carried out. These investigations would be helpful in ascertaining whether the findings of this study can be replicated.

Studies could also be widened to include other public elementary schools with student populations of less than 200 and more than 600 in an effort to find out if the relationships which have been examined are similar throughout the entire public elementary school system of the Columbus School District.

Areas for Future Research

A positive relationship between principal's perceived level of aloofness and teacher job satisfaction in the public elementary schools in the study may be partly explained by a number of other factors. The mandated desegregation of the public schools in the United States by the order of the Supreme Court in 1954 has been affecting the pattern of community relations. Some school communities have been trying to come to terms with the movement of students in and out of the neighborhood. This was necessary to meet the requirements of the law. The racial composition of individual school populations has been changing. Some principals and teachers have been demoted, retired or reassigned (Irvine and Irvine, 1983). As it is not possible for anyone to be sure of the implications and final results of the desegregation process, increased levels of uncertainty and conflict have been promoted in the school communities. The unsettled social and legal environment, and the
entry into some schools of students who, in general, have been dissimilar in background, values, and social patterns have tended to foster increased levels of uncertainty among members of the teaching staff. The inability of members of the staffs to influence the process to any extent, together with the level of uncertainty, may influence them to accept directive leadership as this brings some predictability and reliability to the situation. Despite the external changes in the environment, the school as an organization will be stable in its internal affairs (Bass, 1965).

The effect of the granting to teachers of the right to organize and to collectively bargain with their employers may also contribute indirectly to the positive relationship between directive or aloof behavior on the part of the principal of a school and the level of teacher job satisfaction. The major goal of employee associations is to maximize opportunities for the members and to help them attain a higher standard of living, financial protection, position security, rights, and opportunity for advancement (Castetter, op.cit.). These associations also provide members with a feeling of status, and integrity, of social equality, of satisfaction in group effort and a sense of belonging (Bass, op.cit.). Protection is also provided against punitive actions by supervisors, and the freedom of management to transfer or demote workers. The threat of action by teacher associations against school principals may have encouraged them to exhibit high levels of consideration in an effort to avoid too high a level of initiation of structure which might promote teacher grievance. This pattern of behavior, extended over a
period of time, may have made teachers become conscious of the possibility of being able to achieve at a higher level with their students if there was a more directive leadership pattern.

Teacher job satisfaction too may show a positive relationship with other factors in the schools. Schools have been established for the purpose of providing socially accepted educational experiences for students within particular age ranges. Teachers have been hired mainly on their ability to perform successfully on assigned tasks in connection with the schools' mission, and members of teaching staffs are generally offered tenure and promotion in relation to their performance as measured by their achievements on the tasks allocated to them. Herzberg, et al. (op. cit.) and others have intimated that the job satisfaction of workers is more a consequence of the successful completion of assigned tasks than the leadership behavior of their supervisors. In these schools therefore, the level of teacher job satisfaction may show a highly positive relationship with the level of teacher achievement.

Teacher achievement may however be expressed in terms of the level of attainment shown by students in particular aspects of the school curriculum. The level may be indicated by the achievement of stated objectives for the students which have been decided by the teaching staff in collaboration with the principal. The use of standardized tests with an internal or external reference norm would render the assessment of student achievement easily comparable. The school scores on teacher job satisfaction could be correlated with the school mean scores on student achievement to ascertain the extent of the relationship.
Teacher job satisfaction may also be related to student overall satisfaction with the school. If students perceive their school as interesting and as serving their needs, they would attend school regularly, do their assignments both in class and at home, and take an interest in the maintenance of the school's amenities. Such patterns of behavior would positively influence the level of teacher job satisfaction.

The apparent preference of teachers for a more directive pattern of leadership, and the extent of the relationships between teacher job satisfaction and student achievement and satisfaction can be subjects for future research in these schools.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

The section of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) which comprises items dealing with the principal's behavior was used, with some adjustments, to measure the aspects of the principal's leadership behavior which were investigated in this study. This instrument was considered to be most suitable since the number of items was small, but was adequate to measure behavior indicative of control and consideration. The OCDQ has been widely used by investigators (Owens, op.cit.; Lapham and Hoeh, op.cit.) who have studied aspects of the organizational climate of schools. In spite of its wide usage, however, few attempts have been made to validate the instrument (Thomas, 1975). Some principals and teachers in the Columbus public elementary schools are expressing uneasiness with some of the items of the subtests on
principal's behavior. It is recommended, therefore, that researchers
develop and validate a new instrument which is more representative of
contemporary conditions, and which the principals and teachers in the
public elementary schools may find more acceptable.

In this study, too, principal's perceived level of aloofness
has shown a statistically significant relationship with perceived level
of production emphasis, and perceived level of thrust with perceived
level of consideration. As interpretation of data is made more diffi-
cult if the independent variables correlate significantly with each
other, it is recommended that researchers compile a series of items which
would be of help in differentiating more satisfactorily between these
behavioral concepts.

Questions

More questions need to be asked and answered so as to provide
additional information on the influence of the principal's perceived
leadership behavior on teacher satisfaction. These research questions
can center on facets of job satisfaction and may offer additional expla-
nation on the effects of the principal's perceived level of aloofness,
production emphasis, thrust and consideration on the job satisfaction of
the teaching staffs in the public elementary schools and why some
teachers seem to be happy in their work. Such questions can include:

1. To what extent does the principal's perceived leadership
behavior influence the level of teacher satisfaction with pay?

2. To what extent does the principal's perceived leadership
behavior influence the level of teacher satisfaction with co-workers?
3. What is the relationship between the principal's perceived leadership behavior and teacher satisfaction with promotional opportunities? and

4. To what extent does the principal's perceived leadership behavior influence the level of teacher satisfaction with the working conditions in the school?
APPENDIX A

TABLE 13

TABLE SHOWING THE LIST OF SCHOOLS

WHICH MET THE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR USE IN THE STUDY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentnell</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassady</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deshler</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Alternative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duxberry Park Alternative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Columbus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Linden</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastaven</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Avenue</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian Heights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huy Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianola Informal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koebel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden Park IGE Alternative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Avenue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize Road</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybury</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuffey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moler</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Park Traditional</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Orchard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scioto Trail</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Avenue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mifflin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Traditional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbridge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevitt</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinland Park</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Colleagues:

Please assist me by completing this questionnaire. I want your frank opinion on various aspects of your school. The information will be used for research purposes only, and your identity will never be disclosed to any person or authority.

This is not a test. I am interested in how you feel.

On a trial run it took about twenty minutes.

Please take your time.

Thank you very much for taking the time from your busy schedule in order to help with this research.
For each of the following statements please circle one of SA, MA, U, MD, or SD to indicate how you feel.

KEY
SA means Strongly Agree
MA means Moderately Agree
U means Undecided
MD means Moderately Disagree
SD means Strongly Disagree

1. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda. SA MA U MD SD
2. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings. SA MA U MD SD
3. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference. SA MA U MD SD
4. Teachers request permission to leave the premises during school time. SA MA U MD SD
5. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms. SA MA U MD SD
6. The rules made by the principal to govern operations within the school building are never questioned. SA MA U MD SD
7. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day. SA MA U MD SD
8. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use. SA MA U MD SD
9. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit. SA MA U MD SD
10. The principal makes all class scheduling decisions. SA MA U MD SD
11. The principal schedules the work for the teachers. SA MA U MD SD
12. The principal checks the subject matter being taught by the teachers. 
13. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes. 
14. The principal tries to get teachers to work as hard as possible. 
15. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously. 
16. The principal talks a great deal. 
17. The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers. 
18. The principal sets an example by working hard himself/herself. 
19. The principal uses constructive criticism. 
20. The principal is well prepared when he/she speaks at school functions. 
21. The principal explains his/her reasons for criticism to teachers. 
22. The principal looks out for the physical welfare of teachers. 
23. The principal meets teachers when they arrive. 
24. The principal brings to the notice of teachers new ideas he/she has run across. 
25. The principal's language is easily understood. 
26. The principal is sensitive to teachers' personal problems. 
27. The principal does personal favors for teachers when necessary. 
28. The principal encourages teachers if their standard of work seems to be falling off. 
29. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences. 
30. Teachers help select courses which will be taught.
### Section 3

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Teaching is like a hobby to me.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Teaching is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. It seems that my colleagues are more interested in the job than I am.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I consider teaching to be rather unpleasant.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I am often bored with my job.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I feel fairly well satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Most of the time I have to force myself to work.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am satisfied with teaching for the time being.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I feel that teaching is no more interesting than other jobs.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I definitely dislike my work.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I feel that I am one of the happiest teachers in the service.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Each day of work seems like it will never end.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I just love teaching.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. My job is pretty uninteresting.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I find real enjoyment in my work.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I am disappointed that I ever took this job.</td>
<td>SA MA U MD SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On this page is some information about yourself. Please answer these questions by circling the number opposite the correct answer.

1. What is your Sex?
   1. Female
   2. Male

2. What is your Age?
   1. Under 20 years
   2. 20 to 29 years
   3. 30 to 39 years
   4. 40 to 49 years
   5. Over 49 years

3. How long have you been employed in the teaching service of the Columbus School Board?
   1. 1 to 5 years
   2. 6 to 10 years
   3. 11 to 15 years
   4. 16 to 20 years
   5. Over 20 years

4. What are your Academic and Professional Qualifications?
   1. BA, BS
   2. MA, MS
   3. Other

5. What is your status position in the school?
   1. Class Teacher
   2. Teacher and Counselor
   3. Specialist Teacher
APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM DR. LUCKEY TO ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
TO: Elementary Principals
FROM: Evelyn Luckey
SUBJECT: Teacher Survey
DATE: September 28, 1983

Courtroy Holder who is a doctoral student at OSU has received permission to send the enclosed surveys to your building for distribution to teachers.

You should be aware that Mr. Holder's proposal, including the survey, has been thoroughly reviewed. Approval is based on Mr. Holder's assurance that individual schools will not be identified at any point in the study and that the purpose of the survey is to identify relationships between teacher perceptions of leader behavior and teachers' feelings about their job. Evaluation of an individual school is not at issue, rather, it is a particular set of teacher responses and their relationship to a set of leader behaviors.

Our Division's interest in and support for leadership development has earned us praise. Studies such as this one conducted in years past have provided useful information.

Your cooperation would be appreciated.
APPENDIX D

LETTER FROM C. A. HOLDER TO ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
September 29, 1983

806 Morrison Tower
196 West 11th Avenue
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Sir/Madam:

I do request your cooperation in order to conduct a study involving the teaching staffs' perceptions of leadership in the Columbus Public Elementary Schools, and the resulting levels of teacher job satisfaction.

The study is partly to ascertain if Herzberg's (1959) findings, that environmental conditions are not really significant in promoting worker satisfaction, can really be applicable to educational institutions.

I do wish to inform you that the study is not centered on an analysis of the staffs' perceptions of leadership in a specific school. Since the focus is on the perceptions of leadership in general, a sample of 36 schools has been chosen. This number of schools is considered to be an adequate sample from which some general conclusions may be drawn.

Please be informed also that any information concerning your school which is gathered from the questionnaire, will be treated with the utmost confidentiality, and that the names of individual schools will not be mentioned in any analysis of the findings.

In advance, I thank you very much for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Courtroy A. Holder
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