



1982

The Relationship between a Principal's Leadership Style and the Activities Engaged in During the Implementation of a New District Program

Joseph J. Matula
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Matula, Joseph J., "The Relationship between a Principal's Leadership Style and the Activities Engaged in During the Implementation of a New District Program" (1982). *Dissertations*. 2201.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2201

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1982 Joseph J. Matula

24

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A PRINCIPAL'S
LEADERSHIP STYLE AND THE ACTIVITIES
ENGAGED IN DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF A NEW DISTRICT PROGRAM

by

Joseph J. Matula

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

January

1982

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Max A. Bailey, director of his dissertation committee, for his advice and counsel throughout the preparation of this study. The author also wishes to express gratitude to Dr. Phillip Carlin and Dr. Robert Monks for their assistance as members of the dissertation committee and also to Dr. Francis J. Catania, Dean of the Graduate School. A special note of thanks and appreciation is due Michael Pajor for his expertise and efforts in preparing the statistical analysis of the data.

For their patience, understanding and encouragement, the author is extremely indebted to his wife Jan, his son, Jeff, and his daughter, Juliet.

VITA

Joseph J. Matula, the son of Joseph and Theresa Matula, was born on January 24, 1949 in Chicago, Illinois.

He graduated from St. Laurence High School in Oak Lawn, Illinois in June, 1967. He received his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle in December, 1971 and his Master of Science in Education degree from Chicago State University in August, 1974.

He began his teaching career in January, 1972 as a substitute teacher in the Chicago Public Schools. He received an assignment to Tilden High School in September, 1972 where he taught mathematics for five years and served as department chairperson for the last three of those years. He then served one year as an intern principal at Lindop School in Broadview as part of Loyola University's Administrative Intern program. He was appointed as the principal of Lindop School beginning July 1, 1978 and then as the superintendent of the same Lindop School District beginning April 1, 1980, the position he holds currently.

He is married to the former Jan Hill and has one son, Jeffrey and one daughter, Juliet.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	ii
VITA	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.	iv
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose.	2
Significance	6
Procedure.	6
Limitations.	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH.	15
General Concepts of Leadership Style	15
Specific Leadership Styles	24
The Ohio State Leadership Studies and Derivative Research.	40
General Functions of the Principal	47
Specific Activities of the Principal	55
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA	63
Procedure.	66
Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals.	69
Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals	75
Lowly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals	81
Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals.	86
Factors Which Affected the Principals' Activities.	92
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	96
Procedure.	98
Intra-Group Analysis	102
Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals.	102
Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals	108
Lowly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals	113
Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals.	119
Inter-Group Analysis	125

	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	130
Summary.	130
Conclusions.	131
Recommendations.	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY	138
Books.	138
Periodicals.	139
Miscellaneous.	143
APPENDIX A	145
APPENDIX B	148
APPENDIX C	151
APPENDIX D	155
APPENDIX E	157

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A	145
I. Letter to State Superintendent	146
II. Reply from State Superintendent.	147
APPENDIX B	148
I. Letter to District Superintendent.	149
II. Reply from District Superintendent	150
APPENDIX C	151
I. Leadership Opinion Questionnaire	152
APPENDIX D	155
I. Letter to Principal.	156
II. Principal Activity Questionnaire	157
APPENDIX E	159
I. Follow-up Leaders.	160

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the early days of American education, the principal's role and influence have grown along with his duties and responsibilities. The principal today is the key person in any school. The position provides the principal with a unique vantage point which has a broader perspective than a teacher and a more specific focus than the superintendent or community. The principal must engage in a number of different roles to meet the demands of these different reference groups--teachers, superintendent, parents, etc. Yet no role of the principal is more crucial to the successful functioning of the school than that of "implementer of new programs." Sarason points out that any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal.¹

This role of the principal, implementer of new programs, gives one the opportunity to fulfill the leadership responsibilities of the position. According to Lipham, "leadership is the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals."² Thus the implementation of a new program or policy in the school would

¹Seymour B. Sarason, "The Principal and The Power to Change," The National Elementary Principal 53 (July 1974): 53.

²Charles F. Faber and Gilbert F. Shearron, Elementary School Administration Theory and Practice (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970), p. 307.

provide an ideal context to examine the leadership style of the principal.

During the late 1970's, concern about declining student achievement grew throughout many of the school districts across the country. Scores on standardized tests dropped steadily, causing many people to demand that schools establish certain minimum standards of achievement and hold students accountable for reaching these standards.³ Thus many school districts and even state legislatures initiated the adoption of minimum competency testing programs to insure that students achieve at least at a minimum level before graduation or promotion to the next grade. The adoption of these minimum competency testing programs provides an ideal forum to examine the leadership role of the principal and determine exactly what activities were engaged in to facilitate the implementation of the new district program.

Purpose

It is the purpose of this research to determine how the principal behaves when leading in a given situation, specifically, during the implementation of a new district program.

Much of the current research concerning leadership emphasizes that one's leadership style is related to the situational factors of the environment in which the leader functions. A typical study is that of Morphet who notes that one's leadership style is determined

³Shirley Boes Neill, The Competency Movement: Problems and Solutions (Sacramento: American Association of School Administrators, 1978), p. 17.

more by the expectations of the membership and requirements of the situation than by the personal traits of the leader.⁴ Recognizing the importance of the situation in which the principal will exhibit his leadership style, this research examined the adoption of a new program throughout a number of districts across the country. In this case, the implementation of minimum competency testing programs provided a rare situation in which to examine the principal's leadership activities.

One study which had a major impact on leadership research came out of Ohio State University in the early 1950's. Halpin and Winer, the initiators of the research, developed two important dimensions of leadership style, consideration and initiating structure. Many researchers elaborated on these Ohio State Leadership Studies, one of these being Fleishman who used the same two dimensions in the development of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), used in this research. These dimensions are:

Consideration--Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the individual is likely to be more impersonal in relationships with group members.

Structure--Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension

⁴Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration Concepts, Practices, and Issues, 3rd ed., (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1974), p. 140.

characterized individuals who play a very active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score characterizes individuals who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways.⁵

The principal's leadership style, as determined by the LOQ, will be related to the activities which the principal engaged in during the implementation of the district's minimum competency testing program. The Principal Activity Questionnaire (PAQ), adapted by this writer from Shartle and Stogdill's Work Analysis Forms, will determine whether the principal engaged in people-related activities (things done with another person) or individual activities (things done by self).

Thus it is the purpose of this research to determine if there is a relationship between the dimensions of the principal's leadership style and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of the district's minimum competency testing program. Specifically, the following hypotheses will be tested:

- H₁ There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₂ There is a relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

⁵Edwin A. Fleishman, Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1969), p. 1.

- H₃ There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₄ There is a relationship between a highly considerate/lowly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₅ There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₆ There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₇ There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₈ There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₉ There is a relationship between the activities a principal is actually engaged in during the implementation of a new district program and the activities a principal sees as being the most important during the implementation of this program.

Significance

Since the principal is the chief administrator of a school, the leadership activities engaged in by this person have a direct bearing on the way the school runs. Knowledge of any principal's leadership style helps to understand and predict the principal's behavior. Yet, very often this information concerning leadership is highly theoretical and of little value when related to the day-to-day activities of the principal. This research attempted to relate this theoretical body of knowledge about leadership style to the practical body of knowledge about a principal's specific activities. Thus, the significance of this research is that it serves to bridge the gap between the theoretical and the actual. It expected to answer the question, what does a leader do when he is leading? Useful knowledge such as this research will help to provide greater insight into what makes for a successful leader.

Procedure

Written request was made to all State Superintendents of Education throughout the country asking them to recommend school districts that have implemented minimum competency testing programs. Forty-one superintendents responded, with one hundred districts being recommended.

Copies of a questionnaire were then sent to these superintendents asking for a brief description of their competency program. The following information was received:

1. Size of the district (number of principals, teachers, students, and grade levels).

- 2) Initiator of the minimum competency testing program (state office, local district, other).
- 3) Program information (date of adoption, grade levels assessed, skill or subject areas assessed, and the group responsible for establishing the standards).
- 4) Use of the minimum standards (to determine promotion or graduation, to diagnose remedial students, or to measure student progress).

This last item was crucial, since for purposes of this research the minimum competency standards must have been used to determine a student's graduation (either elementary school or high school) or promotion from one grade to the next. The district must have answered "yes" to either question to be eligible for participation in this study. The last question asked whether the district would be willing to provide further information, thus signifying their willingness to participate. Positive responses were received from sixty school districts with forty-three meeting the required definition.

Letters were sent in March 1980 to the superintendents of these forty-three districts asking if they would distribute the two questionnaires (LOQ and PAQ) and a cover letter of introduction to their principals or forward the names and addresses to this writer for individual mailings. Twenty-three school districts responded resulting in a sample of 108 principals. Following are the participating districts with the number of participating principals from each:

Fulton County School System
Atlanta, Georgia 17 principals

Peoria Public School Dist. No. 150
Peoria, Illinois 15 principals

Gary Community School Corporation
Gary, Indiana 10 principals

Indian River School District
Vero Beach, Florida 8 principals

Westside Comm. School Dist. No. 66
Omaha, Nebraska 7 principals

Roosevelt School District No. 66
Phoenix, Arizona 5 principals

Berea City School District
Berea, Ohio 5 principals

School District No. 10
Covington, Georgia 5 principals

Lincoln County School District
Panaca, Nevada 4 principals

Anderson County School District
Clinton, Tennessee 4 principals

School District No. 3
Pikeville, Tennessee 3 principals

Glendale Union High School District
Glendale, Arizona 3 principals

Austin Independent School District
Austin, Texas 3 principals

Lawton Community School District
Lawton, Michigan 3 principals

Henry County School District
McDonough, Georgia 3 principals

Pershing County School District
Lovelock, Nevada 2 principals

Humboldt County School District
Winnemucca, Nevada 2 principals

Douglas County School District
Gardnerville, Nevada 2 principals

Sarasota County School District
Sarasota, Florida 2 principals

Carson City School District
Carson City, Nevada 2 principals

Millwood I-37 School District
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 1 principal

Orange County School District
Orange, Virginia 1 principal

Benton County School District
Camden, Tennessee 1 principal

The LOQ is a self-administered instrument designed to measure two important dimensions of leadership--Consideration and Structure, defined earlier in this chapter. These two dimensions are independent of each other, meaning a leader may be high on both, low on both, or high on one and low on the other. The instrument is the product of more than eighteen years of research and use in a variety of industrial and other organizational settings.⁶ Individuals must respond in terms of how frequently they feel they should engage in the behavior described in each item. Alternative answers are scored 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4. Internal consistency reliabilities of .74 for the Consideration dimension and .80 for the Structure dimension were obtained by the author using the split-half method. These, together with test-retest reliabilities of .79 for Consideration and .71 for Structure provide an appropriately reliable instrument.⁷ Correlations between Consideration and Structure scores for various samples were also made by the author

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

and these demonstrated no evidence of "halo" or "social desirability" tendencies. The LOQ was developed to maximize construct validity. Fleishman noted that the two dimensions measured by the questionnaire were developed by factor-analysis procedures, and an item analysis was carried out to provide homogeneous measures of Consideration and Structure.⁸ The LOQ was reviewed by Gibb who noted, "that despite difficulties and as yet incomplete information, the LOQ is a well-made instrument."⁹ Kircher, in reviewing the LOQ, feels overall it is not a bad instrument. It has been developed through careful research and careful statistical techniques, and appears to be reliable. It presents good evidence of validity, presents reasonably good norms, and seems well suited for research activities.¹⁰

The PAQ is an instrument adopted from the Work Analysis Forms by Shartle and Stogdill out of Ohio State University. The Work Analysis Forms listed the same activities as the PAQ, but they were separated into two groups; time spent in contact with persons and time spent in individual effort. Individuals were asked to put the percentage of time spent in the activity described.

All the activities were grouped together and each principal was asked to select the five activities which were felt to be the "most important" and the five which were felt to be those "actually engaged

⁸Ibid., p. 2

⁹Oscar K. Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, 2 vols. (Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1972), p. 1531.

¹⁰Oscar K. Buros, The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, 2 vols. (Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1965), p. 1191.

in" regarding the implementation of the district's minimum competency testing program. Scoring of the PAQ consisted of determining whether the activities were "person-oriented" (P) or "individual-oriented" (I). The activities listed on the Work Analysis Forms were selected by the authors because they seemed to be events that take place in all types of executive action.¹¹

Upon receipt of the LOQ's and the PAQ's from all principals, the instruments were scored and grouped into one of four quadrants. The quadrants were determined by the computation of the median and mean of the Consideration and Structure dimensions.

- I Consideration scores above the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4
- II Consideration scores above the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6
Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.
- III Consideration scores below the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6
Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4
- IV Consideration scores below the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.

A further analysis of the principals' questionnaires was made by creating two groups.

Group A consisted of all principals having a discrepancy between their leadership style as described by the LOQ and the activities

¹¹Ralph M. Stogdill and Carroll L. Shartle, Work Analysis Forms Manual, (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1957), p. 1.

they "actually engaged in" as described by the PAQ. Group B consisted of all principals having a discrepancy between the activities listed as being the "most important" and those listed as "actually engaged in."

Brief questionnaires were then sent to these two groups: Group A consisting of thirty-four principals and Group B consisting of thirty-one principals. Sixteen responses were received from each group. Phone interviews were then conducted with six principals in each of the two groups. These interviews were informal and attempted to arrive at the reason for the discrepancies.

Limitations

Any study concerning the topic of leadership style has a number of built-in limitations. One is the difficulty in defining such a concept. Many researchers find it hard to distinguish the leadership aspects from the administrative aspects. Lipham, for example, views the term "leader" as being restricted to the role of change agent while the term "administrator" is limited to the role of maintaining the organization.¹² Thus this writer encountered the same problem and attempts were made to keep the scope of leadership very narrow. This limitation must be kept in mind especially when considering the review of the related literature and research, since a number of "semi-related" studies may have been omitted.

Another limitation to consider is the oversimplification of one's leadership style. Such terms as "consideration" and "structure" mean different things to different people in different situations. The

¹²Morphet, Educational Organization and Administration, p. 127.

behavior of real people is much more complex since one's real behavior does not fit into such neat categories as those used in this research. This research makes no attempt to evaluate one's leadership style since the concern is to describe and not determine good or bad.

There are many factors which influence one's leadership style which were not investigated in this research, such as the characteristics of the superintendent and teachers and their relationships with the principal. The perceptions of these groups are very important to the successful implementation of any new program, but their input was sacrificed due to the geographic size of the sample population. Thus one of the most severe limitations of this study is that it is based completely on the principal's perception of his own role. Most research is in agreement with Halpin concerning this problem as he noted, "Self-descriptive data are of dubious worth and a researcher must discount everything evaluative a leader says about himself."¹³ Yet Gorton and McIntyre found that "significant others"--student, teacher, parent, central office administrators--were not very knowledgeable about how the principals spend their time.¹⁴

Another factor which limited this study was the development of the Principal Activity Questionnaire (PAQ) from Shartle and Stogdill's Work Analysis Forms. The descriptions of the principals' activities

¹³Andrew W. Halpin, "The Superintendent's Effectiveness as a Leader," Administrator's Notebook 7 (October 1978); 3.

¹⁴Richard A. Gorton and Kenneth E. McIntyre, The Senior High School Principalship Volume II: The Effective Principal, (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), p. 31.

were very broad and not unique to the implementation of a minimum competency testing program. These descriptions were left exactly as written in the Work Analysis Forms to avoid using terms which might be relevant to only one or two of the administrative arrangements in the sample.

Finally this research was limited concerning the interviews with the principals. These interviews were done by phone which severely limited the opportunity for thoughtful comments and in-depth discussions. Very often the principal being called was caught during a busy time or this researcher was called during a busy time. This factor along with the impersonalness of the telephone itself might tend to limit the value of these conversations.

The following chapter contains a review of related literature and research with an emphasis on the general and specific concepts of leadership style, the Ohio State Leadership Studies, and the activities of the principal. The remaining chapters deal with a presentation of the data collected, an analysis of the data collected, and a concluding chapter summarizing these findings.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The primary focus of this study was an examination of the relationship between the leadership style of a principal and the activities engaged in when the district adopted a new instructional program. The adoption of a new program, in this case minimum competency testing, merely provided a context of similar opportunities for the sample principals to utilize their leadership capabilities. Since the presence of a minimum competency testing program was incidental to this study, the topic was not examined in this review. The topics researched were: general concepts of leadership style, specific leadership styles, general functions of the principal and the specific activities of the principal.

Also, due to the fact that the Ohio State Leadership Studies produced the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, used in this study, special emphasis was given to review literature derived from these studies. Other studies using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire were also examined.

General Concepts of Leadership Style

Leadership is a concept relevant to any group or institution, not just the field of education. There are enough similarities in the roles of leaders to allow a multidisciplinary analysis of the research. This is the reason that much of the literature on leadership, though

it comes from the world of business, is still applicable to education.

Thus many definitions are broad enough to be useful regardless of where the leader may function. Morphet viewed leadership as, "the influencing of the actions, behaviors, beliefs, and feelings of one actor in a social system by another actor with the willing cooperation of the actor being influenced."¹ Jacobson noted that leadership, "appears to be a working relationship among members of a group in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through completion."² These definitions are representative of the many throughout the literature on leadership. They can be summarized by the one offered by Wayson, "leadership is the process by which a member helps a group to solve one or more of the problems that every group must solve."³ Wayson went on to list some of the problems which all groups must continually solve to be productive; "keep the group together, preserve the basic values of the organization, produce whatever the rest of society expects them to produce, secure the needed resources, review the people's goals by meeting as many as possible, and adapt to meet

¹Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration Concepts, Practices and Issues, 3rd ed., (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), p. 128.

²Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 134.

³William Wayson, "Misconceptions About Leadership," National Elementary Principal 55 (November, 1975): 13.

the world's changing conditions."⁴ Thus leadership involves the influencing of other people who willingly work toward some goal.

Early research into what factors made leaders different from others centered around the examination of the lives of acknowledged leaders. Such men as Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson provided examples to analyze and emulate. This theory was known as the "great man" approach. One step beyond this "great man" theory was the "trait" approach, whereby certain traits or qualities were identified in leaders proven to be effective. These desirable qualities made a leader sound like a model boy scout, that is, a leader is someone who is courageous, trustworthy, creative, etc.⁵ These traits were identified through personality tests and inventories and supported the theory that leaders are born and not made, either one is a leader or he is not. This approach eventually proved to be very limiting, and empirical findings did not support the hypothesis that leaders possess certain common characteristics.⁶ Yet this body of research proved to be an important step in the growth of knowledge concerning leadership.

One of the more valuable research findings in the "trait" area was by Stogdill. He found that the average person who occupies a position of leadership exceeds the average member of his group "to

⁴Ibid.

⁵James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalsip: Foundations and Functions (New York: Harper & Row, Publ., 1974), p. 177.

⁶Gerald Firth, "Theories of Leadership: Where Do We Stand?," Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 327-31.

some degree" in the following: sociability, initiative, persistence, knowing how to get things done, self-confidence, alertness and insight into situations, cooperativeness, popularity, adaptability and verbal facility.⁷ Also, the average person who occupies a position of leadership "clearly" exceeds the average members of his group in the following respects; intelligence, scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibilities, activity and social participation, and socioeconomic status. Stogdill noted that these qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which one is to function as a leader.⁸ Thus Stogdill realized the importance in considering the environment in which the leader operates.

This situational approach maintained that leadership is determined more by the requirements of social systems than by the psychological characteristics of individuals.⁹ Bernthal found that leadership style adapts to the situation where both people and materials blend productively in an organization with a common goal.¹⁰ Bernthal's research was similar to the findings of Blanchard and Hersey who noted that leadership style must be adaptive to the variety of situations

⁷Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1973), p. 140.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Richard W. Saxe, Educational Administration Today: An Introduction (Berkeley: McCutchan Publ. Corp., 1980), p. 144.

¹⁰Wilmar F. Bernthal, "Organizational Leadership: Some Conceptual Models." Paper presented at Mountain Plans Institute for New Presidents of Community Colleges, Scottsdale, Arizona, May 1969.

that occur daily in schools. The multiplicity of role demands on educational leaders prevents adoption of an all-purpose style.¹¹ Huckaby related that situational leadership models provide knowledge in the form of conceptual tools that assist leaders in understanding the relationship between certain situational demands and leadership effectiveness.¹² In one situation the leader might draw on Hersey's theories of the followers' maturity levels and recognize the need for a low task style. In a different situation he might rely on Fiedler's theories of position power and see the appropriateness of a high-task style.¹³ The key to being an effective leader would thus be the skill in accurately reading situations. Perhaps Machiavelli was the first to sense the importance of the situation when in 1512 he noted, "the prince must have the wisdom to recognize subtle changes and adapt to them, he must be a situationalist."¹⁴

Finally, the behavioral theory seems to be the most common in the recent research. This theory recognizes that both individual and situational factors determine effective leadership. Dunifon found that effective leadership is a product of the interdependence between leader behavior and a number of circumstantial or situational variables.

¹¹Kenneth H. Blanchard and Paul Hersey, "A Leadership Theory for Educational Administration," Education 90 (April 1970): 303-310.

¹²William O. Huckaby, "Integrating Style and Purpose in Leadership," Educational Leadership 37 (May 1980): 615.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Gerald P. Burns, "The Principles of Leadership" (Dissertation, Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio, 1978), p. 2.

These variables include: the social, economic, and political context (external to organization) in which the organization exists; the real nature, goals, and objectives of the organization; the history of the organization; the needs of the individuals populating the organization; the needs of the leader; the nature of the immediate task at hand; and the non-negotiable factors in a given situation.¹⁵ Lipham views the behavioral theory as recognizing psychological, sociological, individual, and situational variables.¹⁶

It is clear that the study of leadership is a very complex and multi-faceted problem. This has been shown through the development of leadership research. What began as an investigation into certain traits or qualities of one person, the leader, has resulted in a need to study the roles and relationships of both the leader and follower. In order to get an accurate picture of this concept called leadership, one must consider the leader, the followers, their past experiences, and any other situational factors that might have an effect on the achievement of the group's goals. Halpin realized this when he described leadership as, "a complex social phenomenon that cannot be treated meaningfully apart from related situational factors."¹⁷

There have been a number of valuable concepts that resulted from

¹⁵William S. Dunifon, "The Dimensions of Educational Leadership Amid the Unfamiliar," Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education, Toronto, June 1978, p. 5.

¹⁶Lipham and Hoeh, The Principalsip, p. 180.

¹⁷Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), p. 3.

the research studies done on leadership throughout the past years.

One is Lippitt's ten elements of effective leadership:

(1) must attend to relevant needs of the organization; (2) must set clear and reasonable objectives by which progress can be measured; (3) must possess effective communication skills, ability to listen, write and speak well; (4) must be able to create his/her uniqueness; (5) must recognize that there is no right way, leadership is a performing art; (6) must meet professional standards; (7) must be future oriented; (8) must possess a viable value system, these form the philosophy of the group; (9) must possess skills and competencies in human resource development; and (10) must get results and take action.¹⁸

Another contribution to the body of leadership literature is from Myers. He listed a number of conclusions:

Leadership is the production of interaction, not status or position; leadership cannot be structured in advance; a leader in one situation will not automatically be a leader in another situation; leadership does not result from a status position, but rather how a person behaves in the organization; whether a person is a leader in a group depends upon the group's perception of him; the way a leader perceives his role determines his actions; most groups have more than one person occupying the leadership role; leadership fosters positive sentiments toward the group activity and persons in the group; and program development that involves only persons of a single position (such as principals, supervisors or teachers) is not as comprehensive or lasting as that which involves people of various positions in the organization.¹⁹

Some researchers have expressed their findings by using a different approach. Jacobson relates his common misconceptions about leadership: that a status position, such as the principalship, automatically insures leadership; that leadership in one situation guarantees it in a different situation; that leadership is an inherited trait; and

¹⁸Gordon Lippitt, quoted in Charlene Rothkopf, News Exchange Arlington, Va.: 1980), p. 3.

¹⁹Robert B. Myers, "A Synthesis of Research in Leadership" (Unpublished paper presented to A.S.C.D., March 1957), pp. 4-9.

that administration and leadership are synonymous.²⁰ Wayson takes the same approach by listing his misconceptions: leadership comes with positions; leadership should be exercised exclusively by persons in titled positions; no one can perform a leadership act unless it is expressly permitted by a higher authority; leaders never get opposition and never have to answer any questions about what they are doing; leadership always has to be democratic; and that a democratic leader never leads.²¹ Knowledge of these misconceptions by today's leaders can be very important because the times require them to do things they never had to do before. Today's leaders must make discriminating judgments and respond diplomatically under conditions where the demands of one group seem opposed to the best interests of another.²²

An interesting and useful concept of leadership is the exploration of what factors might prevent its presence. There can be a number of constraints on one's leadership. Potential constraints might be a more inclusive term since what is a serious constraint to one administrator may be viewed only as a minor inconvenience to another. Gorton has noted a number of the potential problems: the press of other responsibilities that they have no time to lead; limited expectations of others--followers must be willing to follow; the nature of the situation--some have no opportunity for leadership; the extent of resources--inadequate finances of facilities; and the personal qualities

²⁰Jacobson, Logsdon, and Wiegman, The Principals, p. 132.

²¹Wayson, "Misconceptions About Leadership," pp. 15-17.

²²Ibid., p. 14.

of the administrator--one's personality, physical abilities, etc.²³ Saxe mentioned a few others such as: the school system's policies, external pressure groups, and government agencies.²⁴ Yet overcoming these handicaps is part of effective leadership since one who really wants to exercise leadership will find a way.

Leadership is not an easy role for a school administrator to assume. Before a person accepts the responsibilities and the rewards, he should be aware of the skills needed to perform leadership functions. Williams expressed these principles: you have to be knowledgeable in the technical aspects, you have to understand and know the individual differences of the people you lead, you must demonstrate enthusiasm, you must have vision and foresight of the future, you must be accountable, and you must know the bounds of responsibility and the framework within which you must operate.²⁵ Gorton also offered a number of certain basic characteristics desirable of a leader: to perceive the existence of a problem--one must be accessible and seek feedback; to possess vision as an educator; to possess certain needs--effective leaders must possess strong needs to develop good interpersonal relations; to engage in difficult problem solving situations and to be achievement-oriented; to be a risk-taker, a disrupter of the status quo; and the ability to work well with people--one must be

²³Dick Gorton, "Administrative Leadership," The Clearing House 53 (September 1979): 50.

²⁴Saxe, Educational Administration Today, p. 197.

²⁵Russell G. Williams, "Examining Leadership Style," The Personnel Administrator 21 (January 1976): 33-34.

sensitive, involve others, accept criticism and most of all be honest.²⁶

Regardless of whether one examines the constraints, the concepts, or the misconceptions of leadership; the many factors and variables affecting the outcome should be appreciated. Thus a potential leader should always be aware of the goals he is trying to achieve. As related by Burns, the leader should clarify his own personal goals, determine whom he is seeking to lead, where he is seeking to lead them, and determine how to overcome the obstacles he may encounter along the way.²⁷

Although there is an abundance of information and research in the area of leadership, it becomes more valuable to narrow the perspective and examine specific leadership styles.

Specific Leadership Styles

Remembering that the role of the leader is to help the group achieve its goals, it becomes very worthwhile to examine the manner in which the leader does this. Each person in a leadership position must rely on a unique set of values and experiences that determine the leadership style to be used.

Faber defined leadership style as, "the characteristic manner

²⁶Gorton, "Administrative Leadership," p. 51.

²⁷James MacGregor Burns, "Two Excerpts from Leadership," Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 382.

of acting exhibited by a leader."²⁸ Although each person has a unique style to utilize in each individual situation, there are enough similarities and common philosophies to make meaningful generalizations possible. Stogdill noted that leadership patterns of behavior as well as non-leadership patterns of behavior are persistent and relatively stable.²⁹ Thus he realized the benefits of not concentrating on traits alone, nor situations alone, but on leadership behavior and, in essence, one's leadership style.

When considering the aspect of leadership style one must consider the values and needs of the leader and also of the group members. Maslow stated that these needs, although related to one another, must usually be satisfied in an order ranging from a lower level to a higher level. Lower level needs are concerned with the physiological aspects and with safety and cannot be permanently satisfied. Higher level needs are concerned with psychological aspects such as status, belonging, and self-fulfillment--and can rarely be satisfied. Satisfied needs are not effective motivators; when one need is satisfied another takes over.³⁰ Satisfied needs ranked as follows: physiological--food, shelter, clothing, sex, and sleep; safety--freedom from physical danger and fear; social--belonging, friendship, and affection; esteem--

²⁸Charles F. Faber and Gilbert F. Shearron, Elementary School Administration: Theory and Practice (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970), p. 312.

²⁹Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Leadership." Journal of Psychology 25 (January 1948): 65.

³⁰Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Row, 1954), p. 39.

recognition, self-respect, status and power; and self-actualization--creativity, self-expression, and competence.³¹

Knowledge of the above concepts can be relevant when considering the motives and thus the qualifications of prospective leaders. Maslow felt that the pushy person who struggles for leadership is one whose suitability should be questioned, because the position is likely to be used for selfish reasons. Such a person is a D-leader (defined by Maslow as concerned with personal gratification alone) who wants power over people and is not particularly interested in getting the job done efficiently or effectively. The B-leader (defined by Maslow as concerned with being in its most fully human sense) is one who does what needs to be done. He does not need power over others in order to enhance his self-concept since his basic needs are satisfied.³² Thus the B-leader is one who demonstrates good leadership while the D-leader demonstrates leadership by coercion.

Another important contribution to the area of research concerning "needs" was by Herzberg, who challenged the assumption that there is a continuum in regard to job satisfaction, with satisfaction on one end and dissatisfaction at the other end. Herzberg found that the predominantly intrinsic aspects of the job made workers happy. These factors termed "motivators" were: achievement, challenging work, increased

³¹Valerie M. Bockman, "The Principal as Manager of Change," paper presented at the Colorado Education Association Administrators' Conference, Grand Junction, Co., 15 January 1971, p. 21.

³²Abraham H. Maslow, Eupsychian Management (Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and the Dorsey Press, 1965), p. 1.

responsibility, growth, development, and recognition for accomplishment. If these factors were present, they increased job satisfaction beyond a neutral point; but if not, they led only to minimal dissatisfaction. Thus they were satisfiers, not dissatisfiers. The things that, if absent, made workers unhappy or dissatisfied, were termed "hygiene factors" and were predominantly extrinsic. They were: interpersonal relations, money, status, security, policies, administration, supervision, and working conditions.³³ Herzberg's theory is compatible with Maslow's since the hygiene factors dealt with lower-order needs and the motivators dealt with higher-order needs. In two studies based on Herzberg's theory, Sergiovanni found three significant satisfiers (achievement, recognition, and responsibility) and five dissatisfiers (interpersonal relations with subordinates, interpersonal relations with peers, supervision, school administration, and personal life) among teachers; while Schmidt found school administrators were highly motivated by achievement, recognition and advancement and were dissatisfied by salary, interpersonal relations, school policies, and supervision of teachers.³⁴ Recognition and understanding of what motivates people and what doesn't is very important to the study of leadership and the leader's style.

Early research identified three distinct styles of leadership: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. Autocratic leaders were

³³Frederick Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man (New York: World, 1966), p. 2.

³⁴Gene L. Schmidt, "Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Administrators," Educational Administration Quarterly 12 (Spring 1976): 68.

identified by Lippitt and White as being very leader-oriented with little or no group input in the decision making process. These autocratic leaders were found to be the highest in quantity of production, but production decreased when the leader was absent. Democratic leaders provided opportunities for group members to share in decisions. These democratic leaders were found to be the highest in quality of production and in group morale and continued to perform in the leader's absence. Laissez-faire leaders gave all responsibility to the group. These laissez-faire leaders functioned better and increased productivity when the leader was absent.³⁵ Thus the democratic type was considered the most effective leadership style.³⁶ This style does not mean that the leader is always right, nor does it mean that a state of confusion prevails. Democratic leadership provides a vehicle through which a group decision can be executed along with obligating each group member in that decision. Hambrick found that the primary quality of a democratic leader was being sensitive to the opinions of others.³⁷

One of the best known theories concerning leadership style is that of McGregor, a former professor of business management. He identified two opposing viewpoints of human behavior, Theory X and

³⁵Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," The Journal of Social Psychology 10 (1939): 271-299.

³⁶James R. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 170.

³⁷Bill M. Hambrick, "Commentary: Ten Beatitudes for Successful Leadership," The National Elementary Principal 57 (June 1978): 60.

Theory Y. The assumptions comprising Theory X were that: human beings have an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if they can; they are inherently self-centered, indifferent and must be coerced to meet organizational objectives; they treasure security above all else; and yearn for external direction. The assumptions comprising Theory Y were that: human beings consider physical and mental effort in work as natural as play; they strive to establish cooperative social relations and do not enjoy being loners; they are basically self-directive and want to help and contribute; they are naturally creative; and they strive for excellence in everything they do.³⁸ The decision of the leader to view people through the pessimistic Theory X or the optimistic Theory Y determines how much opportunity for involvement is given to the group. The leader who perceives people through Theory X will design a rigid organizational structure with careful supervision, complete compliance, and the use of threats to motivate the recalcitrants. The leader who perceives people through Theory Y will design an open organizational structure with reliance on self-control, freedom for the individuals to act, and the use of recognition for achievement to motivate rather than fear of punishment.³⁹ Sexton felt that there is no categorically "correct" style in relation to McGregor's model. Modern leaders should know which style is better in which situation and should

³⁸Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 1.

³⁹Ibid.

be able to draw from both poles.⁴⁰ Musella related McGregor's theories to the principal's degree of dogmatism (attention to policies and rules) and found a positive relationship to the degree of X ness. Musella also found a positive relationship to the extent in which subordinates were involved in the decision making process and the principal's degree of Y ness.⁴¹ Thus the leader's perception of people has a definite relationship to one's style and amount of involvement allowed subordinates.

Another popular theory of leadership effectiveness is the Contingency Theory developed by Fiedler. The emphasis here is that a leader's effectiveness is determined by how well one's leadership style fits the needs of a specific situation. Fiedler divided leaders into two types: those motivated by a desire for good interpersonal relations with subordinates (Human Relations Oriented) and those motivated by a concern for accomplishing the task at hand (Task-Oriented). He goes on to describe a situation in terms of its "favorableness," which is determined by three factors: the quality of leader/member relations in the group, the amount of structure imposed on tasks and assignments within the organization, and the amount of formal power that goes with the leader's position. As these three factors increase, so does

⁴⁰Michael J. Sexton and Karen Dawn Dill Switzer, "Educational Leadership: No Longer a Potpourri," Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977): 24.

⁴¹Donald Musella, Steve Lawton, and Tunde Palmer, "The Relationships Among Dogmatism, Administrative Style, Autonomy and Decision-Making of Aspiring and Practicing School Principals," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington D.C., 31 March 1975, p. 3.

favorability.⁴² Fiedler maintained that there is no simple correlation between situational favorability and leadership effectiveness. In general, evidence suggests that human-relations oriented leaders are most effective in moderately favorable situations, while task-oriented leaders are at their best in very favorable or unfavorable situations. Fiedler also suggested that experience, like training tended to increase situational favorability.⁴³ Sergiovanni, in reviewing Fiedler's Contingency Theory, noted that various combinations of the presence or absence of the "favorableness" factors represented the kind of power and influence which groups give to leaders. The position power of the leader, which refers to the status difference between leaders and groups, is the least important of Fiedler's three dimensions listed earlier. The task structure refers to the degree to which the group's work is programmed or routinized as opposed to being vague and ambiguous. Finally the leader/member personal relationships, which refer to the degree to which the group trusts and likes the leader, is the most important of the three dimensions. Thus the moderately favorable situations, in which human relations oriented leaders are most effective, are those which afford the leaders moderate control over the group, while situations which provide leaders with substantial influence or situations which provide very little influence, are best for the

⁴²Fred E. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. McGraw-Hill Series in Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), p. 1.

⁴³Fred E. Fiedler, et.al., "Responses to Sergiovanni," Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 395.

task oriented leader.⁴⁴ Summarizing, Fiedler noted that since leadership style is determined by an individual's personality, which may be difficult to change, it is important to focus attention on ways to manipulate situational variables to make leadership more effective.⁴⁵

Perhaps the best known leadership model is that of Getzels and Guba, which views school administration as a hierarchy of superordinate-subordinate relationships within a social system. The social system is conceived of in terms of three major dimensions that are conceptually independent but actually interactive.⁴⁶ The first is the idiographic or personal dimension, which stresses the requirements of the individual, the personality and need dispositions. Sanctions are intrinsic rather than extrinsic and the most expeditious route to the goal is seen as residing in the people involved rather than the institutional structure. The standard of leadership excellence is efficiency more than effectiveness. The second dimension is the nomothetic or normative one which stresses the requirements of the institution, the role and the expectations. If roles are clearly defined and everyone is held responsible for doing what he is supposed to do, the desired outcomes will ensure regardless of who the particular role incumbents are, provided they have the necessary technical competence. Sanctions are extrinsic rather

⁴⁴Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971), p. 202.

⁴⁵Fred E. Fiedler, "The Effects of Leadership Training and Experience. A Contingency Model Interpretation," Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (December 1972): 453.

⁴⁶Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, pp. 144-47.

than intrinsic and effectiveness more than efficiency is the standard of leadership excellence. A third dimension, called the transactional, emphasizes the need for moving toward one style under one set of circumstances and toward another style under another set of circumstances. It is the intermediate dimension with sanctions either extrinsic or intrinsic and the standard of leadership excellence being effectiveness and efficiency.⁴⁷ Observed behavior is the result of interaction between the nomothetic dimension and the idiographic dimension. This interaction suggests the possibility of role conflicts when a role incumbent is required to conform simultaneously to a number of expectations which are contradictory or inconsistent; and of personality conflicts when there is a discrepancy between the pattern of expectations attached to a role and the pattern of needs of the individual.⁴⁸ Moser, relying on the theory of Getzels and Guba, established three leadership styles in his research: nomothetic (stresses goal accomplishment rules and regulations and centralized authority at the expense of the individual), idiographic (stresses the individuality of people, minimal rules and regulations, decentralized authority and highly individualistic relationships with subordinates), and transactional (balances nomothetic and idiographic and utilizes each style as the occasion demands). Moser found that:

superintendents express the most confidence in principals whom they perceive as exhibiting transactional behavior and express

⁴⁷J.W. Getzels and E.G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review 65 (Winter 1957): 423.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 423-441.



the least confidence in principals whom they perceive as exhibiting idiographic behavior; superintendents express the highest confidence in principals who profess to be nomothetic; superintendents who profess nomothetic behavior are given the highest effectiveness ratings by principals; superintendents expect principals to be transactional with emphasis upon the nomothetic; principals tend to emphasize idiographic behavior in dealing with teachers and nomothetic behavior in their relations with superintendents (this indicates that the principal is subjected to different expectations from his superintendent than from his teachers); and high mutual ratings of confidence by superintendents and principals are accompanied by similarities in leadership style, feelings of security, general satisfaction with the relationships, desire to consult with one another on important matters, clear delineation of duties, and authority in decision making.⁴⁹

In a research project involving teacher descriptions of elementary principal leader behavior by Ignatovich, three leadership styles were identified. They are: tolerant integrator--described as being considerate and tolerant in dealings with subordinates; intolerant structuralists--described as being bureaucratic and role oriented and tending to stress production; and tolerant interloper--described as granting teachers complete freedom and not assuming the leader role. Ignatovich found that tolerant-integrator type principals were actively involved with teachers and interpersonally linked with faculty. Intolerant structuralists interacted with faculty but maintained an interpersonal distance by emphasizing rules and regulations and standard procedures. Tolerant interlopers were considered less potent and withdrew from fulfilling the role of principal. Other conclusions reached included: a significantly greater agreement between principal and teachers in describing the principal's behavior under tolerant

⁴⁹Robert F. Moser, "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals," Administrator's Notebook 6 (September 1957): 6.

integrator types, greater esprit behavior of teachers under tolerant integrator types, lower hindrance behavior of teachers under tolerant-integrator types, and no relationship between staff size, organizational intimacy and the type of principal.⁵⁰

In a research study by House, the following leadership styles were developed: instrumental leadership--behavior which defines roles and regulations, stresses rules and regulations, schedules work to be done, stresses standards of performance and explains why tasks should be done; supportive leadership--behavior which builds interpersonal relationships, makes it pleasant to be a member of the group, helps others in overcoming problems and facilitates change; and participative leadership--behavior which includes working directly with others, listens to what subordinates say, asks for suggestions and involves others in making decisions. House found that most principals saw the instrumental style as negative and were unsure how to use it, that the supportive style was of great importance to teacher job satisfaction and the effective functioning of a school, and that participative leadership is a very important aspect of most principals and is undertaken in different ways.⁵¹

Gibb described two styles of leadership: one being the "defensive"

⁵⁰Frederick R. Ignatovich, "Types of Elementary School Principal-Leaders: A Q-Factor Analysis," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, 6 February 1971, p. 14.

⁵¹Robert J. House, "Leadership Style, Hierarchies Influence and the Satisfaction of Subordinate Role Expectations: A Test of Likert's Influence Proposition," Journal of Applied Psychology, 5 (October 1971); 422.

style which is based on fear and distrust, thrives on the distortion of information, and uses strategies of persuasion and high control; and the other is the "participatory" style which is based on high trust and confidence in people and tends to assume that people are responsible, loyal, and work oriented.⁵²

Bockman reviewed two styles of leadership which he called the "traditional" approach and the "human relations" approach. The traditional approach emphasizes the role of the manager as the determiner of what shall be done with responsibility and authority emanating downward through a highly centralized managerial hierarchy. This type of leader makes the decisions himself, relies on fear as a motivator, and runs a tight-ship. The human relations approach, however, emphasizes group and consensus oriented decisions, regards the worker as responsible, and gives the worker more importance than the job. This type of leader believes in a loosely structured and self-motivated environment.⁵³

The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, after researching various leadership styles, recommend the democratic style as the only acceptable approach because it improves the schools and gets things done. In support of this endorsement it listed the "inward" convictions of democratic leadership:

- (1) the welfare of the group is assured by the welfare of each individual;
- (2) group decisions are more valid than individual decisions;
- (3) every idea is entitled to a fair hearing;
- (4) every person can make a unique and important contribution;
- (5)

⁵²Jack R. Gibb, "Dynamics of Leadership," In Search of Leaders (Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1967), p. 56.

⁵³Bockman, "The Principal as Manager of Change," p. 14.

growth comes from within the group; (6) democracy is a way of living; and (7) democratic methods are efficient and dependable. The "outward" signs of democratic leadership were also noted: (1) its processes increase the powers of individuals to adjust, to solve problems and to mature in behavior; (2) its effectiveness is measured by what happens to people; (3) it grows out of the action of a group working on a problem and doesn't belong to any one individual as a privilege; (4) it comes from within the group; (5) it develops and uses for the common good the potentialities of each group member; (6) it shares the formulation of policies and decisions with every person concerned; and (7) it assists the group in arriving at a consensus.⁵⁴

Gaynor delineates his approach to leadership style by establishing three distinct types. They are identified as the: personal-transactional leader--seeks information, makes decisions based on that information and communicates to his subordinates; authoritarian--emphasizes curriculum over personnel, communicates in an impersonal manner and emphasizes authority; and the participative--emphasizes human relations and face to face communication.⁵⁵ Thus the personal-transactional style is very leader-oriented, the authoritarian style is subject oriented and the participative style is person-oriented.

Doll related two leadership styles to a measure of effectiveness. The "hierarchy-oriented" principal is rigid and unsuccessful and prone to act dependently on bureaucratic directives. The "personnel-oriented" principal is non-rigid and successful and attends to teacher needs. The "personnel-oriented" principal perceives the role as one where the primary task is to assist the teachers to teach, regardless of the

⁵⁴Nolte, An Introduction to School Administration, p. 114.

⁵⁵Alan K. Gaynor, "Playing the Role of the Principal: Patterns of Administrative Response," paper presented at American Educational Research Association meeting.

wishes of the hierarchy.⁵⁶

Hamachek noted that principals either consciously or unconsciously reflect a particular style of leadership which best suits them as individuals. He listed three models: the charismatic leader--who is interested in keeping attention focused on himself by means of power, energy and commitment; the authoritarian leader--who claims power thru his office, assumes that he knows while others do not, is intolerant of indecisiveness, inflexible and operates one-way communication (yet good for insecure followers since he gives clear directions); and the therapeutic leader--who finds it difficult to make decisions for fear of hurting someone's feelings, adheres to a democratic framework and works with each teacher as an individual.⁵⁷ Although it is unlikely that any leader fits neatly into any of the three models, they all find fragments in common with their own styles.

Afton related three basic types of leadership styles which are dependent upon the priorities that the group considers important. These styles are described in the following way: "punishment centered"--obsessed with rules, very inflexible, all policy is sacred; "country club"--concerned about image with staff, friendly, a gregarious personality is his trademark; "participatory"--characterized by involvement of the staff, a cooperative venture where the group is involved in

⁵⁶Russell C. Doll, "Variations Among Inner City Elementary Schools: An Investigation into the Nature and Causes of Their Differences," (Kansas City: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, University of Missouri, 1969), p. 5.

⁵⁷Don E. Hamachek, "Leadership Styles, Decision Making, and the Principal," The National Elementary Principal 45 (April 1966): 26-31.

decision making.⁵⁸

Maccoby, with a business orientation, identified four species of leaders among some top manufacturing companies. The four styles, also relevant to education, are: the craftsman--prides self on quality work, has a strong sense of self-worth; the jungle-fighter--uses considerable politicking to get ahead, does not do well in situations that require trust; company man--adheres to policy, equates self-interest with the success of the corporation or school; games man--competitive, wants to win, loves change and wishes to influence its course, likes to take calculated risks.⁵⁹ Maccoby felt that education needs more risk takers and that values are an extremely important determinant of the goals the leader pushes for or compromises on.⁶⁰

A pattern has developed in the research of leadership concerning the number of styles reviewed. Regardless of how many leadership styles the researcher established, the end result seemed to reveal just two basic concepts: one was primarily concerned with people and the other was primarily concerned with accomplishing a given task.⁶¹ This dichotomy was further emphasized by the Ohio State Leadership Studies and other research derived from them.

⁵⁸Alex Afton, "Perceptions of the Principal's Role," NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974): 71-75.

⁵⁹Charles A. Reavis and Betty MacPhail, "Leadership Style: A Model for Choice," Planning and Changing 10 (Summer 1979): 106.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Frank Spikes, "Choosing a Personal Leadership Style," Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years 3 (November 1979): 8.

The Ohio State Leadership Studies and Derivative Research

One of the most significant large scale psychological research programs to be concerned with the situational aspects of leadership was that conducted at Ohio State University over the decade 1946-56. From nearly two thousand items describing leader behavior, the Ohio State investigators selected 150. They postulated nine dimensions of leader behavior, developed questionnaires and descriptions of the behavior of over 300 leaders, and computed a statistical analysis to reduce the number of dimensions to four (consideration, initiating structure, production emphasis and sensitivity). The next steps were the construction of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the administration of it to air crews, which eventually led to the reduction of leadership dimensions to two: consideration and initiating structure.⁶² This identification of the two independent dimensions of leader behavior was perhaps the most far reaching result of the research. The two dimensions are described as follows:

Consideration--reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, consideration of their feelings and a certain warmth between supervisor and subordinates. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the supervisor is likely to be more impersonal in his relations with group members.

Structure--reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterizes individuals who play a more active role in directing group activities

⁶²Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Columbus: Ohio State University College of Education, 1956), p. 1.

through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, etc.⁶³

Two instruments were developed to measure these two dimensions. They are the LBDQ, as noted earlier, measuring subordinate perceptions of supervisor behavior, and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), measuring how the supervisor thinks he should behave in his leadership role.

Halpin discovered that the effective leaders, in his study of aircraft commanders, were those who scored high on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.⁶⁴ Hemphill came to the same conclusion in his study of college department chairmen.⁶⁵ Halpin did a subsequent study on school superintendents and found that staff members and board members tended to agree among themselves in describing the superintendent's leader behavior.⁶⁶ In this study, Halpin administered real and ideal forms of the LBDQ to three groups; the superintendents (self-ratings); the staff, and the boards of education. They were asked to describe the superintendents' actual behavior and ideal behavior. Some of Halpin's other findings were: self-ratings and staff ratings of actual behavior were about the same with respect to initiating structure; there was no correlation between board's description and self-rating of actual behavior on both dimensions; superintendent

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Andrew W. Halpin, "The Superintendent's Effectiveness as a Leader," Administrator's Notebook 7 (October 1978): 2.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 3.

set higher ideal behavior than the other groups; superintendents described as being high on both dimensions were perceived by the reference groups to be highly effective; superintendents who were low on both dimensions were perceived as least effective; and superintendents who were high on either dimension, but low on the other were perceived as ineffective.⁶⁷

There have been a number of other research studies based on the dimensions of leadership style developed by the Ohio State Leadership Studies. Evenson replicated Halpin's study with principals and found similar results.⁶⁸ Kung and Hoy found, like Halpin, that the most effective leaders were high in both consideration and initiating structure. They also found that teachers generally prefer principals high in consideration, while upper level administrators favor principals strong in initiating structure.⁶⁹ McCleary and Hencley found that school boards preferred leader behavior that was oriented toward initiating structure, whereas staffs preferred leaders perceived as high in consideration.⁷⁰

In a major study using the LBDQ, Blanchard and Hersey indicated that there is no single all-purpose leadership style, but different

⁶⁷Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, p. 1.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Daniel W. Kung and Wayne K. Hoy, "Leadership Style of Principals and Professional Zone of Acceptance of Teachers," Educational Administration Quarterly 4 (December 1972): 49.

⁷⁰Lloyd E. McCleary and Stephen P. Hencley, Secondary School Administration: Theoretical Bases of Professional Practice (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. Inc., 1965), p. 103.

combinations of task and relationship behavior depending upon the maturity of members of the group. They define a group as being mature when it sets high but attainable goals, is willing to accept responsibility, and has sufficient experience and/or education. Task behavior (initiating structure) is the organizing and defining of the followers' roles and the establishing of well-defined patterns of organization and communication while relationship behavior (consideration) is characterized by open communication, socio-emotional support, and other facilitating behaviors. They concluded that if a group is immature then the leader should use high task/low relationship behavior and if a group is very mature then the leader should use low task/low relationship behavior. Thus the effective leader is one who accurately assesses the group's maturity and adapts the appropriate leader behavior. It was also found that principals who said they used mostly high relationship/low task behavior (high consideration/low structure) were viewed unfavorably by their teachers. Teachers saw them as not assuming their proper roles, unable to reconcile conflicting demands, and unable to predict outcomes accurately. Principals were reluctant to practice low task/low relationship behavior (low structure/low consideration) yet teachers perceived it positively.⁷¹

Feitler conducted research using the LBDQ-XII, an updated version of the original LBDQ with increased leadership dimensions. It was found that tolerance of freedom, consideration, integration, and

⁷¹P. Hersey and K.H. Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1977), p. 1.

tolerance of uncertainty were significantly higher for schools which demonstrated the participative-group style of management--where leadership facilitates meaningful interpersonal interaction and a high regard for teachers as persons.⁷² The implication is that this positive regard for teachers exhibited by the principal determines the quality of the environment of the school.

Another adaptation of the Ohio State Leadership Studies was completed by Blake and Mouton. They used the two dimensions of consideration and initiating structure and applied a numerical scale of one to nine to each dimension. These were placed on a horizontal axis and a vertical axis with the following combinations defined: (Concern for productivity, Concern for People); (1,1)--low concern for achievement of school goals, low concern for human organization of school, has already accepted defeat; (1,9)--human relationships are important for their own sake and group harmony is the key to organizational success, needs to be accepted, people oriented; (5,5)--balanced solutions are generally acceptable, satisfactory, workable, but rarely outstanding; (9,1)--places top priority on school goals, relies on formal authority, needs to be in control, Theory X, pessimistic; and (9,9)--believes people will assume responsibility, no conflict between work and people, relies on self-control and commitment, Theory Y, optimistic.⁷³ The

⁷²Fred C. Feitler, "A Study of Principal Leader Behavior and Contrasting Organizational Environments," paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, 3 April 1972, p. 9.

⁷³Robert Blake and Jane Mouton, The Managerial Grid (Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964), p. 1.

implication inherent in their study was that leadership effectiveness is at its maximum when a leader can be characterized as (9,9).

The LBDQ and LOQ have been used in numerous research projects both in education and out of education. The LBDQ was used by Moy and Hales to investigate the leadership style of staff members of college residence halls of Ohio University.⁷⁴ The LBDQ was used by Johnson to explore the relationship between rule administration leadership behavior and the sex of black elementary school principals.⁷⁵ The LBDQ was utilized by Stotts to examine the leadership behavior of administrators in adult basic education centers in Illinois.⁷⁶ The LBDQ was utilized by Lucietto in a study analyzing the language usage patterns of principals.⁷⁷ Croghan used the LBDQ in a study of principals who were high in both consideration and initiating structure^{*}were more frequently designated by teachers as leaders of the informal groups

⁷⁴James Y.K. Moy and Loyde W. Hales, "Management Styles and Leadership Behavior Within a Residence Life Program," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, February 1973, p. 2.

⁷⁵Florence DeVida H. Johnson, "The Relationship Between Rule Administration and the Leadership Behavior of Black Male and Female Urban Elementary School Principals," paper presented at the Annual National Conference on Urban Education, Norfolk, 20 November 1977, p. 2.

⁷⁶Michael J. Stotts, "Field Study of the Perceptions of Directors' Leader Behavior in Illinois Basic Education Centers," paper presented to the Illinois State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, August 1968, p. 34.

⁷⁷Lena L. Lucietto, "The Verbal Behavior of Educational Administrators: An Analysis of the Language of School Principals," paper presented to the National Center for Educational Research and Development, Washington, D.C., December 1969, p. 203.

within their schools.⁷⁸ The LOQ was used by Staff to analyze leadership attitudes in three occupational categories: banking, food marketing, and retailing.⁷⁹ The LOQ was used by Baker in a study of students' attitudes concerning leadership behavior at the National Outdoor Leadership School.⁸⁰ The LOQ was used by Dagenais in a study of allied health managers. One finding was that the allied health group preferred a leadership style that was high on consideration and very low on structure.⁸¹ The LOQ was also used: by Bass as part of a program for predicting success in a large food-products corporation; by Parker in a study conducted at a large wholesale pharmaceutical company; by Bass in a large petrochemical refinery study; by Fleishman and Ko in a study in a large shoe manufacturing company; by Oaklander and Fleishman in a study designed to establish the relationship of leadership patterns to organizational stress and effectiveness in hospitals; by Litzinger in a study of leadership attitudes of bank managers; and by Rim in a study exploring the relationship between

⁷⁸John H. Croghan, "A Study of the Relationships Between Perceived Leadership Behavior of Elementary Principals and Informed Group Dimensions and Composition in Elementary Schools," doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969.

⁷⁹Bruce S. Staff, "Personality Characteristics, Interpersonal Values and Leadership Attitude of Mid-Level Managers," paper presented to the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Washington, D.C., September 1978, p. 4.

⁸⁰Edward Draper (Baker, Jr.), "Change in Leadership Behavior Attitudes Effected by Participating in Basic Courses at the National Outdoor Leadership School," (M.S. thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1975), p. 16.

⁸¹Fred Dagenais, "Leadership Styles of Allied Health Administrators," Journal of Allied Health 6 (Winter 1977): 31.

risk-taking behavior and leadership attitude.⁸²

General Functions of the Principal

A review of the literature concerning leadership would be fruitless unless a position that provided someone an opportunity to lead was examined along with it. This position is that of principal, who according to Heichberger is responsible for the overall direction and operation of the school. The principal is perceived, positively or negatively, as the person who establishes the pace for the school's accomplishments. By virtue of the administrative role, the school principal is in a position to exert positive influence as to the kind of educational program that is offered.⁸³ Mills listed the principal first as an organizer, one who pulls together all aspects of the school; next as a facilitator of a climate conducive to learning; and perhaps most importantly, as a catalyst for change.⁸⁴ Theoretically the principal could be characterized as the implementer of school board and superintendent developed policy. Campbell noted that since the principal is closer to the learning environment, the principal is the translator of district-wide goals as to the purpose of education in a given school system. Therefore the task is to plan programs

⁸²Edwin A. Fleishman, Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1969), pp. 5-7.

⁸³Robert L. Heichberger, "Creating the Climate for Humanistic Change in the Elementary School with Principal as Change Agent," Education 96 (Winter 1975): 106.

⁸⁴Troy Mills, "The Principal as Catalyst," Theory Into Practice 18 (February 1979): 21.

using all of the educational knowledge and expertise that can be enlisted using the involvement of the primary manager of learning, the teacher, and using the participation of the school's community.⁸⁵ The principal has been placed in a middle position between the school and the larger community forces. This unique position affords a broader perspective than that of the teachers and a better focus than that of the superintendent and school board. Thus this unique position gives the principal an opportunity to be a leader.

The principal is the key figure that differentiates a good school from a poor one. Bishop related that in a good school, the principal sets instructional goals, participates in classroom teaching and instructional supervision and has high expectations for the staff and students.⁸⁶ Goldhammer thought of the educational leader as the principal who: has a thorough knowledge of educational needs, technology, and strategies; has some philosophical perspectives on the societal and human needs for education; is able to evaluate the significance (strengths and weaknesses) of the programs in the school; and plans for the future by joining societal needs and developmental aspects of educational technology.⁸⁷ Goldhammer listed the competencies needed by the principal: knowledge of social and political forces in

⁸⁵Anne Campbell, "Are Instructional Leaders Still Needed?," Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977): 14.

⁸⁶Walter Bishop, Charles Dedrick, and Norman McCumsey, "An Urgent Mandate for the 1980's: Dynamic Educational Leadership," Illinois Principal 12 (September 1980): 21.

⁸⁷Paul L. Houts, "A Conversation with Keith Goldhammer," The National Elementary Principal 53 (March 1974): 27.

the community, skills in group procedures and group understanding, leadership skills (communication, sensitivity, and knowledge of change), knowledge of the legal bases of schools, understanding of employee/management relations, understanding of curriculum development, and ability to clarify educational philosophy and needs to the broader public.⁸⁸

The principal can expect to find that his behavior is largely subject to the control of the school climate. Principals tend to pattern their leadership style to a role construed for them by the school and school district, related Wiggins. The influence of internal and external organizational expectations prevails over the principal's personality characteristics the longer he remains in the position. The principal functions in a social system wherein he is influenced by the roles and expectations of the school, the district, and the clientele as much as he influences the school by his personal leadership style.⁸⁹ Ingram noted that concerns about the principal's role-conflicts often manifest themselves in the question of whether he can be an instructional leader in an era of increasing managerial demands.⁹⁰ This problem was further discussed by Vann who listed the reasons that principals give for their failure to devote time to curriculum development

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 30.

⁸⁹Thomas Wiggins, "Conceptualizing Principal Behavior in the School Climate: A Systems Analysis," paper presented to the University of Oklahoma.

⁹⁰Ruben L. Ingram, "The Principal: Instructional Leader, Site Manager, Educational Executive," Thrust (April 1979): 23.

Principals say their time is consumed by unimportant administrative and clerical duties and they have no autonomy as instructional leaders. Yet Vann found no significant relationship between the amount of time devoted to curriculum and the amount of clerical help. He also found no relationship between curriculum time and the principal's autonomy. A relationship was found between the amount of time spent on curriculum development and the principal's perception of the importance of curriculum development by central office superiors. Thus principals devote little time to curriculum development because they perceive it to be a low priority of their superiors.⁹¹ Myers indicated that the position of the principal is mainly a functionary one. Almost all significant decisions concerning his role are made for him; because this is true, the decisions can be modified or changed without his approval.⁹² Simon agreed with this view and calls the leader/principal a bus driver whose passengers will leave him unless he takes them in the direction they wish to go. Principals delude themselves into thinking they have power, but in reality that power often dissolves as soon as they try to use it.⁹³ Yet Saranson claimed the principal is in a pivotal position and any attempt to change the educational system

⁹¹Allan Vann, "Three Principals Discuss the Principal's Leadership Role," Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 405.

⁹²Donald A. Myers, "The Chautauqua Papers: A Dissent," The National Elementary Principal 54 (September 1974): 19.

⁹³Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization (New York: MacMillan Co., 1947), p. 134.

must begin with the principal.⁹⁴ Brown stated that as long as we have schools, the principal will remain a leading character in whatever drama unfolds.⁹⁵ If there is a conflict in the role of the principal as the instructional leader, then it is due to internal and external constraints in force.

One major constraint of the principal's leadership was related by Myers. He felt that the principal has no power to reward or punish his staff. The principal does not hire them, set their salaries, establish fringe benefits, provide bonuses, or lessen their workloads. He cannot fire them, reduce their salaries, increase their workload, require them to work overtime or discriminate in pupil placement. This decline in the power of principals and their ability to lead has been influenced greatly by the rise of collective bargaining.⁹⁶ Goldhammer noted the major constraint upon the principal's leadership effectiveness as being the requirement to spend a large part of his time on routine clerical and secretarial chores. He also cited a lack of money and resources in the district and felt that talking to principals about leadership effectiveness is like talking about good nutrition to a person who is down to his last crust of bread. The topic is worthwhile but not relevant to the present level of crisis.⁹⁷ Pendergrass and Wood

⁹⁴Myers, The National Elementary Principal, p. 20.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 21.

⁹⁷Keith Goldhammer, et.al., Elementary School Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1971), p. 209.

agreed when they said the problem was simple: the principal has a limited amount of time and energy and an infinite number of tasks to address.⁹⁸ Pharis viewed the constraints as external when he suggested that the principal's role is all too often defined by people outside the principal's office: state and federal legislators, the central office, and the community.⁹⁹ Spodek identified three forces restraining a principal's attempt at leadership: power of the community, educational bureaucracy (principals are inundated by administrivia), and resistance of teachers to change. He also noted that the role definition for principals is ambiguous; principals and their reference groups have unclear and conflicting expectations of what that role should be. It may fluctuate between instructional leader, curriculum director, bureaucrat, representative of superintendent or representative of faculty.¹⁰⁰ Wayson summarized the situation by noting that the constraints on the principal are like the constraints on most people; they arise primarily from one's own perception of himself, his world and his role. Perhaps the influencing factors are only as inflexible as the principal thinks they are.¹⁰¹ Barth stated that the constraints of the principal best when he related, "the obstacles to performing the

⁹⁸R.A. Pendergrass and Diane Wood, "Instructional Leadership and the Principal," NASSP Bulletin 63 (March 1979): 39.

⁹⁹Bill Pharis, "U.S. Principals: The Inside Story," The National Elementary Principal 58 (March 1979): 48.

¹⁰⁰Harold J. McNally, "Summing Up," The National Elementary Principal 54 (September 1974): 7.

¹⁰¹William W. Wayson, "A Proposal to Remake the Principalship," The National Elementary Principal 54 (September): 31.

job ARE the job."¹⁰²

In a research study conducted by Utz, where urban teachers were asked to evaluate their principals, a number of interesting, conclusions were reached concerning the principals' roles. Excellent principals tended to thoroughly orient new teachers and to plan extensively with honest solicitation of teacher input; problems were neither hidden nor handled in an authoritarian manner, but explored in depth; teacher evaluations were open and tended to focus on the means by which those performances could be improved rather than overt criticism; the principal was respected and trusted and seen as cooperating with teachers in getting the teaching job done. Poor principals were perceived to be more limited in social/emotional skills than in management skills; they gave minimal orientation to new teachers and did not solicit input from teachers; they maintained faculty meetings that were merely explanations of administrative decisions; teacher evaluations were either not done or not made known to the teachers; teachers who fit were those who didn't rock the boat and who stayed out of the principal's way.¹⁰³

When examining the role of the principal, certain consideration should be given to the context or situation in which his leadership takes place. For example, desegregation was viewed as a change in

¹⁰²Roland S. Barth, "The Head Nut, or Reflections on School Leadership," The National Elementary Principal 58 (March 1979): 30.

¹⁰³Robert T. Utz, "Principal Leadership Styles and Effectiveness as Perceived by Teachers," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, 3 April 1972, pp. 5-6.

policy, whether undertaken voluntarily or by court order. Very little literature has been devoted to examining the principal's role in this desegregation policy change. Yet the principal's role in such a situation is crucial. In a report by the National Institute of Education, it was noted that the effective principal, in implementing the desegregation plan for his school, will call upon the political and local community leaders to legitimize the legally mandated steps being taken. Other functions of the principal in the desegregation context were to help ameliorate resistant factions, mediate disputes, coordinate the dissemination of information, and incite community participation and support. The principal should realize that it is to his advantage to include school groups, community elements, parents, and central administrators in the desegregation process.¹⁰⁴ Another special situation in which an examination of the principal's role is worthwhile is that of the mainstreaming policy of Public Law 94-142. Rebores noted that if the support needed to make mainstreaming work is exemplified only in terms of rules, regulations, procedures, and instructions, mainstreaming will surely fail. Leadership on the part of the principal is the necessary ingredient. The participative model of leadership can provide an effective method for facilitating such change. It is necessary for the principal to develop a high degree of trust with the staff. An atmosphere of openness conducive to information sharing should be encouraged. Being more specific, the principal must

¹⁰⁴National Institute of Education, "The Role of the School Principal in School Desegregation," position paper prepared by the Desegregation Studies Staff, Washington, D.C., 1977, p. 6.

thoroughly understand what is involved by knowing board of education policies and consulting with the central office concerning district implementation guidelines. The principal must also incorporate for himself not only the letter of the law but also its spirit, since the chance for a successful program can be enhanced or diminished by the principal's attitude, mannerisms, etc.¹⁰⁵

No matter what the administrator's role may be, noted Krajewski, the duties within that role must be effected via "interaction" with people. In other words, how the school's administrator works with people in the everyday situation is the basic determinant of overall success.¹⁰⁶ The principal must maintain that empathetic understanding which helps him to be a more sympathetic leader. He should never completely remove himself from the classroom; thus should arrange his work days so he is consistently and constantly in one classroom or another, assisting, teaching, helping children, etc. As related by McNally, if principals are to function successfully as leaders, they will have to rely on the authority they "earn" from their staffs.¹⁰⁷

Specific Activities of the Principal

In the early days of American education, the principal's duties were largely clerical in nature, including such things as keeping

¹⁰⁵Ronald W. Rebores, "Public Law 94-142 and the Building Principal," NASSP Bulletin 63 (April 1979): 27-28.

¹⁰⁶Robert J. Krajewski, "Role Effectiveness: Theory Into Practice," Theory Into Practice 18 (February 1979): 53.

¹⁰⁷McNally, "Summing Up," p. 13.

attendance and accounting for funds and supplies. As the population grew and schools became larger, graded, and departmentalized, the managerial aspects began to assume greater importance. The principal had to classify pupils, assign teachers, etc. Toward the end of the 19th century, the principal began to assume responsibility for supervision and improvement of instruction.

The Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration designated seven major task areas of the principal: Instruction and Curriculum Development--formulate objectives, determine content and organization, relate to available time, personnel, facilities, and materials, and provide supervision of instruction; Pupil Personnel--maintain an attendance system, orient pupils, provide counseling, and health services, and deal with pupil irregularities; Staff Personnel--recruit and assign personnel, maintain records, and provide for professional growth; Community and School Leadership--determine school services, and help develop plans to improve community life; School Plant and School Transportation--develop program to maintain physical plant, and provide for safety of pupils, personnel, and equipment; Organization and Structure--develop staff organization to implement objectives, and organize lay and professional groups for educational planning; and School Finance and Business Management--prepare budget, account for monies and property.¹⁰⁸

Killian and Sexton maintained that all tasks of the principal

¹⁰⁸Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1965), p. 10.

fall into one of three function categories: Maintenance Functions--routine, easily reversible and system imposed (examples: mail, phone calls, reports, etc.); Critical/Crisis Functions--crisis potential, immediate problems, and externally imposed (examples: student discipline, parent conferences, vandalism, etc.); Professional Goal Functions--far-reaching effects, non-reversible, and self-imposed (examples: curriculum planning, evaluations, teacher conferences, etc.). Lower level functions must be taken care of before one can successfully move up the ladder. They recommended that the amount of time one spends on the more numerous but less productive maintenance functions should be closely analyzed, and every effort should be made to reduce the time spent on them.¹⁰⁹

McCleary stated that the principal should communicate regularly with central office personnel regarding school operations and work cooperatively with the central office in the evaluation of the school's program, facilities, and personnel. He classified the principal's behavior in light of communication responsibilities and grouped the tasks into twelve areas: district-wide policy development, business affairs, community relations, pupil personnel, student activities, pupil control, building level organization, auxiliary services, staff personnel, staff improvement, curriculum development, and change and innovation. He found that management tasks formed the major portion

¹⁰⁹Michael G. Killian and Michael J. Sexton, "Climbing the Ladder to Leadership," NASSP Bulletin 63 (March 1979): 8.

of the principal's job.¹¹⁰

In a study by Gorton and McIntyre, sixty effective principals ranked the activities in which they spent the most time. Following are the activities arranged in order of most time spent: personnel (evaluation, advising, conferencing and recruiting); school management (calendar, office, budget, correspondence); program development (curriculum, instructional leadership); student activities (meetings, supervision, planning); district office (meetings, task forces, reports); community (advisory groups, parent conferences); planning (annual, long range); professional development (reading, conferences); and student behavior (discipline, attendance, meetings). The most frequently cited "time-waster" by the principals was attendance at meetings, specifically district office meetings. The principals also listed factors causing them to spend more time on tasks than they thought desirable: lack of administrative help, need to be visible to students, emergencies, discipline problems, immediate needs of people, paper bureaucracy, reasons why the time spent on tasks was appropriate, capable assistant principals, faith in orders to perform assigned responsibilities, ability to delegate, and ability to operate according to goals.¹¹¹

In a study by Fishburn, twenty-two common tasks of elementary

¹¹⁰Lloyd E. McCleary, "An Essay on Role Attrition: Three Studies of the Job of the Principal," paper presented to the University of Utah, 8 April 1971, pp. 12-13.

¹¹¹Richard A. Gorton and Kenneth E. McIntyre, The Senior High School Principalship Volume II: The Effective Principal, (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), p. 29.

school principals were listed: develop inservice for faculty, define school goals, give service to community, interview and select personnel, keep attendance records, define employees' responsibilities, administer discipline, evaluate staff, order materials, prepare calendar, inventory books and equipment, manage school facilities, oversee food service program, complete reports, patrol building and grounds, plan and run staff meetings, develop schedules, utilize community resources, encourage home communication, cooperate with special teachers, supervise custodians, meet with teachers and parents about discipline problems.¹¹²

A recent report issued by the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the United States Senate concerning the role of the school principal was reviewed by Weldy. It noted that in many ways the principal is the most influential individual in any school. If a school is vibrant, innovative, child-centered, and has a reputation for excellence, one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success. A representative job description listing the principal's responsibilities was contained in the report: studies neighborhood needs and develops plans to meet them, exerts leadership in adapting programs to meet needs, directs activities of staff members in performance of their duties, supervises instructional staff in matters of curriculum and student activities, reports to appropriate superiors regarding school needs, develops a public relations program,

¹¹²Wanda Fishburn, "Differences in Professional Tasks of Elementary Principals in Rural and Urban Areas," (n.p. May 1978), p. 17.

administers budgeted allocations, implements board policies, utilizes school system and community resources, consults with and coordinates resource personnel, establishes student conduct and maintains discipline, supervises the school's teaching process, orients new staff members and assists in development, attends special events and athletic activities, cooperates with college officials, works with superiors on district programs, conducts staff meetings to keep members current, keeps superintendent informed of school's problems, and performs other tasks as superintendent may direct. The principal's typical work week was reported as being fifty-six hours.¹¹³

Krajewski conducted a study whereby principals and teachers were asked to rank ten principal duties based on "real" and "ideal" models. Following are the ranked positions of this study:

	PRINCIPAL		TEACHER	
	Real	Ideal	Real	Ideal
staff selector/orientator	9	3	8	3
instructional supervisor	4	1	7	2
public relations facilitator	3	5	2	7
public services coordinator	6	7	5	6
self-evaluator	10	9	10	10
curriculum supervisor	8	2	9	4
teacher evaluator	7	8	4	8
school program administrator	1	4	1	1
disciplinarian	2	10	3	9
morale builder	5	6	6	5

Some of the conclusions reached, were that the principal's role as instructional supervisor was in reality not viewed as important, yet teachers and principals wish it were more important--this is also true concerning the principal's role as staff selector/orientator. The

¹¹³Gilbert R. Weldy, Principals: What They Do and Who They Are, (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), p. 7.

role as disciplinarian came out for both groups as being very important in reality, but both wish it were not.¹¹⁴

McIntyre and Grant completed a similar study, but asked teachers, principals and superintendents to list eight principal responsibilities according to their perception of what is their priority and what is the actual performance.

	TEACHERS		PRINCIPALS		SUPERIN- TENDENTS	
	Real	Ideal	Real	Ideal	Real	Ideal
community relations	2	1	3	2	3	3
staffing	1	2	1	1	1	1
time and space	3	3	2	3	2	4
goal setting	4	4	4	4	4	2
non-instructional services	5	5	5	5	5	7
materials and equip- ment	6	6	6	7	6	8
program evaluation	7	7	7	8	7	6
inservice training	8	8	8	6	8	5

Some of the conclusions reached were: all groups gave the principals the highest marks in staffing, while receiving the lowest marks in inservice training; principals and superintendents both gave staffing as the highest priority.¹¹⁵

Roe and Drake noted that principals prefer to spend less time on administration and clerical work and more on supervision and curriculum. Many factors affect the way each principal perceives and performs his

¹¹⁴Robert J. Krajewski, "Role Implications of a Rank Ordering Process by Elementary Principals," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Las Vegas, 18 April 1977, p. 2.

¹¹⁵Kenneth E. McIntyre and Ed A. Grant, "How Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents View the Principalship," NASSP Bulletin 64 (February 1980): 45.

duties. There is no standard description of the principalship that is appropriate for schools everywhere. Some principals contend that there is no adequate description of the position anywhere.¹¹⁶ Thus the principal responds to a virtual kaleidoscope of problems and attempts to keep everything on an even keel while maintaining a positive profile as the educational leader. Perhaps the principal's job tasks and responsibilities can best be summarized by the common phrase that appears on a multitude of contracts, "performs other duties as assigned."

¹¹⁶William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principalship (New York: Macmillan Co., 1974), p. 10.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this research was to determine if there is a relationship between the dimensions of a principal's leadership style and the activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program, in this case minimum competency testing. A measure of these dimensions, Consideration and Structure, was determined by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), an instrument developed by Fleishman during the Ohio State Leadership Studies. (A copy of the LOQ is contained in the appendix.) The dimensions were defined as follows:

Consideration--Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the individual is likely to be more impersonal in relationships with group members.

Structure--Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterized individuals who play a very active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score characterizes individuals who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways.¹

The activities engaged in by the principal during the implementation

¹Edwin A. Fleishman, Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1969), p. 1.

of the district's minimum competency testing program were determined by the Principal Activity Questionnaire (PAQ). (A copy of the PAQ is contained in the appendix.) This instrument was adapted from the Work Analysis Forms by Shartle and Stogdill, which was also developed during the Ohio State Leadership Studies. The activities, covering a wide variety of principal functions were defined as follows:

People Related Activities - time spent in various types of contacts with persons.

Individual Activities - time spent in various types of individual effort.²

Thus this study examined the relationships between the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the principals' leadership style and the People-Related and Individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program. Specifically, the following hypotheses were examined:

- H₁ There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₂ There is a relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₃ There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of

²Ralph M. Stogdill and Carroll L. Shartle, Work Analysis Forms, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957), pp. 2-3.

people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

H₄ There is a relationship between a highly considerate/lowly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

H₅ There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

H₆ There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

H₇ There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

H₈ There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

H₉ There is a relationship between the activities a principal is actually engaged in during the implementation of a new district program and the activities a principal sees as being the most important in the implementation of this program.

Procedure

A written request was made to all State Superintendents of Education throughout the United States, asking for recommendations of school districts that had implemented MCT programs. Forty-one superintendents responded, with one hundred districts being recommended. Copies of a questionnaire, asking for a brief description of the district minimum competency testing program, were sent to the superintendents of these one hundred districts. One of the questions asked whether the use of the MCT program standards was to determine promotion or graduation, to diagnose remedial students, or to measure student progress. This question was crucial, since for purposes of this research the MCT program's standards had to be used to determine a student's graduation (either elementary or high school) or promotion (from one grade to the next). This standard distinguished the program as a true "minimum competency testing" program rather than a mere "testing" program.

It also asked whether districts would be willing to provide further information, thus signifying their willingness to participate in this research. Positive responses were received from sixty school district superintendents with forty-three districts meeting the required definition noted previously. Letters were sent in March 1980 to the superintendents of these forty-three districts asking if they would distribute the two questionnaires (LOQ and PAQ) and a cover letter of introduction to their principals or forward the names and addresses for individual mailings. Representatives from twenty-three school districts responded resulting in a sample of 108 principals. Following

are the participating districts with the number of participating principals from each:

Fulton County School System
Atlanta, Georgia 17 principals

Peoria Public School Dist. No. 150
Peoria, Illinois 15 principals

Gary Community School Corporation
Gary, Indiana 10 principals

Indian River School District
Vero Beach, Florida 8 principals

Westside Comm. School Dist. No. 66
Omaha, Nebraska 7 principals

Roosevelt School District No. 66
Phoenix, Arizona 5 principals

Berea City School District
Berea, Ohio 5 principals

School District No. 10
Covington, Georgia 5 principals

Lincoln County School District
Panaca, Nevada 4 principals

Anderson County School District
Clinton, Tennessee 4 principals

School District No. 3
Pikeville, Tennessee 4 principals

Glendale Union High School District
Glendale, Arizona 3 principals

Austin Independent School District
Austin, Texas 3 principals

Lawton Community School District
Lawton, Michigan 3 principals

Henry County School District
McDonough, Georgia 3 principals

Pershing County School District
Lovelock, Nevada 2 principals

Humboldt County School District
Winnemucca, Nevada 2 principals

Douglas County School District
Gardnerville, Nevada 2 principals

Sarasota County School District
Sarasota, Florida 2 principals

Carson City School District
Carson City, Nevada 2 principals

Millwood I-37 School District
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 1 principal

Orange County School District
Orange, Virginia 1 principal

Benton County School District
Camden, Tennessee 1 principal

Upon receipt of the LOQ's and PAQ's from all principals, the instruments were scored and grouped into one of four quadrants. These were determined by the computation of the medians and means of the Consideration and Structure dimensions on the LOQ. The quadrants were defined as follows:

- I Consideration scores above the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6
Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.
- II Consideration scores above the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.
- III Consideration scores below the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6
Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.
- IV Consideration scores below the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.

The remainder of this chapter presents the data received.

Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

The division of the 108 principals into four subgroups was determined by computing the mean and median for the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Group I consisted of twenty-eight principals having their Consideration scores above the median of 56.6 and mean of 56.5 and their Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and mean of 47.4. The LOQ scores for the principals in Group I are:

<u>Principal</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Structure</u>
1	Atlanta, Georgia	64	48
4	Atlanta, Georgia	63	59
8	Atlanta, Georgia	63	51
22	Peoria, Illinois	63	53
30	Peoria, Illinois	59	55
33	Gary, Indiana	63	53
35	Gary, Indiana	58	57
37	Gary, Indiana	60	49
38	Gary, Indiana	69	56
39	Gary, Indiana	68	48
49	Vero Beach, Florida	70	49
58	Phoenix, Arizona	60	50
60	Phoenix, Arizona	66	49
61	Phoenix, Arizona	62	49
65	Berea, Ohio	61	48
69	Covington, Georgia	57	51
72	Covington, Georgia	61	49
78	Clinton, Tennessee	58	48
82	Pikeville, Tennessee	60	48
85	Glendale, Arizona	66	49
87	Austin, Texas	63	51
89	Austin, Texas	62	51
90	Lawton, Michigan	60	55
92	Lawton, Michigan	61	51
94	McDonough, Georgia	66	49
95	McDonough, Georgia	59	51
99	Winnemucca, Nevada	58	50
104	Carson City, Nevada	61	51

Following are the data from the Principal Activity Questionnaires in which the principals were asked to select the five activities they most often engaged in (considering number of minutes) during the implementation of the districts' MCT programs and the five activities (in order of importance) they saw as being the most important in the development of the districts' programs.

The following table contains two sets of scores for the highly considerate/highly structured principals. The first set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities actually engaged in during the implementation of the new program. The second set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities considered to be the most important during the implementation of the new program. The raw scores were established by assigning five points to the highest ranked activity, four points to the second ranked activity, three points to the third ranked activity, two points to the fourth ranked activity and one point to the fifth ranked activity. These point values were added for each activity, thus determining their ranks.

The top ranked activity, for both the actually engaged in category and the most important category, was "observation, inspection, examination." This activity received a considerably higher raw score than any other and was the only activity to be ranked in the same position for both categories. It was listed as one of the five activities most often engaged in by eighteen of the twenty-eight principals in this highly considerate/highly structured group and as one of the five most important activities by nineteen principals.

Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

<u>People Related Activities</u>	<u>Activities Actually Engaged in</u>		<u>Activities Considered Most Important</u>	
	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>
1. Attending committee meetings and conferences.	2	63	4	38
2. Consulting superiors about technical matters.	9	20	7	22
3. Consulting superiors about personal matters.	11	17	12	11
4. Consulting peers (members at same echelon).	10	19	6	27
5. Consulting subordinates about their work, training, etc.	7	24	5	35
6. Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, etc.	5	27	7	22
7. Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.	13	10	9	21
8. Teaching, instruction, training.	6	25	3	51
9. Making speeches, addresses, talks.	17	5	15	5
10. Attending meetings of outside groups.	19	0	17	3
<u>Individual Activities</u>				
11. Observation, inspection, examination.	1	73	1	75
12. Reading and answering mail.	15	6	19	1
13. Examining reports.	4	28	10	16
14. Preparing and writing reports, etc.	3	47	12	11
15. Reading technical publications.	15	6	19	1
16. Writing for publication.	19	0	18	2
17. Thinking and reflection.	7	24	2	52
18. Mathematical computation.	18	4	14	7
19. Preparing charts, tables, etc.	14	9	15	5
20. Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, etc.	12	13	11	15

The second ranked activity that was actually engaged in was "attending committee meetings and conferences" with a raw score of sixty-three. This activity was listed by nineteen principals, but not in as high a position as the first ranked one. It was noted by thirteen principals as being one of the most important activities with a raw score of thirty-eight. This placed "attending committee meetings and conferences" in the position of the fourth most important activity by this group of principals.

"Preparing and writing reports" was the activity ranked in the third position of those being actually engaged in. It was mentioned by fifteen of the twenty-eight principals in this group and received a raw score of forty-seven. This same activity was noted by only five principals as being one of the five most important activities which resulted in a raw score of eleven and a rank in the twelfth position.

The fourth most often engaged in activity by these highly considerate/highly structured principals was "examining reports." It was listed by thirteen principals, giving the activity a raw score of twenty-eight. Only eight principals listed "examining reports" as one of the five activities considered to be the most important. This gave the activity a raw score of sixteen which placed it in the tenth ranked position.

"Consulting subordinates about their personal problems" was the fifth most often engaged in activity by these highly considerate/highly structured principals. It received a raw score of twenty-seven and was noted by eleven principals in at least one of the five available positions. This same activity was ranked as the seventh most important

by these principals, a ranking very close to the actually engaged in result. Eight principals out of the twenty-eight selected it, resulting in a raw score of twenty-two.

The sixth activity which was most often engaged in by these principals was "teaching, instruction, training." It was listed by eight principals and received a raw score of twenty-five. Having received a considerably higher raw score of fifty-one and a ranking of third was the same activity, but in the most important category. In this case "teaching, instruction, training" was noted by fifteen principals.

Another activity in which the actually engaged in ranking was lower than the most important ranking was "thinking and reflection." It was ranked seventh and second respectively. "Thinking and reflection" received an actually engaged in raw score of twenty-four by seven principals and a most important raw score of fifty-two by thirteen principals.

"Consulting subordinates about their work, training, etc." was also ranked in the seventh position of activities which were actually engaged in. Receiving a raw score of twenty-four, it was mentioned by nine principals in this highly considerate/highly structured group. This was the fifth most important activity, which received a raw score of thirty-five by thirteen of these twenty-eight principals.

The ninth ranked activity in the actually engaged in category was "consulting superiors about technical matters." This activity was selected by seven principals as one of the five most often engaged in, receiving a raw score of twenty. This activity was ranked seventh

in the most important category, which received a raw score of twenty-two. There were nine principals in this group who listed "consulting superiors about technical matters" somewhere in their selections.

"Consulting peers" was ranked as the tenth most often engaged in activity by the eight principals who mentioned it, thus receiving a raw score of nineteen. This same activity was ranked considerably higher, sixth, by the eleven principals who listed it as one of their most important. In this case, "consulting peers" received a raw score of twenty-seven.

The eleventh ranked activity which was actually engaged in by these highly considerate/highly structured principals was "consulting superiors about personal matters." It received a raw score of seventeen by the five principals who listed it as one of their selections. This activity was ranked as the twelfth most important while receiving a raw score of eleven by the four principals who listed it.

"Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools" was ranked as the twelfth most often engaged in activity by this group. It was listed by only four principals and received a raw score of thirteen. Ranked in relatively the same position, eleventh, this activity was selected by five principals as their most important. It received a raw score of fifteen.

The thirteenth most often engaged in activity was "consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates," which was listed by three principals. It received a raw score of ten. This same activity was considered to be the ninth most important activity by these principals. It was ranked in one of the top five positions by

six principals while receiving a raw score of twenty-one.

The remaining activities which were most often engaged in received rankings of fourteenth or lower and corresponding raw scores of nine through zero. These same activities in no case received more than seven points for any of their raw scores and were ranked from fourteenth through nineteenth in the most important activity category.

Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

The division of the 108 principals into four subgroups was determined by computing the mean and median for the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Group II consists of twenty-six principals having their Consideration scores above the median of 56.5 and mean of 56.6 and their Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and mean of 47.4. The LOQ scores for the principals in Group II are:

<u>Principal</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Structure</u>
2	Atlanta, Georgia	61	44
6	Atlanta, Georgia	63	39
7	Atlanta, Georgia	65	44
9	Atlanta, Georgia	59	39
12	Atlanta, Georgia	63	36
13	Atlanta, Georgia	57	45
15	Atlanta, Georgia	65	44
16	Atlanta, Georgia	59	42
19	Peoria, Illinois	57	37
46	Vero Beach, Florida	60	46
48	Vero Beach, Florida	62	44
51	Omaha, Nebraska	60	31
53	Omaha, Nebraska	67	46
54	Omaha, Nebraska	63	46
55	Omaha, Nebraska	61	35
56	Omaha, Nebraska	58	43
57	Omaha, Nebraska	57	41
59	Phoenix, Arizona	65	47
62	Phoenix, Arizona	68	36
73	Panaca, Nevada	61	28

<u>Principal</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Structure</u>
74	Panaca, Nevada	63	35
79	Clinton, Tennessee	62	40
80	Clinton, Tennessee	67	42
83	Pikeville, Tennessee	59	42
103	Sarasota, Florida	62	43
107	Orange, Virginia	65	42

Following are the data from the Principal Activity Questionnaire in which the principals were asked to select the five activities they most often engaged in (considering number of minutes) during the implementation of the district's MCT program and the five activities (in order of importance) they saw as being the most important in the development of the district's program.

The following table contains two sets of scores for the highly considerate/lowly structured principals. The first set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities actually engaged in during the implementation of the new program. The second set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities considered to be the most important during the implementation of the new program. The raw scores were established by assigning five points to the highest ranked activity, four points to the second ranked activity, three points to the third ranked activity, two points to the fourth ranked activity and one point to the fifth ranked activity. These point values were added for each activity, thus determining their ranks.

The top ranked activity for both the actually engaged in category and the most important category, was "observation, inspection, examination." This activity received considerably more points in its raw score than any other and was one of the few activities to be ranked in

Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

<u>People Related Activities</u>	<u>Activities Actually Engaged in</u>		<u>Activities Considered Most Important</u>	
	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>
1. Attending committee meetings and conferences.	2	43	5	27
2. Consulting superiors about technical matters.	11	13	11	15
3. Consulting superiors about personal matters.	13	10	14	7
4. Consulting peers (members at same echelon).	9	20	7	22
5. Consulting subordinates about their work, training, etc.	3	40	3	46
6. Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, etc.	6	27	4	31
7. Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.	10	15	7	22
8. Teaching, instruction, training.	5	32	2	52
9. Making speeches, addresses, talks.	14	8	13	8
10. Attending meetings of outside groups.	17	0	17	1
<u>Individual Activities</u>				
11. Observation, inspection, examination.	1	68	1	73
12. Reading and answering mail.	15	7	17	1
13. Examining reports.	4	35	10	18
14. Preparing and writing reports, etc.	7	26	9	20
15. Reading technical publications.	15	7	12	13
16. Writing for publication.	17	0	19	0
17. Thinking and reflection.	8	25	6	25
18. Mathematical computation.	17	0	19	0
19. Preparing charts, tables, etc.	16	3	16	4
20. Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, etc.	12	11	15	5

the same position for both categories. It was listed as one of the five activities most often engaged in by eighteen of the twenty-six principals in this highly considerate/lowly structured group and by twenty principals as one of the five most important activities.

The second ranked activity that was actually engaged in was "attending committee meetings and conferences" with a raw score of forty-three. This activity was selected by fourteen principals. It was noted by eleven principals as being one of the most important activities with a raw score of twenty-seven. This placed "attending committee meetings and conferences" in the position of the fifth most important activity by this group of principals.

"Consulting subordinates about their work, training" was one of the activities ranked in the same position, third, for both categories. It was selected as one of the five activities most often engaged in by twelve of the twenty-six principals and again by twelve as one of the five most important activities. This activity received raw scores of forty and forty-six respectively.

The fourth most often engaged in activity by these highly considerate/lowly structured principals was "examining reports." It was listed by thirteen principals, giving the activity a raw score of thirty-five. Only nine principals listed "examining reports" as one of the five activities considered to be the most important. This gave the activity a raw score of eighteen which placed it in the tenth ranked position.

"Teaching, instruction, training" was the fifth most often engaged in activity by these highly considerate/lowly structured

principals. It received a raw score of thirty-two and was noted by eight principals in at least one of the five available positions. This same activity was ranked as the second most important by these principals. Fourteen out of the twenty-six in this group selected it, which resulted in a raw score of fifty-two.

The sixth ranked activity which was most often engaged in by these principals was "consulting subordinates about their personal problems, etc." It was listed by ten principals and received a raw score of twenty-seven. Having received a slightly higher raw score of thirty-one and a ranking of fourth was the same activity, but this time in the most important category. It was selected by eleven different principals.

"Preparing and writing reports, etc." was the seventh most often engaged in activity with a raw score of twenty-six and a frequency of ten principals. This same activity was selected by nine principals as one of the five most important activities which resulted in a rank of ninth and a raw score of twenty.

The eighth ranked activity in the actually engaged in category was "thinking and reflection." This activity was selected by six principals as one of the five most often engaged in, receiving a raw score of twenty-five. This activity was ranked sixth in the most important category, also receiving a raw score of twenty-five. There were ten principals in this group who listed "thinking and reflection" somewhere in their selections.

"Consulting peers" was ranked as the ninth most often engaged in activity by the eight principals who mentioned it, thus receiving a

raw score of twenty. This same activity was ranked slightly higher, seventh, by the eight principals who listed it as one of their most important. In this case, "consulting peers" received a raw score of twenty-two.

The tenth ranked activity which was actually engaged in by these highly considerate/lowly structured principals was "consulting persons other than superiors peers or subordinates." It received a raw score of fifteen by the six principals who listed it as one of their selections. This activity was ranked as the seventh most important while receiving a raw score of twenty-two by the nine principals who listed it.

"Consulting superiors about technical matters" was another of the activities ranked in the same position, eleventh, for both categories. It was selected as one of the five activities, most often engaged in by six of the twenty-six principals and again by five of them as one of the most important. This activity received raw scores of thirteen and fifteen respectively.

The thirteenth most often engaged in activity was "consulting, superiors about personal matters," which was listed by three principals. It received a raw score of ten. This same activity was considered to be the fourteenth most important by these principals. It was ranked in one of the top five positions by only two principals while receiving a raw score of seven.

The remaining activities which were most often engaged in received ranks of fourteenth or lower and corresponding raw scores of eight through zero. These same activities received raw scores of

thirteen through zero while being ranked in positions thirteenth to nineteenth in the most important category.

Lowly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

The division of the 108 principals into four subgroups was determined by computing the mean and median for the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Group III consists of twenty-nine principals having their Consideration scores below the median of 56.5 and mean of 56.6 and their Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and mean of 47.4. The LOQ scores for the principals in Group III are:

<u>Principal</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Structure</u>
3	Atlanta, Georgia	47	51
17	Atlanta, Georgia	49	64
20	Peoria, Illinois	38	52
21	Peoria, Illinois	53	49
23	Peoria, Illinois	50	50
24	Peoria, Illinois	52	57
26	Peoria, Illinois	55	67
27	Peoria, Illinois	55	71
28	Peoria, Illinois	54	51
29	Peoria, Illinois	50	53
31	Peoria, Illinois	51	60
32	Peoria, Illinois	53	50
34	Gary, Indiana	45	57
40	Gary, Indiana	48	50
42	Gary, Indiana	49	48
63	Berea, Ohio	50	51
68	Covington, Georgia	56	55
71	Covington, Georgia	52	59
75	Panaca, Nevada	52	52
77	Clinton, Tennessee	51	56
84	Glendale, Arizona	51	55
86	Glendale, Arizona	56	56
88	Austin, Texas	50	52
96	Lovelock, Nevada	43	48
100	Gardnerville, Nevada	53	50
102	Sarasota, Florida	52	51
106	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	49	59
108	Camden, Tennessee	56	48

Following are the data from the Principal Activity Questionnaire, in which the principals were asked to select the five activities they most often engaged in (considering number of minutes) during the implementation of the district's MCT program and the five activities (in order of importance) they saw as being the most important in the development of the district's program.

The following table contains two sets of scores for the lowly considerate/highly structured principals. The first set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities actually engaged in during the implementation of the new program. The second set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities considered to be the most important during the implementation of the new program. The raw scores were established by assigning five points to the highest ranked activity, four points to the second ranked activity, three points to the third ranked activity, two points to the fourth ranked activity and one point to the fifth ranked activity. These point values were added for each activity, thus determining their ranks.

The top ranked activity, for both the actually engaged in category and the most important category was "observation, inspection, examination." It was one of the few activities to be ranked in the same position for both categories. This activity received a much higher raw score, seventy-five, than any other activity in the actually engaged in category. It was listed as one of the five activities most often engaged in by twenty-two of the twenty-nine principals in this lowly considerate/highly structured group and as one of the five most

Lowly Structured/Highly Considerate Principals

<u>People Related Activities</u>	<u>Activities Actually Engaged in</u>		<u>Activities Considered Most Important</u>	
	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>
1. Attending committee meetings and conferences.	2	60	4	39
2. Consulting superiors about technical matters.	6	30	7	20
3. Consulting superiors about personal matters.	16	7	17	4
4. Consulting peers (members at same echelon).	7	28	5	37
5. Consulting subordinates about their work, training, etc.	9	18	9	18
6. Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, etc.	10	14	10	12
7. Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.	16	7	11	11
8. Teaching, instruction, training.	3	47	2	74
9. Making speeches, addresses, talks.	12	10	13	7
10. Attending meetings of outside groups.	12	10	13	7
<u>Individual Activities</u>				
11. Observation, inspection, examination.	1	75	1	76
12. Reading and answering mail.	15	8	19	2
13. Examining reports.	5	34	6	24
14. Preparing and writing reports, etc.	8	21	15	5
15. Reading technical publications.	12	10	12	10
16. Writing for publication.	19	0	15	5
17. Thinking and reflection.	4	40	3	59
18. Mathematical computation.	19	0	20	1
19. Preparing charts, tables, etc.	18	3	17	4
20. Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, etc.	11	13	7	20

important activities by twenty-three principals.

The second ranked activity that was actually engaged in was "attending committee meetings and conferences" with a raw score of sixty. This activity was selected in at least one of the five positions by fifteen principals. It was noted by thirteen principals as being one of the most important activities with a raw score of thirty-nine. This placed "attending committee meetings and conferences" in the position of the fourth most important activity by this group.

"Teaching, instruction, training" was the third most often engaged in activity, with a raw score of forty-seven. It was mentioned in at least one of the five positions by seventeen principals. This activity received a higher ranking, second, in the most important category with a raw score of seventy-four. It was listed as one of the five most important activities by twenty of the twenty-nine principals in this group.

The fourth ranked activity, "thinking and reflection," was selected by ten principals as being one of the activities most often engaged in. It had a raw score of forty in this category while receiving a raw score of fifty-nine in the most important category. This gave "thinking and reflection" a rank of third while being selected by fifteen principals in this category of activities considered to be the most important.

"Examining reports" was the fifth most often engaged in activity by these lowly considerate/highly structured principals. It received a raw score of thirty-four and was noted by fourteen principals in at least one of the five available positions. This same activity was

ranked as the sixth most important by these principals. Eleven out of the twenty-nine in this group selected it, which resulted in a raw score of twenty-four.

The sixth ranked activity which was most often engaged in by these principals was "consulting superiors about technical matters." It was listed by nine principals and received a raw score of thirty. Only six principals listed "consulting superiors about technical matters" as one of the five activities considered to be the most important. This gave the activity a raw score of twenty which placed it in the seventh ranked position.

"Consulting peers" was ranked as the seventh most often engaged in activity by the eleven principals who mentioned it, thus receiving a raw score of twenty-eight. This same activity was ranked slightly higher, fifth, by the twelve principals who listed it as one of their most important. In this case, "consulting peers" received a raw score of thirty-seven.

The eighth ranked activity in the actually engaged in category was "preparing and writing reports." This activity was selected by seven principals as one of the most often engaged in, receiving a raw score of twenty-one. This activity was ranked fifteenth in the most important category, having received a raw score of five. There were only three principals in this group who listed "preparing and writing reports" somewhere in their selections.

"Consulting subordinates about their work, training" was the ninth most often engaged in activity with a raw score of eighteen and a frequency of only six principals. This same activity was again

selected by six principals as one of the five most important activities which resulted in a rank of ninth and a raw score of eighteen.

"Consulting subordinates about their personal problems" was another of the activities ranked in the same position, tenth, for both categories. It was selected as one of the five activities most often engaged in by seven of the twenty-nine principals and again by seven of them as one of the most important. This activity received raw scores of fourteen and twelve respectively.

The eleventh ranked activity which was actually engaged in by these lowly considerate/highly structured principals was "operation or use of instruments, machines, tools." It received a raw score of thirteen by the four principals who listed it as one of their choices. This same activity was considered to be the seventh most important by these principals. It was ranked in one of the top five positions by six principals while receiving a raw score of twenty.

The remaining activities which were most often engaged in received ranks of twelfth or lower and corresponding raw scores of ten through zero. These same activities received raw scores of eleven through one while being ranked in positions eleventh to twentieth in the most important category.

Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

The division of the 108 principals into four subgroups was determined by computing the mean and median for the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Group IV consists of twenty-five principals having their Consideration scores

below the median of 56.5 and mean of 56.6 and their Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and mean of 47.4. The LOQ scores for the principals in Group IV are:

<u>Principal</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Structure</u>
5	Atlanta, Georgia	52	43
10	Atlanta, Georgia	52	36
11	Atlanta, Georgia	45	47
14	Atlanta, Georgia	48	44
18	Peoria, Illinois	38	46
25	Peoria, Illinois	56	40
36	Gary, Indiana	49	43
41	Gary, Indiana	51	44
43	Vero Beach, Florida	56	46
44	Vero Beach, Florida	52	46
45	Vero Beach, Florida	49	43
47	Vero Beach, Florida	56	40
50	Vero Beach, Florida	51	43
52	Omaha, Nebraska	55	42
64	Berea, Ohio	54	38
66	Berea, Ohio	50	40
67	Berea, Ohio	49	43
70	Covington, Georgia	49	44
76	Panaca, Nevada	56	45
81	Pikeville, Tennessee	49	35
91	Lawton, Tennessee	55	44
93	McDonough, Georgia	55	45
97	Lovelock, Nevada	56	32
98	Winnemucca, Nevada	54	44
105	Carson City, Nevada	56	47

Following are the data from the Principal Activity Questionnaire, in which the principals were asked to select the five activities they most often engaged in (considering number of minutes) during the implementation of the district's MCT program and the five activities (in order of importance) they saw as being the most important in the development of the district's program.

The following table contains two sets of scores for the lowly considerate/lowly structured principals. The first set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities actually engaged in

Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

<u>People Related Activities</u>	<u>Activities Actu- ally Engaged in Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>	<u>Activities Considered Most Important Ranks</u>	<u>Raw Scores</u>
1. Attending committee meet- ings and conferences.	4	35	6	25
2. Consulting superiors about technical matters.	9	22	7	20
3. Consulting superiors about personal matters.	13	7	15	5
4. Consulting peers (members at same echelon).	7	27	9	18
5. Consulting subordinates about their work, training, etc.	8	25	5	27
6. Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, etc.	11	12	11	12
7. Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.	12	9	10	17
8. Teaching, instruction, training.	5	33	3	46
9. Making speeches, address- ses, talks.	19	1	18	2
10. Attending meetings of outside groups.	10	20	15	5
 <u>Individual Activities</u>				
11. Observation, inspection, examination.	1	50	1	61
12. Reading and answering mail.	16	5	19	1
13. Examining reports.	6	29	4	29
14. Preparing and writing reports, etc.	3	39	7	20
15. Reading technical publications.	15	5	15	5
16. Writing for publication.	20	0	19	1
17. Thinking and reflection.	2	43	2	52
18. Mathematical computation.	18	3	11	12
19. Preparing charts, tables, etc.	17	4	13	9
20. Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, etc.	14	6	14	8

during implementation of the new program. The second set of columns lists the ranks and raw scores for the activities considered to be the most important during the implementation of the new program. The raw scores were established by assigning five points to the highest ranked activity, four points to the second ranked activity, three points to the third ranked activity, two points to the fourth ranked activity and one point to the fifth ranked activity. These point values were added for each activity, thus determining their ranks.

The top ranked activity for both the actually engaged in category and the most important category, was "observations, inspection, examination." This activity was one of the few to be ranked in the same position for both categories. It received raw scores of fifty and sixty-one respectively. This activity was listed as one of the five activities most often engaged in by sixteen of the twenty-five principals and as one of the five most important activities, again by sixteen principals.

The second ranked activity that was actually engaged in was "thinking and reflection" with a raw score of forty-three. This activity was selected in at least one of the five positions by eleven principals. It was noted by twelve principals as being one of the most important activities with a raw score of fifty-two. This placed "thinking and reflection" again in the second ranked position by this group of principals.

"Preparing and writing reports" was the third most often engaged in activity, with a raw score of thirty-nine. It was mentioned in at least one of the five positions by fourteen principals. This activity

was ranked as the seventh most important activity with a raw score of twenty and a selection frequency of twelve principals.

The fourth ranked activity, "attending committee meetings and conferences" was selected by thirteen principals as being one of the activities most often engaged in. It had a raw score of thirty-five in this category while receiving a raw score of twenty-five in the most important category. This gave "attending committee meetings and conferences" a rank of sixth while being selected by eight principals in this category of activities considered to be the most important.

"Teaching, instruction, training" was ranked as the fifth most often engaged in activity by the nine principals who mentioned it, thus having received a raw score of thirty-three. This same activity was ranked slightly higher, third, by the fourteen principals who listed it as one of their most important. In this case, "teaching, instruction, training" received a raw score of forty-six.

The sixth ranked activity in the actually engaged in category was "examining reports." This activity was selected by nine principals as one of the most often engaged in, receiving a raw score of twenty-nine. This activity was ranked fourth in the most important category, also having received a raw score of twenty-nine. There were eleven principals who listed the activity somewhere in their selections.

"Consulting peers" was the seventh most often engaged in activity with a raw score of twenty-seven and a selection frequency of nine principals. This same activity was considered to be the ninth most important by these principals with a raw score of eighteen. It was ranked in one of the top five positions of importance by nine principals

in this group.

The eighth ranked activity in the actually engaged in category was "consulting subordinates about their work, training." This activity was listed by eleven principals as one of the most often engaged in, having received a raw score of twenty-five. This activity was ranked fifth in the most important category, having received a raw score of twenty-seven. There were nine principals who noted this activity somewhere in their selections of most important activities.

"Consulting superiors about technical matters" was ranked as the ninth most often engaged in activity by the eight principals who listed it, thus having received a raw score of twenty-two. This same activity was ranked slightly higher, seventh, by the six principals who listed it as one of their most important. In this case, "consulting superiors about technical matters" received a raw score of twenty.

The tenth ranked activity most often engaged in was "attending meetings of outside groups" which received a raw score of twenty. It was selected for this category by five principals. This same activity was ranked fifteenth, but only due to one principal's selection of it as the most important, thus giving it a raw score of five.

"Consulting subordinates about their personal problems" received a raw score of twelve which determined its eleventh place rank. This was based on the selections of the most often engaged in activities by four principals. This activity was also ranked as eleventh in the most important category. The raw score again was twelve due to the selections of four principals.

The remaining activities which were most often engaged in

received ranks of twelfth through twentieth and corresponding raw scores of nine through zero. These same activities received raw scores of seventeen through one while being ranked in positions tenth through nineteenth in the most important activity category.

Factors Which Affected the Principals' Activities

After the questionnaires were scored and reviewed, a number of discrepancies became apparent. Regardless of the principals' leadership styles, there were thirty-one principals that had discrepancies between three, four or five of the activities that were considered as being the most important and those that were actually engaged in. Letters were sent to these principals which asked what prevented them from actually engaging in those activities that they saw as being the most important. Sixteen responses were returned with phone interviews being conducted with six of them in order to gain further elaboration as to the reasons for the discrepancies.

A further review of the original sample revealed another group of thirty-four principals which had discrepancies between their leadership styles and the amount of people related and individual activities the principals actually engaged in. Discrepancies in these cases were considered to be high consideration scores and low amounts of people-related activities or high structure scores and low amounts of individual activities. Letters were sent to the thirty-four principals in this group asking what caused these adjustments in their leadership styles. Seventeen responses were returned with phone interviews being conducted with six of them in order to gain further elaboration

as to the reasons for the discrepancies.

The two groups described above were combined due to the similarity which determine their selection, that is, discrepancies existed between their "actual" activities and their "ideal" activities. Thus the responses of the thirty-three principals will be examined collectively according to their leadership styles.

Group I: Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

The major constraint that caused an adjustment in these principals' leadership styles was a lack of time. One principal felt there was never enough time to do some of the activities that were considered the most important. Another stated that the lack of an assistant forced the performance of certain activities to be done in the limited amount of time available. Thus sometimes the important things were neglected. One principal cited a lack of time, but accepted the blame for not putting forth more effort. Two other principals noted reasons that could also be related to the lack of time problem. These were the abundance of paperwork required by the central office and the fact that ideas and techniques that did not work had to be discarded. The amount of paperwork was due to requests from higher bureaucratic organizations such as the state and federal governments. The opportunity for trial and error in the use of certain ideas and techniques was noted as a need to meet the changing climate of the world today.

Group II: Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

The major constraints that caused adjustments in these principals' leadership styles were the requirements by the central offices to fulfill

certain tasks. One principal noted that attendance at committee meetings and the preparation of reports prevented the participation in activities felt to be the most important. This principal stated that even a people oriented principal must complete certain reports since they can't really be delegated to teachers. These reports were the greatest sources of frustration. Another principal noted that the job was task-oriented by nature but her training, as a counselor, was people oriented. Very often one had to go to the people to get the task completed.

Group III: Lowly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

The major constraint that caused an adjustment in these principals' leadership styles was a lack of time. This was due to meetings with superiors and other support service personnel. Often these meetings were random and unscheduled. One principal related that there was no control over the variables of the schedule. It was dictated by the superintendent or other central office personnel. Another principal was in a district that allowed considerable flexibility. There was no conflict concerning the superintendent's directives since the principals had the opportunity for input. Another principal stated that directives were projected by the board of education and the superintendent and were firm and had to be carried out. This responsibility to fulfill certain assigned tasks was the reason for the adjustment to leadership style.

Group IV: Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

The major constraint that caused an adjustment in these

principals' leadership styles was a lack of time. One principal pointed out that the trivia that consumed his time prevented participation in the most important activities. More reports, more meetings, more staff, more programs, more students and more demands on time have entered the work day with no increase in available hours.

Another principal related that during school hours, people related activities took precedence, while after school, task oriented activities were most important. Another principal noted that the increased amount of paperwork and the demands of the community left little time to engage in the most important activities. One principal pointed out the great amount of time spent with community members and superiors which had to do with the positive and negative implications of the minimum competency testing program. This amount of time was misjudged which left less time to engage in the most important activities. The remaining principals cited a lack of time as the major factor which caused the adjustment in their leadership styles.

Lack of time and central office demands were the two major reasons for the discrepancies between the principals' "actual" behavior and their "ideal" behavior. These constraints were present for all four leadership styles.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

It was the purpose of this research to determine if there is a relationship between the leadership dimensions of the principal and the activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program, in this case minimum competency testing (MCT). The dimensions of the principal's leadership style, as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), were related to the principal's activities, as measured by the Principal Activity Questionnaire (PAQ).

The LOQ (a copy is contained in the appendix) developed by Fleishman during the Ohio State Leadership Studies, described one's leadership style through two dimensions, Consideration and Structure. They were defined as follows:

Consideration--Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the individual is likely to be more impersonal in relationships with group members.

Structure--Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterized individuals who play a very active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score characterizes individuals who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways.¹

¹Edwin A. Fleishman, Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1969), p. 1.

The PAQ (a copy is contained in the appendix), which was adapted from Shartle and Stogdill's Work Analysis Forms, determined whether the principal engaged in people-related activities or individual activities. They were defined as follows:

People-Related Activities - time spent in various types of contacts with persons.

Individual Activities - time spent in various types of individual effort.²

Thus the purpose of this research was to determine how the principal behaved when leading in a given situation. More specifically, the following hypotheses were tested:

- H₁ There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people-related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₂ There is a relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₃ There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of people-related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₄ There is a relationship between a highly considerate/lowly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in

²Carroll L. Shartle and Ralph M. Stogdill, Work Analysis Forms, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957), pp. 1-2.

- during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₅ There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people-related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₆ There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₇ There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of people-related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₈ There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.
- H₉ There is a relationship between the activities a principal is actually engaged in during the implementation of a new district program and the activities a principal sees as being the most important during the implementation of this program.

Procedure

A written request was made to all superintendents of education throughout the fifty states asking them to recommend school districts that had implemented minimum competency testing programs. Forty-one superintendents responded with one hundred districts being recommended.

Questionnaires were then sent to these districts asking for a brief description of their MCT programs. One of the questions asked for the purpose of the MCT standards. This was needed to distinguish a "true MCT" program from a mere "testing" program. In order for the district to be eligible for this research, the MCT standards had to be used to determine one's graduation from either high school or elementary school, or to determine one's promotion from grade to grade. Thus sixty superintendents responded as being willing to participate in this study, with programs from forty-three districts meeting the required definition of a "true MCT" program.

Letters were sent in March 1980 to the superintendents of these forty-three districts asking if they would distribute the two questionnaires (LOQ and PAQ) and a cover letter of introduction to their principals or forward their names and addresses for individual mailings. Twenty-three school districts responded resulting in a sample of 108 principals.

Upon receipt of the LOQ's and the PAQ's from all 108 principals, the instruments were scored and the principals were assigned to one of four groups. These groups were determined by the computation of the median and mean of the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the LOQ. The median of all Consideration scores was 56.5 while the mean was 56.6. The median of all Structure scores was 47.9 while the mean was 47.4. Thus the four groups were defined as follows:

- I Consideration scores above the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.

- II Consideration scores above the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.
- III Consideration scores below the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores above the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.
- IV Consideration scores below the median of 56.5 and the mean of 56.6.
Structure scores below the median of 47.9 and the mean of 47.4.

This breakdown of the sample into four subgroups, each with a distinct leadership style, was the major purpose of the LOQ.

The LOQ was a self-administered instrument to which individuals responded in terms of how frequently they thought they should engage in the behavior described in each item. Alternative answers were scored 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. Internal consistency reliabiliteis of .74 for the Consideration dimension and .80 for the Structure dimension were obtained by Fleishman using the split-half method.³ These, together with test retest reliabilities of .79 for Consideration and .71 for Structure, provided an appropriately reliable instrument.⁴ Correlations between Consideration and Structure scores for various samples were also made by Fleishman and these demonstrated no evidence of "halo" and "social desirability" tendencies. The LOQ was developed to maximize construct validity. Fleishman noted that the two dimensions measured by the questionnaire were developed by factor analysis

³Fleishman, Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, p. 1.

⁴Ibid.

procedures, and an item analysis was carried out to provide homogeneous measures of Consideration and Structure.⁵

The LOQ was reviewed by Gibb who noted, "that despite difficulties and as yet incomplete information, the LOQ is a well made instrument."⁶ Kircher, in reviewing the LOQ, indicated that overall, it is not a bad instrument. It has been developed through careful research and statistical techniques and appears to be reliable. It presents good evidence of validity, presents reasonably good norms, and seems well suited for research activities.⁷

The PAQ was an instrument adopted from the Work Analysis Forms by Shartle and Stogdill, also during the Ohio State Leadership Studies. The Work Analysis Forms listed the same activities as the PAQ, but they were separated into two groups; time spent on contact with people and time spent in individual effort. The activities listed on the Work Analysis Forms were selected by the authors because they seemed to be events that take place in all types of executive action. Individuals were asked to put the percentage of time spent in each activity described. In this study all the activities were grouped together and each principal was asked to select the five activities most often engaged in (considering the number of minutes) during the implementation of the district's MCT program and the five activities (in order

⁵Ibid., p. 2.

⁶Oscar K. Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, 2 vols (Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1972), p. 1531.

⁷Oscar K. Buros, The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, 2 vols (Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1965), p. 1191.

of importance) viewed as being the most important in the development of the district's MCT program. Scoring of the PAQ's consisted of determining whether the activities were "people-related" or "individual." These totals were used in the testing of H₁, H₃, H₅, and H₇. The PAQ's were also scored by assigning five points to the highest ranked activity, four points to the second ranked activity, three points to the third ranked activity, two points to the fourth ranked activity, and one point to the fifth ranked activity for both the Actually Engaged In scores and the Most Important scores. These totals produced the "raw score" values for each activity which were ranked in order for the four subgroups of principals. These "raw scores" and "ranks" were used in the testing of H₂, H₄, H₆, H₈ and H₉. Although validity and reliability measures were established for the Work Analysis Forms, the measures were not investigated for this research.

Following in this chapter is an intra-group analysis of each of the four groups of principals and an inter-group analysis among the same.

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS

Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

The data concerning the amount of people-related activities/individual activities selected by this group of Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals are as follows:

<u>Number of People-Related Activities</u>	<u>Number of Individual Activities</u>	<u>Number of Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of Group I Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of TOTAL Principals</u>
0	5	1	3.6	.9
1	4	3	10.7	2.8
2	3	9	32.1	8.3
3	2	10	35.7	9.3
4	1	5	17.9	4.6
5	0	0	0	0

These principals, based on their LOQ scores, would be expected to exhibit highly considerate behavior characterized by mutual trust with subordinates, respect for their feelings, a climate of good rapport, and two-way communication. They would also be expected to exhibit highly structured behavior characterized by a very active role in directing group activities, defining and structuring of roles for self and subordinates toward goal attainment, planning, criticizing, and trying out new ideas.

Kerlinger noted that the best advice for handling categorical data is to calculate Chi-square, calculate the Coefficient of Contingency, calculate the percentages and then interpret the data using all the information.⁸ Thus cross tabulations of the four principal groups and the "actually engaged in" scores were computed. A review of the frequencies, listed earlier in this section, indicated a mixture of people-related activities and individual activities. The majority of principals engaged in either three people related activities and two individuals activities or vice versa. These selections indicated that nothing significant was demonstrated and was further emphasized by the

⁸Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed., (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 172.

examination of a number of statistical tests. One of the most useful of these tests is the Chi-square test of statistical significance. The value calculated was 4.44282 with ten degrees of freedom thus establishing an exact significance value of .9252. This means that the obtained results could occur "by chance" more than ninety-two times in one hundred trials, thus indicating little significance. This finding was further supported by an examination of the Coefficient of Contingency which in this case gave a value of .19878. The Contingency Coefficient is an index of the strength of the association between nominal variables. The minimum value is zero and occurs when the two variables are independent. Since the value obtained in this research was relatively close to zero it can be concluded that a very weak association existed, thus establishing that the dimensions of the principal's leadership style do not have a significant relationship to the amount of people-related and individual activities that were actually engaged in.

Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Weighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>	
<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
1	75	1	73	Observation, inspection, examination.
4	38	2	63	Attending committee meetings and conferences.
12	11	3	47	Preparing and writing reports, orders, memos.
10	16	4	28	Examining reports.
7	22	5	27	Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences, etc.
3	51	6	25	Teaching, instruction, training.
5	35	7	24	Consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits, etc.
2	52	7	24	Thinking and reflection.

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	
7	22	9	20	Consulting superiors about technical matters.
6	27	10	19	Consulting peers (members at same echelon).
12	11	11	17	Consulting superiors about personnel matters.
11	15	12	13	Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, charts, inspection forms, etc.
9	21	13	10	Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.
15	5	14	9	Preparing charts, tables and diagrams.
17	1	15	6	Reading and answering mail.
17	1	15	6	Reading technical publications.
5	5	17	5	Making speeches, addresses, talks.
14	7	18	4	Mathematical computation.
18	2	19	0	Writing for publication.
6	3	19	0	Attending meetings of outside groups.

The kind of activities engaged in by these highly considerate/highly structured principals provided a variety of results.

The top ranked activity "observation, inspection, examination," was a logical and necessary activity in the implementation of the new program. This was true regardless of the principal's leadership style. Before a principal can make effective decisions, a certain amount of information and familiarity with the program's methods and objectives must be gained. Thus the "observation, inspection, examination" activity could have involved either the condition of the present program or the implications of the proposed program. The importance of this activity was realized by the principals in their designation of it as the most important. The value of this activity should be noted because it allowed the principal to form certain opinions and ideas about the program without being committed to any one position. This gave the

principal time to weigh the implications of his role in the adoption procedure.

Consistent with this need to gain information, "examining reports" ranked fourth, a relatively high position. This activity provided the principal with another opportunity to mentally evaluate ideas that might be used in the future implementation procedure. "Examining reports" provided a chance to weigh the pros and cons of the program before being called upon to make decisions. There were numerous reports to be considered and thoroughly reviewed before a program can be put into operation: parent surveys, teacher surveys, student achievement summaries, etc. Even though "examining reports" received a low importance ranking, it was closely related to the previously discussed activity.

Another activity closely related to the above two was "thinking and reflection," ranked seventh. This would seem to be an activity that was engaged in throughout all stages of the implementation process. The major reason for its receiving a ranking lower than expected, was that cited by two principals in the interviews. They noted that there was a lack of time for a thoughtful analysis of the program and the implications of its adoption. One principal stated that there was no time for a trial and error procedure. This lack of time for experimentation neglected the use of a very helpful aspect of the implementation process. Due to the lack of "thinking and reflection," this was an understandable complaint.

A major discrepancy in ranks and weighted scores was demonstrated by the activity, "attending committee meetings and conferences."

Although a considerable amount of time was spent in meetings, the principals did not feel these sessions were very important. Often these meetings were due to a pre-determined district or superintendent policy regarding the implementation procedure of a new program. The lower importance ranking gave the impression that the principals would have preferred a less time-consuming method for the dissemination of any necessary guidelines. Meetings should be well prepared and called only when necessary information must be disseminated. Meetings called only to meet some pre-determined requirement or only for the sake of the superintendent's convenience often lack a feeling of importance.

A similar discrepancy occurred between the ranks of the activity "preparing and writing reports, orders, memos." These were very time-consuming tasks which were not considered to be of much importance. This was pointed out in a number of the interviews as being a requirement of the central office administration. Often these reports are needed by bureaucratic officials further up the hierarchical ladder such as the state or federal offices. Due to these reporting requirements, there was little any local district could have done, but comply. Based on the principals' comments, the writing of reports was the most distasteful part of the implementation process. Perhaps these writing assignments could have been delegated to another staff member.

One of the more important activities was "teaching, instruction, training." This was valued highly by the principals along with "consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits," both very similar activities. Engaging in these activities provided an ideal way for the highly considerate/highly structured principals to

disseminate the methods and procedures of the new program to the teachers involved. "Teaching, instruction, training" provided the opportunity to give direction and structure and still gave the principal time to maintain close personal relationships. Both of these dimensions are important aspects of the principals' leadership styles.

An activity which also involved working with teachers but for different reasons was, "consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences." This activity received a similar ranking in the importance category and was probably the most crucial regarding the effect of a new program on staff morale. This activity provided the principal with an opportunity to maintain a rapport with staff members who might have objected to the program's adoption. When considering that a new program could cause many teachers, some very experienced, to change their educational philosophies, the "considerateness" of the principal can be a major factor in determining the program's acceptance.

The remaining activities were not examined in depth due to the low weighted scores received. These low scores indicated that very little time had been spent engaged in them by these highly considerate/highly structured principals.

Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

The data concerning the amount of people-related activities/individual activities selected by this group of Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals are as follows:

<u>Number of People-Related Activities</u>	<u>Number of Individual Activities</u>	<u>Number of Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of Group I Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of TOTAL Principals</u>
0	5	0	0	0
1	4	3	11.5	2.8
2	3	8	30.8	7.4
3	2	10	38.5	9.3
4	1	4	15.4	3.7
5	0	1	3.8	.9

These principals, based on their LOQ scores, would be expected to exhibit highly considerate behavior characterized by mutual trust with subordinates, respect for their feelings, a climate of good rapport, and two-way communication. They would also be expected to exhibit lowly structured behavior characterized by a very inactive role in directing group activities, no defining and structuring of roles for self or subordinates toward goal attainment, little planning, no criticizing, and no attempt to try out new ideas.

Kerlinger noted that the best advice for handling categorical data is to calculate Chi-square, calculate the Coefficient of Contingency, calculate the percentages and then interpret the data using all the information.⁹ Thus cross tabulation of the four principal groups and the "actually engaged in" scores were computed. A review of the frequencies, listed earlier in this section, indicated a mixture of people-related activities and individual activities. The majority of principals engaged in either three people related activities and two individual activities or vice versa. These selections indicate that nothing significant was demonstrated and was further emphasized by the

⁹Ibid.

examination of a number of statistical tests. One of the most useful of these tests is the Chi-square test of statistical significance. The value calculated was 4.93880 with ten degrees of freedom thus establishing an exact significance value of .8952. This means that the obtained results could occur "by chance" more than eighty-nine times in one hundred trials, thus indicating little significance. This finding was further supported by an examination of the Coefficient of Contingency which in this case gave a value of .20912. The Contingency Coefficient is an index of the strength of the association between nominal variables. The minimum value is zero and occurs when the two variables are independent. Since the value obtained in this research was relatively close to zero, it can be concluded that a very weak association existed, thus establishing that the dimensions of the principals' leadership style do not have a significant relationship to the amount of people-related and individual activities that were actually engaged in.

Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	
1	73	1	68	Observation, inspection, examination.
5	27	2	43	Attending committee meetings and conferences.
3	46	3	40	Consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits, etc.
10	18	4	35	Examining reports.
2	52	5	32	Teaching, instruction, training.
4	31	6	27	Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences, etc.
9	20	7	26	Preparing and writing reports, orders, memos.
6	25	8	25	Thinking and reflection.

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Weights</u>	<u>Weights</u>	<u>Weights</u>	<u>Weights</u>	
<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
7	22	9	20	Consulting peers (members at same echelon).
7	22	10	15	Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.
11	15	11	13	Consulting superiors about technical matters.
15	5	12	11	Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, charts, inspection forms, etc.
14	7	13	10	Consulting superiors about personnel matters.
13	8	14	8	Making speeches, addresses, talks.
17	1	15	7	Reading and answering mail.
12	13	15	7	Reading technical publications.
16	4	17	3	Preparing charts, tables and diagrams.
19	0	18	0	Writing for publication.
19	0	18	0	Mathematical computation.
17	1	18	0	Attending meetings of outside groups.

The kind of activities engaged in by these highly considerate/lowly structured principals provided a mixture of results. The top ranked activity "observation, inspection, examination," was a logical and necessary activity in the implementation of the new program. This was true regardless of the principal's leadership style. Before a principal can make effective decisions, a certain amount of information and familiarity with the program's methods and objectives must be gained. Thus the "observation, inspection, examination," activity could have involved either the condition of the present program or the implications of the proposed program. The importance of this activity was realized by the principals in their designation of it as the most important. The value of this activity should be noted because it allowed the principal to form certain opinions and ideas about the program without being committed to any one position. This gave the principal time to weigh

the implications of his role in the adoption procedure.

Consistent with this need to gain information, "examining reports" ranked fourth, a relatively high position. This activity provided the principal with another opportunity to mentally evaluate ideas that might be used in the future implementation procedure. "Examining reports" provide a chance to weigh the pros and cons of the program before being called upon to make decisions. There were numerous reports to be considered and thoroughly reviewed before a program can be put into operation: parent surveys, teacher surveys, student achievement summaries, etc. In districts where the programs' adoption procedures were outlined by the upper level administration, these activities were valued by the principals because they had an opportunity to be creative leaders and express their autonomy.

An activity which also involved working with teachers, but for different reasons was "consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences." This activity received a similar ranking in the importance category and was probably the most crucial regarding the effect of a new program on staff morale. This activity provided the principal with an opportunity to maintain a rapport with staff members who might have objected to the program's adoption. When considering that a new program could cause many teachers, some very experienced, to change their educational philosophies, the "considerateness" of the principal can be a major factor in determining the program's acceptance.

A major discrepancy in ranks and weighted scores was demonstrated by the activity, "attending committee meetings and conferences."

Although a considerable amount of time was spent in meetings, the principals did not feel these sessions were very important. Often their required attendance at these meetings was due to a predetermined district or superintendent policy regarding the implementation procedure of a new program. The lower importance ranking gave the assumption that the principals would have preferred a less time-consuming method for the dissemination of any necessary guidelines. Since these meetings were arranged by a higher level of administration, the principals felt somewhat frustrated in their lack of control.

"Preparing and writing reports, orders, memos" was an activity not engaged in a great deal of time, while also not being considered very important, by these principals. This unimportance was due to the fact that they were lowly structured and thus little value was given to this opportunity to provide direction through written memos. Thus the rankings of this activity were consistent with the leadership styles of these highly considerate/lowly structured principals. The high consideration aspect of one's style resulted in a more person-to-person type of dissemination process.

The remaining activities were not examined in depth due to the low weighted scores received. These low scores indicated that very little time had been spent engaged in them by this group of principals.

Lowly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

The data concerning the amount of People Related Activities/ Individual Activities selected by this group of Lowly Considerate/ Highly Structured Principals are as follows:

<u>Number of People Related Activities</u>	<u>Number of Individual Activities</u>	<u>Number of Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of Group III Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of TOTAL Principals</u>
0	5	0	0	0
1	4	3	10.3	2.8
2	3	9	31.0	8.3
3	2	13	44.8	12
4	1	4	13.8	3.7
5	0	0	0	0

These principals, based on their LOQ scores, would be expected to exhibit lowly considerate behavior characterized by impersonal relations with group members, a lack of mutual trust with them, a climate of poor rapport, and no two-way communication. They would also be expected to exhibit highly structured behavior characterized by a very active role in directing group activities, defining and structuring roles for self and subordinates toward goal attainment, planning, criticizing, and trying out new ideas.

Kerlinger noted that the best advise for handling categorical data is to calculate Chi-square, calculate the Coefficient of Contingency, calculate the percentages and then interpret the data using all the information.¹⁰ Thus cross tabulations of the four principal groups and the "actually engaged in" scores were computed. A review of the frequencies, listed earlier in this section, indicated a mixture of people-related activities and individual activities. The majority of principals engaged in either three people related activities and two individual activities or vice versa. These selections indicated that nothing significant was demonstrated and was further emphasized by the

¹⁰Ibid.

examination of a number of statistical tests. One of the most useful of these is the Chi-square test of statistical significance. The value calculated was 4.93880 with ten degrees of freedom thus establishing an exact significance value of .8952. This means that the obtained results could occur "by chance" more than eighty-nine times in one hundred trials, thus indicating little significance. This finding was further supported by an examination of the Coefficient of Contingency which in this case gave a value of .20912. The Contingency Coefficient is an index of the strength of the association between nominal variables. The minimum value is zero and occurs when the two variables are independent. Since the value obtained in this research was relatively close to zero it can be concluded that a very weak association existed, thus establishing that the dimensions of the principals' leadership style do not have a significant relationship to the amount of people-related and individual activities that were actually engaged in.

Lowly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	
1	76	1	75	Observation, inspection, examination.
4	59	2	60	Attending committee meetings and conferences.
2	74	3	47	Teaching, instruction, training.
3	59	4	40	Thinking and reflection.
6	24	5	34	Examining reports.
7	20	6	30	Consulting superiors about technical matters.
5	37	7	28	Consulting peers (members at same echelon).
15	5	8	21	Preparing and writing reports, orders, memos.
9	18	9	18	Consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits, etc.

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Weights</u>	<u>Scores</u>	<u>Weights</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
10	12	10	14	Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences, etc.
7	20	11	13	Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, charts, inspection forms, etc.
13	7	12	10	Making speeches, addresses, talks.
13	7	12	10	Attending meetings of outside groups.
12	10	12	10	Reading technical publications.
19	2	15	8	Reading and answering mail.
11	11	16	7	Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.
17	4	18	3	Preparing charts, tables and diagrams.
17	4	19	0	Mathematical computation.
20	1	19	0	Writing for publication.

The kind of activities engaged in by these lowly considerate/highly structured principals provided a variety of results. The top ranked activity "observation, inspection, examination," was a logical and necessary activity in the implementation of the new program. This was true regardless of the principal's leadership style. Before a principal can make effective decisions, a certain amount of information and familiarity with the program's methods and objectives must be gained. Thus the "observation, inspection, examination" activity could have involved either the condition of the present program or the implications of the proposed program. The importance of this activity was realized by the principals in their designation of it as the most important. The value of this activity should be noted since it allowed the principal to form certain opinions and ideas about the program without being committed to any one position. This gave the principal the time to weigh the implications of his role in the program's

adoption procedure.

Consistent with this need to gain information, "examining reports" ranked fifth, still a relatively high position. This provided the principal with another opportunity to mentally evaluate ideas that might be used in the future implementation procedure. "Examining reports" provided a chance to weigh the pros and cons of the program before being called upon to make decisions. There were numerous reports to be considered and thoroughly reviewed before a program can be put into operation: parent surveys, teacher surveys, student achievement summaries, etc. Even though "examining reports" received a low importance ranking, it was closely related to the previously discussed activity.

Another activity closely related to the above two was "thinking and reflection," ranked fourth. This activity would seem to be one that was engaged in throughout all stages of the implementation process. These principals gave "thinking and reflection" a high importance ranking and also spent a considerable amount of time engaged in it. The reason for this was the highly structured aspects of the principals' leadership styles. This group sought to have procedures directed and organized. Structured and well-planned implementation procedures often increase the acceptance of a program. This acceptance is due to confidence that the leaders know what they are doing. Thus they spent much time in planning and outlining the stages that the program's adoption must follow. This was the role of the principals who were allowed the flexibility to utilize their leadership styles.

A further demonstration that this group was allowed certain

flexibility in their implementation procedures was the fact that the second most important activity, "teaching, instruction, training" was engaged in often enough to be ranked third. This activity, along with "consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits," ranked ninth, provided an ideal method for these lowly considerate/highly structured principals to give the adoption procedure the direction and guidance desired. These activities gave this group the opportunity to put their personal leadership touch to the program. This involvement increased the motivation of the principals to make the program a success since they had a stake in the implementation process.

A somewhat surprising result was the relatively high importance ranking that the activity "attending committee meetings and conferences" received. This high ranking pointed out that since these principals had more opportunity for input at the meetings, they felt the sessions were of more value. This is an important finding and relevant to all administrators. When meetings are well-planned and considered to be important, the whole program benefits and gains acceptance.

Two similarly related activities, "consulting superiors about technical matters" and "consulting peers" again demonstrated the give-and-take approach used by these principals. Apparently they spent much time seeking advice and help from their fellow principals and their central office personnel. This was an excellent way to exchange ideas and get a feel as to how a proposed plan sounds to the superintendent or a neighboring principal before implementing it. This dialogue resulted in a decrease of wasted effort which is characteristic of a trial and error process. This two-way communication between the

principals and the central office led to the program's adoption based on the district's needs.

A discrepancy was evident in this group's rank and weighted scores of the "preparing and writing reports, orders, memos" activity. This was the eighth highest activity engaged in while being ranked fifteenth in importance. One reason for this result was that written-memos did not readily offer the opportunity for input and dialogue. When reports such as those written for higher level administrators are considered unimportant, the quality of that report also suffers.

The remaining activities were not examined in depth due to the low weighted scores received. These low scores indicated that very little time had been spent engaged in them by this group of lowly considerate/highly structured principals.

Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

The data concerning the amount of People Related Activities/ Individual Activities selected by this group of Lowly Considerate/ Lowly Structured Principals are as follows:

<u>Number of People Related Activities</u>	<u>Number of Individual Activities</u>	<u>Number of Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of Group IV Principals</u>	<u>Per Cent of TOTAL Principals</u>
0	5	0	0	0
1	4	3	12	2.8
2	3	8	32	7.4
3	2	9	36	8.3
4	1	5	20	4.6
5	0	0	0	0

These principals, based on their LOQ scores, would be expected to exhibit lowly considerate behavior characterized by impersonal relations with group members, a lack of mutual trust with them, a climate

of poor rapport, and no two-way communication. They would also be expected to exhibit lowly structured behavior characterized by a very inactive role in directing group activities, no defining and structuring of roles for self and subordinates toward goal attainment, little planning, no criticizing, and no attempt to try out new ideas.

Kerlinger noted that the best advice for handling categorical data is to calculate Chi-square, calculate the Coefficient of Contingency, calculate the percentages and then interpret the data using all the information.¹¹ Thus cross tabulations of the four principal groups and the "actually engaged in" scores were computed. A review of the frequencies, listed earlier in this section, indicated a mixture of people-related activities and individual activities. The majority of principals engaged in either three people related activities and two individual activities or vice versa. These selections indicated that nothing significant was demonstrated and was further emphasized by the examination of a number of statistical tests. One of the most useful of these is the Chi-square test of statistical significance. The value calculated was 4.44282 with ten degrees of freedom thus establishing an exact significance value of .9252. This means that the obtained results could occur "by chance" more than ninety-two times in one hundred trials, thus indicating little significance.

This finding was further supported by an examination of the Coefficient of Contingency which in this case gave a value of .19878. The Contingency Coefficient is an index of the strength of the association

¹¹Ibid.

between nominal variables. The minimum value is zero and occurs when the two variables are independent. Since the value obtained in this research was relatively close to zero it can be concluded that a very weak association existed thus establishing that the dimensions of the principals' leadership style do not have a significant relationship to the amount of people-related and individual activities that were actually engaged in.

Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Weights</u>	<u>Scores</u>	<u>Weights</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
1	61	1	50	Observation, inspection, examination.
2	52	2	43	Thinking and reflection.
7	20	3	39	Preparing and writing reports, orders, memos.
6	25	4	35	Attending committee meetings and conferences.
3	46	5	33	Teaching, instruction, training.
4	29	6	29	Examining reports.
9	18	7	27	Consulting peers (members at same echelon).
5	27	8	25	Consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits, etc.
17	20	9	22	Consulting superiors about technical matters.
15	5	10	20	Attending meetings of outside groups.
11	12	11	12	Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences, etc.
10	17	12	9	Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.
15	5	13	7	Consulting superiors about personnel matters.
14	8	14	6	Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, charts, inspection forms, etc.
15	5	15	5	Reading technical publications.
19	1	15	5	Reading and answering mail.
13	9	17	4	Preparing charts, tables, and diagrams.
11	12	18	3	Mathematical computation.

<u>Most Important</u>		<u>Actually Engaged In</u>		<u>Activities</u>
<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	<u>Ranks</u>	<u>Weighted Scores</u>	
18	2	19	1	Making speeches, addresses, talks.
19	1	20	0	Writing for publication.

The kind of activities engaged in by these lowly considerate/lowly structured principals provided a mixture of results. The top ranked activity, "observation, inspection, examination," was a logical and necessary activity in the implementation of the new program. This was true regardless of the principal's leadership style. Before a principal can make effective decisions, a certain amount of information and familiarity with the program's methods and objectives must be gained. Thus the "observation, inspection, examination" activity could have involved either the condition of the present program or the implications of the proposed program. The importance of this activity was realized by the principals in their designation of it as the most important. The value of this activity should be noted because it allowed the principal to form certain opinions and ideas about the program without being committed to any one position. This gave the principal time to weigh the implications of his role in the adoption procedure.

Consistent with this need to gain information, "examining reports" ranked sixth, still a relatively high position. This activity provided the principal with another opportunity to mentally evaluate ideas that might be used in the future implementation procedure. "Examining reports" provided a chance to weigh the pros and cons of the program before being called upon to make decisions. There were numerous reports to be considered and thoroughly reviewed before a program can be put

into operation: parent surveys, teacher surveys, student achievement summaries, etc. "Examining reports" along with the previously discussed activity were considered very worthwhile since they received importance rankings of sixth and fourth respectively.

Another activity closely related to the above two was "thinking and reflection," ranked second in both categories. This would seem to be an activity that was engaged in throughout all stages of the implementation process. It is not surprising for the principals to give this activity a high importance score, but it is unusual for them to be able to devote as much time doing it as they did. Not only did the interviews make no mention of these principals being allowed more input into their districts' implementation procedures; but also the rankings of the activities in the other categories did not support this increased input idea. Thus these principals did a good job in finding the time to plan and analyze the proposed steps which needed to be carried out. The only other conclusion that can be drawn would be that the time spent in "thinking and reflection" was not wisely utilized. "Thinking and reflection" must be accompanied by some definite action to be worthwhile.

A noted discrepancy occurred between the rankings of the activity "preparing and writing reports, orders, memos." These were very time-consuming tasks which were not considered to be of much importance. This discrepancy was emphasized in the interview results as being a requirement of the central office administration. This increased paperwork left little time to engage in some of the more meaningful activities. Often these reports are needed by bureaucratic officials

further up the hierarchical ladder, such as the state or federal departments. When reports such as these are considered unimportant, the quality of the work suffers. Based on the principals' comments, the trivia of paperwork was the most distasteful part of the implementation process.

Two of the more important activities were "teaching, instruction, training" and "consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits." Engaging in these activities provided an ideal way for these principals to disseminate the methods and procedures of the new program to the teachers involved. Since these principals were low in both consideration and structure, it cannot be determined if they felt these were enjoyable activities or not. Perhaps they were required by upper level administrators to perform these actions and would rather have spent the time engaged in "thinking and reflection." This choice could imply that they are not action-oriented principals. These activities provided an opportunity to add structure to the program but whether they were utilized or not depended on the principal's style.

Another discrepancy in ranks and weighted scores was demonstrated by the activity "attending committee meetings and conferences." Although much time was spent in meetings, the principals did not feel these sessions very worthwhile. Often these meetings were due to a predetermined district or superintendent policy regarding the implementation procedure of a new program. The lower importance ranking gave the assumption that the principals would have preferred a less time-consuming method for the dissemination of any necessary guidelines. The whole program benefits when committee meetings are well-planned

and viewed as being important by those in attendance.

The remaining activities were not examined in depth due to the low weighted scores received. These low scores indicated that very little time had been spent engaged in them by these lowly considerate/lowly structured principals.

INTER-GROUP ANALYSIS

An analysis of the kind of activities actually engaged in by the four principal groups revealed a number of similarities (for purposes of this analysis, similar ranks are those with a difference of three or less between the groups' highest scores and lowest scores) and differences (for purposes of this analysis different ranks are those with a difference of more than four between the groups' highest scores and lowest scores). In first looking at the similarities among the principals, the most striking was that all the groups ranked "observation, inspection, examination" as first. It was also listed as the most important activity by all groups. This listing demonstrated that, regardless of the principal's leadership style, the need to gather information and become knowledgeable about the proposed program was of utmost concern. Since all four groups of principals engaged so often in the same activity, it can be said with certainty that the activity was independent of leadership style. The need to become familiar with the implications of a new district program was of such overriding importance that the principal's leadership style was sacrificed for the sake of the program's acceptance.

Another common activity in which considerable time was spent was

"attending committee meetings and conferences." This was ranked second by all groups except the lowly considerate/lowly structured principals, in which case it was ranked fourth. Based on the fact that this activity received lower importance rankings for all four groups it can be concluded that these principals attended the meetings and conferences because they had to. Also noted during the interviews, by principals in all four groups, was the considerable involvement of central office administrators in determining some of the implementation procedures, such as these many meetings and conferences. These were found to be very time-consuming and of questionable value and were considered one of the adjustments the principals made to their leadership styles. Since the ranked positions were so close, this was an activity independent of leadership style.

There were a number of activities which received similar rankings by two or more groups. One of these was "examining reports," receiving two fourths, one fifth and one sixth. This was very closely related to the highest ranked activity and seemed to be an excellent way for the principals to become acquainted with the proposed program and its implications. "Examining reports" was an activity that was present in a considerable amount, regardless of the principal's leadership style. Since the ranks varied by only two positions, this was another activity that proved to be independent of leadership style.

Another activity with two or more similar ranks was "teaching, instruction, training," which received one third, two fifths and one sixth. Thus it also proved to be an activity independent of leadership style. "Teaching, instruction, training" was an activity that provided

the best means of communicating the program's methods to the teachers and staff. It gave the principals the opportunity to put their personal touch on the program. It was an activity that principals found enjoyable because it released them from the trivia of paperwork and sitting behind the desk.

"Consulting peers" was one last activity with two or more similar ranks. This consultation with other principals would seem to be a very valuable and necessary component in the implementation process. Being able to discuss different techniques and hear what was working in a colleague's school would have proved invaluable as a time saver and eliminator of wasted effort. This activity, due to its similar ranks, also proved to be independent of leadership style.

One activity with different ranks was "consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits." This was closely related to the activity "teaching, instruction, training" since it involved an interaction with teachers concerning the program's methods and techniques. This activity allowed the principals to communicate the structure and direction they wanted the program to have. Since the ranks received were higher for the highly considerate groups than for the lowly considerate groups, there seemed to be a mild relationship here. Thus the presence of this activity was dependent on the "consideration" dimension of the principal's leadership style, with the "structure" dimension showing no relationship. This was surprising since this activity would have provided the ideal opportunity for the highly structured principals to give the program the direction desired. Again, the influences of the district's or superintendent's policies

were felt.

Another activity with different ranks was "consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences." This activity also involved an interaction with teachers, but in this case it concerned a different purpose. This activity allowed the principals to take a personal interest in the teachers. This was crucial since the implementation of a new program caused many teachers to change their educational philosophies. These teachers needed the counsel and support of the principal. These ranks, following a pattern similar to the previous activity, were higher for the highly considerate groups than for the lowly considerate groups. Thus a mild relationship was shown with the presence of this activity being dependent on the "consideration" dimension of the principal's leadership style with the "structure" dimension not showing a relationship. This was a predictable result since this activity provided an opportunity for the highly considerate principal to maintain good personal relationships in working for acceptance of the program.

"Thinking and reflection" was an activity with different ranks and a surprising result. This activity provided an opportunity for the principals to plan and analyze the details of the proposed program's implementation procedure. Before making decisions and attempting to establish certain stages of the new program, careful thought and reflection was needed to avoid wasted effort. This was an activity that could have and should have been present at all stages of the implementation process. Failure to select this activity might have been an oversight in that the principals did not realize the amount of time

spent in this activity and selected others instead. The surprising thing about this activity was that the highly considerate groups engaged in this activity much less than the lowly considerate groups. In other words, the highly considerate principals were busy engaging in implementation activities while the lowly considerate principals were busy thinking about what they should do. Thus the presence of this activity was dependent on the "structure" dimension of the principal's leadership style, with the "consideration" dimension not showing a relationship.

The activity "preparing and writing reports" was an activity that proved to be related not to any leadership style but to the demands of the central office staff. It was an activity not showing any relationship to either the consideration dimension or the structure dimension, yet a considerable amount of time was devoted to it. Since it received low importance rankings, the only conclusion seemed to be that this was one of the detested paperwork responsibilities required by the bureaucratic authorities, the central office. This too was an activity not showing a relationship to the principal's leadership style.

The remaining activities were not examined in depth due to the low weighted scores received. This indicated that very little time had been spent engaged in them by these principals exhibiting the four leadership styles.

Thus there were a variety of activities actually engaged in for a variety of reasons, some related to the principal's leadership style and some independent of it.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research was to determine if there was a relationship between the leadership dimensions of the principal and the activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

The sample consisted of 108 principals from twenty-three school districts across the United States. These districts were recommended by the respective State Superintendents as having recently implemented minimum competency testing programs.

The dimensions of the principal's leadership style, Consideration and Structure, were established through the self-administered Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Based on these results, the principals were placed into one of four groups: Highly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals, Highly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals, Lowly Considerate/Highly Structured Principals and Lowly Considerate/Lowly Structured Principals. These leadership dimensions of each group were related to the principals' activities, as measured by the Principal Activity Questionnaire. This instrument listed twenty activities, people-related and individual, of which the principals were asked to select the five they most often engaged in during the implementation of the new district program. The principals also selected the five

they saw as being the most important in this implementation process. All activities selected were scored, given weighted values as determined by their positions, and ranked. Certain statistical methods of analysis were used in determining the accuracy of the hypotheses.

Conclusions

This study led to the following conclusions derived from the hypotheses, along with one ancillary conclusion.

1. There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

These principals did not distinguish between people related activities and individual activities when they engaged in the procedures needed to implement the new program. They did what they felt was necessary and important unless some other factors influenced their decisions. This could have been due to the policies of the school district or the superintendent or due to some other influential variable. Principals engaged in combinations of people related activities and individual activities regardless of their leadership style. Thus this hypothesis is rejected.

2. There is a relationship between a highly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the

implementation of a new district program.

These principals demonstrated a slight preference for activities that showed concern for staff members and those that improved faculty morale. The preferences for these kinds of activities though, were given secondary status due to the need to fulfill other responsibilities which were more important in the implementation process. These other responsibilities such as attendance at committee meetings, writing reports, and examining reports were of greater importance to the success of the new program than the principal's need to operate in a characteristic style. Although the principal's leadership style was adjusted for the sake of a successful implementation process, a slight relationship was present. Thus this hypothesis is accepted.

3. There is a significant relationship between a highly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

These principals did not distinguish between people related activities and individual activities when they engaged in the procedures necessary to implement the new program. They did what they felt was needed and important unless some other factors influenced their decisions. This could have been due to the policies of the school district or the superintendent or due to some other influential variable. Principals engaged in combinations of people related activities and individual activities regardless of their leadership style. Thus this hypothesis is rejected.

4. There is a relationship between a highly considerate/lowly

structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

These principals also showed a slight preference for activities that demonstrated concern for staff members and those that gave a priority to communication and direction. The preferences for these kinds of activities though, were given secondary status due to the need to fulfill other responsibilities which were more important in the implementation procedure. These other responsibilities such as attendance at committee meetings, the training of teachers, and examining reports were of greater importance to the success of the new program than the principal's need to operate according to a certain leadership style. Although the principal's leadership style was adjusted for the sake of a successful implementation process, a slight relationship was present. Thus this hypothesis is accepted.

5. There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

These principals did not distinguish between people related activities and individual activities when they engaged in the process needed to implement the new district program. They performed the tasks they felt were needed and important unless some other factors influenced their decisions. This could have been due to the policies of the school district or the superintendent or due to some other influential variable. Principals engaged in combinations of people related activities and individual activities regardless of their

leadership style. Thus this hypothesis is rejected.

6. There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/highly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

These principals showed a slight preference for activities that demonstrated a concern for planning and the training of teachers. The tendencies to engage in these kinds of activities were given secondary status due to the need to fulfill other responsibilities which were more important in the implementation process of the program. These other responsibilities such as attendance at committee meetings, writing reports, and examining reports were of greater importance to the success of the program than the principal's need to operate in a characteristic style. Although the principal's leadership style was adjusted for the sake of a successful implementation process, a slight relationship was present. Thus this hypothesis is accepted.

7. There is a significant relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the amount of people related and individual activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

These principals did not distinguish between people related activities and individual activities when they engaged in the procedures necessary to implement the new program. They did what they felt was needed and important unless some other factors influenced their decisions. This could have been due to the policies of the school district or the superintendent or due to some other influential variable. Principals engaged in combinations of people related activities and

individual activities regardless of their leadership style. Thus this hypothesis is rejected.

8. There is a relationship between a lowly considerate/lowly structured principal and the kind of activities engaged in during the implementation of a new district program.

These principals showed a slight preference for activities that showed concern for planning and writing reports. The tendencies to engage in these kinds of activities were given secondary status due to the need to fulfill other responsibilities which were of greater importance in the implementation process of the program. These other responsibilities such as attendance at committee meetings and writing reports, although very important to the success of the program, did not receive the same high priority from this group as from the other groups. Although the principal's leadership style was adjusted for the sake of a successful implementation procedure, it was not adjusted to the same degree as the other leadership styles. Thus this hypothesis is accepted.

9. There is a relationship between the activities a principal is actually engaged in during the implementation of a new district program and the activities a principal sees as being the most important during the implementation of this program.

Some of the activities which the principals actually engaged in during the implementation process were not those which they felt to be the most important. The principals spent considerable time in attendance at committee meetings, yet they felt teaching and training were more important.

The principals engaged in certain activities due to district or superintendent policies or some other influential variable. Any discrepancy between the activities actually engaged in and those considered to be the most important meant the principal's leadership style was adjusted for the sake of the successful implementation of the new program. Even though this discrepancy occurred, a slight relationship was present. Thus this hypothesis is accepted.

Ancillary conclusion: Activities concerned with observation, inspection, and examination are those most crucial in the implementation process of a new district program regardless of leadership style.

Observation, inspection and examination were the only activities selected by all four groups of principals as being the ones they most often engaged in and the ones they considered as the most important. This means that these activities were unaffected by any outside variables that would have caused the principals to adjust their leadership styles. Thus the principals were free to engage in what they thought were the most important activities, which they did.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, several recommendations are presented to superintendents and school boards regarding the effect of the principal's leadership style in relation to the implementation process of a new district program.

1. Be aware of the leadership styles of the district's principals. Since different people handle the superintendent's directives in different ways, knowledge of how the principals in the district might

handle a directive could determine how much structure and definition need to be provided. If a superintendent wants a program implemented in a certain way, then the guidelines might have to be very detailed in order to maintain consistency. If a superintendent wants a program to fit the needs or style of the individual school, then the guidelines could be loose and flexible.

2. Develop a structured format for the implementation process of a new district program.

3. Re-examine the need to conduct committee meetings in order to insure that the importance of the meeting is felt by all in attendance.

In addition to the recommendations for superintendents and school boards, there are recommendations to researchers for further study.

1. Examine the role of the superintendent in the implementation process of a new district program, especially in relation to the principal's role.

2. Examine the role of the school board in the implementation process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Baughman, Dale M., Anderson, Wendell, G., Smith, Mark, and Wiltse, Earle W. Administration and Supervision of the Modern Secondary School. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., 1969.
- Bradfield, Luther E., and Kraft, Leonard E. The Elementary School Principal in Action. Scranton, Penn.: International Textbook Co., 1970.
- Campbell, Donald T. Leadership and Its Effects Upon the Group. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1956.
- Campbell, Ronald F., Bridges, Edwin M., and Nystrand, Raphael O. Introduction to Educational Administration, 5th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1977.
- Faber, Charles F., and Shearron, Gilbert F. Elementary School Administration Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Fleishman, Edwin A. Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1969.
- Gorton, Richard A., and McIntyre, Kenneth E. The Senior High School Principalship. Vol. II: The Effective Principal. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.
- Grieder, Calvin, Pierce, Truman M., and Jordan, K. Forbis. Public School Administration, 3rd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1969.
- Harrison, Raymond H. Supervisory Leadership in Education. New York: American Book Co., 1968.
- Jacobson, Paul B., Logsdon, James D., and Wiegman, Robert R. The Principalship: New Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1973.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education, 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1975.
- Lipham, James M., and Hoeh Jr., James. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1974.
- Marks, James R., Stoops, Emery, and King-Stoops, Joyce. Handbook of Educational Supervision. Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc., 1971.

- Mazzarella, Jo Ann. Leadership Effectiveness. Burlingame, Ca.: Association of California School Administrators, 1979.
- Morphet, Edgar L., Johns, Roe L., and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration Concepts, Practices and Issues, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.
- Neill, Shirley Boes. The Competency Movement Problems and Solutions. Sacramento: American Association of School Administrators, 1978.
- Nolte, M. Chester. An Introduction to School Administration Selected Readings. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1966.
- Raubinger, Frederick M., Sumption, Merle R., and Kamm, Richard M. Leadership in the Secondary School. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1974.
- Saxe, Richard W. Educational Administration Today: An Introduction. Berkeley: McCutchan Pub. Corp., 1980.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Starratt, Robert J. Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.
- Snyder, Fred A., and Peterson, R. Duane. Dynamics of Elementary School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970.
- Stogdill, Ralph M., Scott, Ellis L., and Jaynes, William E. Leadership and Role Expectations. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1956.
- Stogdill, Ralph M., and Shartle, Carroll L. Patterns of Administrative Performance. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1956.
- Weldy, Gilbert R. Principals What They Do and Who They Are. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

Periodicals

- Afton, Alex. "Perceptions of the Principal's Role." NASSP Bulletin 58 (September 1974): 71-75.
- Baker Jr., Edward Draper. "A Proposal to Remake the Principalship." The National Elementary Principal 54 (September 1974): 28-44.
- Barraclough, Terry. "Management Styles." Educational Management Review Series 17 (May 1973): 1-6.
- Barth, Roland S. "The Head Nut or Reflections on School Leadership." The National Elementary Principal 58 (March 1979): 30.

- Bishop, Walter, Dedrick, Charles, and McCumsey, Norman. "An Urgent Mandate for the 1980's: Dynamic Educational Leadership." Illinois Principal 12 (September 1980): 12.
- Brandt, Ron. "On Leadership: A Conversation with James MacGregor Burns." Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 384-386.
- Burns, James MacGregor. "Two Excerpts from Leadership." Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 382.
- Campbell, Anne. "Are Instructional Leaders Still Needed." Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977): 14.
- Cawelti, Gordon. "Which Leadership Style-From the Head or Heart?" Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 378.
- Clearinghouse on Educational Management. "Leadership: Improving Its Effectiveness." Research Action Brief 1 (January 1978): 1-4.
- Clearinghouse on Educational Management. "Managerial Control: A Middle Way." Research Action Brief 2 (June 1978): 1-6.
- Clearinghouse on Educational Management. "Leadership Styles." The Best of ERIC 5 (January 1975): 1-4.
- Dagenais, Fred. "Leadership Styles of Allied Health Administrators." Journal of Allied Health 6 (Winter 1977): 31.
- Danley, W. Elzie, and Burch, Barbara G. "Effective Instructional Leader." The Clearing House 52 (October 1978): 78-79.
- Farkes, William. "Leadership Style - It all Depends." NASSP Bulletin 63 (March 1979): 29.
- Fiedler, Fred E., Lasher, Gaylord C., Lippitt, Gordon, L., Cawelti, Gordon, Hoge, James, and Snyder, Karolyn J. "Responses to Sergiovanni." Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 395.
- Fiorello, Anthony. "Leadership Concepts for Principals." NASSP Bulletin 57 (November 1973): 20.
- Firth, Gerald. "Theories of Leadership: Where Do We Stand?" Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 327-331.
- Gage, Kent H. "The Principal's Role in Implementing Mainstreaming." Educational Leadership 36 (May 1979): 575-577.
- Goodlad, John I. "Educational Leadership: Toward the Third Era." Educational Leadership 35 (January 1978): 322-331.

- Gorton, Dick. "Administrative Leadership." The Clearing House 53 (September 1979): 50-52.
- Halpin, Andrew W. "The Superintendent's Effectiveness as a Leader." Administrator's Notebook 7 (October 1958).
- Hambrick, Bill M. "Commentary: Ten Beatitudes for Successful Leadership." The National Elementary Principal 57 (June 1978): 60.
- Heichberger, Robert L. "Creating the Climate for Humanistic Change in the Elementary School with Principal as Change Agent." Education 96 (Winter 1975): 106.
- Holloway, William H., and Miazi, Ghulam. "A Study of Leadership Style, Situation Favorableness, and the Risk Taking Behavior of Leaders." The Journal of Educational Administration 16 (October 1978): 160-168.
- Houts, Paul L. "A Conversation with Keith Goldhammer." The National Elementary Principal 53 (March 1974): 27.
- Huckaby, William O. "Integrating Style and Purpose in Leadership." Educational Leadership 37 (May 1980): 613-615.
- Ingram, Ruben L. "The Principal: Instructional Leader, Site Manager, Educational Executive." Thrust 23 (April 1979): 23.
- Killian, Michael G., and Sexton, Michael J. "Climbing the Ladder to Leadership." NASSP Bulletin 63 (March 1979): 8.
- Klopf, Gordon J., Blake, Sallie M., Scheldon, Ethel S., and Burnes, Judith Crooks. "A Taxonomy of Educational Leadership." The National Elementary Principal 53 (July 1974): 54-58.
- Krajewski, Robert J. "Role Effectiveness: Theory Into Practice." Theory Into Practice 18 (February 1979): 53-58.
- Licata, Joseph W. "Is the Principal An Effective Change Agent?" NASSP Bulletin 59 (December 1975): 75-81.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E., and Grant, Ed A. "How Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents View the Principalship." NASSP Bulletin 64 (February 1980): 45-49.
- McNally, Harold J. "Summing Up." The National Elementary Principal 54 (September 1974): 6-17.
- Mills, Troy. "The Principal as Catalyst." Theory Into Practice 18 (February 1979): 21-27.

- Moyle, Colin R.J. "Principal Leader Behavior and Shared Decision Making." The Journal of Educational Administration 18 (May 1979): 39-49.
- Myers, Donald A. "The Chautauqua Papers: A Dissent." The National Elementary Principal 54 (September 1974): 19-21.
- Palmer, Walter J. "Management Effectiveness as a Function of Personality Traits of the Manager." Personnel Psychology 27 (Summer 1974): 283-284.
- Pendergrass, R.A., and Wood, Diane. "Instructional Leadership and the Principal." NASSP Bulletin 63 (March 1979): 39.
- Pharis, Bill. "U.S. Principals: The Inside Story." The National Elementary Principal 58 (March 1979): 48.
- Reavis, Charles A., and MacPhail, Betty. "Leadership Style: A Model for Choice." Planning and Changing 10 (Summer 1979): 106.
- Rebore, Ronald W. "Public Law 94-142 and the Building Principal." NASSP Bulletin 63 (April 1979): 27-28.
- Robinson, Phil Clayton. "What Skills Are Needed by Today's School Leaders." Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977).
- Sarason, Seymour B. "The Principal and the Power to Change." The National Elementary Principal 53 (July 1974): 47-53.
- _____. "Is Leadership the Next Great Training Robbery." Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979).
- Sexton, Michael J., and Switzer, Karen Dawn Dill. "Educational Leadership: No Longer a Potpourri." Educational Leadership 35 (October 1977): 24.
- Spikes, Frank. "Choosing a Personal Leadership Style." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years 3 (November 1979): 8-31.
- Vann, Allan. "Three Principals Discuss the Principal's Leadership Role." Educational Leadership 36 (March 1979): 404-406.
- Walter, James E., Caldwell, Sarah De Jarnette, and Marshall, Jon. "Evidence for the Validity of Situational Leadership Theory." Educational Leadership 37 (May 1980): 618-621.
- Wayson, William. "A New Kind of Principal." The National Elementary Principal 50 (February 1971): 9-19.
- _____. "Misconceptions about Leadership." The National Elementary Principal 55 (January 1973): 13.

Williams, Russell G. "Examining Leadership Style." The Personnel Administrator 21 (January 1976): 32-34.

Miscellaneous

Baker Jr., Edward Draper. "Change in Leadership Behavior Attitudes Effected by Participation in Basic Courses at the 16 National Outdoor Leadership School." M.S. Thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1975.

Bockman, Valerie M. "The Principal as Manager of Change." Paper presented at California Education Association Administrators' Conference, Grand Junction, Co., January 1971.

Burns, Gerald P. "The Principles of Leadership." Dissertation for Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio, 1978.

Dunifon, William S. "The Dimensions of Educational Leadership Amid the Unfamiliar." Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education, Toronto, June 1978.

Feitler, Fred C. "A Study of Principal Leader Behavior and Contrasting Organizational Environments." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, April 1972.

Fishburn, Wanda. "Differences in Professional Tasks of Elementary Principals in Rural and Urban Areas." (n.p. May 1978).

Ignatovich, Frederick R. "Types of Elementary School Principal-Leaders: AQ - Factor Analysis." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, February 1971.

Johnson, Florence DeVida H. "The Relationship Between Rule Administration and the Leadership Behavior of Black Male and Female Urban Elementary School Principals." Paper presented at the Annual National Conference on Urban Education, Norfolk, November 1977.

Krajewski, Robert J. "Role Implications of a Rank Ordering Process by Elementary Principals." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Las Vegas, April 1977.

Lucietto, Lena L. "The Verbal Behavior of Educational Administrators: An Analysis of the Language of School Principals." Paper presented to the National Center for Educational Research and Development, Washington, D.C., December 1969.

McCleary, Lloyd E. "An Essay on Role Attrition: Three Studies of the Job of the Principal." Paper presented to the University of Utah, April, 1971.

- Moy, James Y.K., and Hales, Loyde W. "Management Styles and Leadership Behavior Within a Residence Life Program." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, February 1973.
- Musella, Donald, Lawton, Steve, and Palmer, Tunde. "The Relationships Among Dogmatism, Administrative Style, Autonomy and Decision Making of Aspiring and Practicing School Principals." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., March 1975.
- Staff, Bruce S. "Personality Characteristics, Interpersonal Values and Leadership Attitudes of Mid-Level Managers." Paper 21 presented to the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Washington, D.C., September 1978.
- Stotts, Michael J. "Field Study of the Perceptions of Directors' Leader Behavior in Illinois Basic Education Centers." Paper presented to the Illinois State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, August 1968.
- Utz, Robert T. "Principal Leadership Styles and Effectiveness as Perceived by Teachers." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, April 1972.
- _____. "Conceptualizing Principal Behavior in the School Climate: A Systems Analysis." Paper presented to the University of Oklahoma.

APPENDIX A

2400 South 18th Avenue
Broadview, IL 60153
August 6, 1979

Dear Superintendent:

I am presently conducting a research study in the area of "administrative implications of minimum competency testing" as part of the requirement for my doctoral dissertation at Loyola University of Chicago. In order to do this I need to consult some of the school districts in your state concerning such administrative aspects as cost, implementation procedures, etc.

Would you please assist me in this project by recommending any school districts in your state that may have minimum competency testing programs which may be of help to me. Please list these on the attached sheet. I would appreciate any help you can give me in this study.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Matula

State of _____

Yes _____ No _____

We presently have no law requiring a competency testing program in our state.

Yes _____ No _____

We presently have a state-wide minimum competency testing program. I recommend that you contact the following districts for further information:
(Please supply contact person and address for each district listed.)

Yes _____ No _____

We presently require local districts to establish their own minimum competency testing programs. I recommend that you contact the following districts for further information: (Please supply contact person and address for each district listed.)

Yes _____ No _____

We do not fit into any of the above categories. I recommend that you contact the following person for further information:

APPENDIX B

2400 South 18th Avenue
Broadview, Illinois 60153
September 26, 1979

Dear Sir:

I am presently conducting a research study in the area of "administrative implications of minimum competency testing," as part of the requirement for my doctoral dissertation at Loyola University of Chicago. In order to do this, I need to acquire certain information concerning the implementation of your testing program. Your state superintendent of public education has suggested that I contact your district for such information.

Would you please respond to the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible? I would appreciate your time and help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Matula

P.S. If any terms in the questionnaire are not appropriate to your district, please provide any explanation you may feel is necessary. Thanks again for your time.

Competency Testing Questionnaire

Superintendent _____

District _____

Address _____

Phone _____

Number of Principals _____

Number of Teachers _____

Number of Students _____

Grade Levels in District _____

Program Coordinator _____ Position _____

1. Who initiated the idea to implement a minimum competency testing program in your district?

state mandate	Yes _____	No _____
local district decision	Yes _____	No _____
other	_____	

2. When was your program officially adopted? _____

3. What grade levels are assessed in your minimum competency testing program? _____

4. What skill areas or subjects are assessed? _____

5. Who established the minimum standards used for your program?

state board	Yes _____	No _____
local district	Yes _____	No _____
other	_____	

6. How are these minimum standards used?

to determine promotion or retention?	Yes _____	No _____
to determine graduation?	Yes _____	No _____
to diagnose remedial students?	Yes _____	No _____
to measure student progress?	Yes _____	No _____

I would be willing to provide further information concerning the implementation process of our minimum competency program. Yes _____
No _____

APPENDIX C

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

by Edwin A. Fleishman

Name _____ Date _____
 (Last) (First) (Middle)
 Organization _____ Position _____

Raw Score	Percentile	Other
C		
S		
Description of Norm Group		

INSTRUCTIONS:

For each item, choose the alternative which most nearly expresses your opinion on how frequently you *should* do what is described by that item. Always indicate what you, as a supervisor, or manager, sincerely believe to be the desirable way to act. Please remember—there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Different supervisors have different experiences and we are interested only in your opinions.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the box before the alternative that best expresses your feeling about the item. *Mark only one* alternative for each item. If you wish to change your answer, draw a circle around your first "X" and mark a new "X" in the appropriate box.

S R I A [®] SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.
 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606
 A Subsidiary of IBM

Copyright 1960, Science Research Associates, Inc.
 Printed in U.S.A. All rights reserved.
 Reorder No. 7-651
 12/77

1. ^S
Put the welfare of your unit above the welfare of any person in it. 1
2. ^C
Give in to your subordinates in discussions with them. 2
3. ^S
Encourage after-duty work by persons of your unit. 3
4. ^S
Try out your own new ideas in the unit. 4
5. ^C
Back up what persons under you do. 5
6. ^S
Criticize poor work. 6
7. ^C
Ask for more than the persons under you can accomplish. 7
8. ^C
Refuse to compromise a point. 8
9. ^S
Insist that persons under you follow to the letter those standard routines handed down to you. 9
10. ^C
Help persons under you with their personal problems. 10
11. ^C
Be slow to adopt new ideas. 11
12. ^C
Get the approval of persons under you on important matters before going ahead. 12
13. ^C
Resist changes in ways of doing things. 13
14. ^S
Assign persons under you to particular tasks. 14
15. ^C
Speak in a manner not to be questioned. 15
16. ^S
Stress importance of being ahead of other units. 16
17. ^C
Criticize a specific act rather than a particular member of your unit. 17
18. ^S
Let the persons under you do their work the way they think is best. 18
19. ^C
Do personal favors for persons under you. 19
20. ^S
Emphasize meeting of deadlines. 20
- Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never
- Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very Seldom
- A great deal
 Fairly often
 To some degree
 Once in a while
 Very seldom
- Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom
- Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never
- Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never
- Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom
- Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never
- Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never
- Always
 Often
 Fairly often
 Fairly much
 To some degree
 Comparatively little
 Not at all
- Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never
- Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never
- Always
 Often
 Fairly often
 Fairly much
 To some degree
 Comparatively little
 Not at all
- Always
 Often
 Fairly often
 Fairly much
 To some degree
 Comparatively little
 Not at all

21. **S**
Insist that you be informed on decisions made by persons under you.

- 21/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

22. **S**
Offer new approaches to problems.

- 22/ Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom

23. **C**
Treat all persons under you as your equals.

- 23/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

24. **C**
Be willing to make changes.

- 24/ Always 4
 Often 3
 Occasionally 2
 Seldom 1
 Never 0

25. **S**
Talk about how much should be done.

- 25/ A great deal
 Fairly much
 To some degree
 Comparatively little
 Not at all

26. **S**
Wait for persons in your unit to push new ideas.

- 26/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

27. **S**
Rule with an iron hand.

- 27/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

28. **C**
Reject suggestions for changes.

- 28/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

29. **C**
Change the duties of persons under you without first talking it over with them.

- 29/ Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom

30. **S**
Decide in detail what shall be done and how it shall be done by the persons under you.

- 30/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

31. **S**
See to it that persons under you are working up to capacity.

- 31/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

32. **C**
Stand up for persons under you, even though it makes you unpopular with others.

- 32/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

33. **C**
Put suggestions made by persons in the unit into operation.

- 33/ Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom

34. **C**
Refuse to explain your actions.

- 34/ Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom

35. **S**
Ask for sacrifices from persons under you for the good of your entire unit.

- 35/ Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom

36. **C**
Act without consulting persons under you.

- 36/ Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom

37. **S**
"Needle" persons under you for greater effort.

- 37/ A great deal 4
 Fairly much 3
 To some degree 2
 Comparatively little 1
 Not at all 0

38. **C**
Insist that everything be done your way.

- 38/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

39. **S**
Encourage slow-working persons in your unit to work harder.

- 39/ Often
 Fairly often
 Occasionally
 Once in a while
 Very seldom

40. **S**
Meet with the persons in your unit at certain regularly scheduled times.

- 40/ Always
 Often
 Occasionally
 Seldom
 Never

APPENDIX D

2400 South 18th Avenue
Broadview, Illinois 60153
April 23, 1980

Dear Sir:

I am presently conducting research concerning the leadership style of the principal and the activities he/she engaged in during the implementation process of a minimum competency testing program. This is part of the requirement for my doctoral dissertation at Loyola University of Chicago.

In order to complete this project I need your assistance. Enclosed are copies of two questionnaires: The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and the Principal's Activity Questionnaire. Would you please complete each one and return them in the self-addressed stamped envelope. All names and responses will be kept completely confidential. I appreciate all your time and effort in helping me with this research.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Matula

Principal Activity Questionnaire

Dear Sir:

Listed below are twenty activities you may have engaged in during the implementation of your district's minimum competency testing program. On the reverse side, would you please list the five activities, (in order of importance) you see as being the most important in the development of your MCT program and also the five you most engaged in (considering number of minutes). Writing the numbers of the activity items is sufficient. If you have any questions please call 312-345-3110.

Thank you,

Joseph J. Matula

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Thinking and reflection. | 10. Consulting peers (members at same echelon). |
| 2. Making speeches, addresses, talks. | 11. Attending meetings of outside groups. |
| 3. Consulting superiors about personnel matters. | 12. Examining reports. |
| 4. Observation, inspection, examination. | 13. Reading technical publications. |
| 5. Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, charts, inspection forms. | 14. Consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits, etc. |
| 6. Teaching, instruction, training. | 15. Attending committee meetings and conferences. |
| 7. Consulting superiors about technical matters. | 16. Preparing and writing reports, orders, memos. |
| 8. Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates. | 17. Reading and answering mail. |
| 9. Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences, etc. | 18. Writing for publication. |
| | 19. Preparing charts, tables and diagrams. |
| | 20. Mathematical computation. |

Principal Activity Questionnaire

Principal's Name _____

School _____

School Address _____

District Name _____

School Phone _____

Number of years as a principal _____

Number of years in the district _____

Number of years as principal in district _____

Most ImportantActually Engaged In

1. 1.

2. 2.

3. 3.

4. 4.

5. 5.

APPENDIX E

November 17, 1980

Dear _____:

Approximately six months ago you filled out two questionnaires for me as part of my study on the implementation of your district's minimum competency testing program. In order to complete this research I need to ask you for some additional information. Would you please answer the following question regarding your role in the adoption procedure. All replies will be kept completely confidential. If you would like to answer the following question verbally or if you need further information, please call collect: 312-345-3110. Please return this sheet in the pre-addressed stamped envelope. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Matula

Your described yourself on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire as having a _____ leadership style. Yet the activities that you listed as "actually engaged in" indicated a majority of _____ activities. (See other side). What caused this adjustment in your leadership style?

1. Thinking and reflection.
2. Making speeches, addresses, talks.
3. Consulting superiors about personnel matters.
4. Observation, inspection, examination.
5. Operation or use of instruments, machines, tools, charts, inspection forms.
6. Teaching, instruction, training.
7. Consulting superiors about technical matters.
8. Consulting persons other than superiors, peers or subordinates.
9. Consulting subordinates about their personal problems, grievances, discipline, absences, etc.
10. Consulting peers (members at same echelon).
11. Attending meetings of outside groups.
12. Examining reports.
13. Reading technical publications.
14. Consulting subordinates about their work, training, advancement, benefits, etc.
15. Attending committee meetings and conferences.
16. Preparing and writing reports, orders, memos.
17. Reading and answering mail.
18. Writing for publication.
19. Preparing charts, tables and diagrams.
20. Mathematical computation.

Actually Engaged In

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

November 14, 1980

Dear _____:

Approximately six months ago you filled out two questionnaires for me as part of my study on the implementation of your districts' minimum competency testing program. In order to complete this research I need to ask you for some additional information. Would you please answer the following questions regarding your role in the adoption procedure. All replies will be kept completely confidential. If you would like to answer the following questions verbally or if you need further information, please call collect: 312-345-3110.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Matula

1. Attached is a list of the activities from which you picked five as being the "most important" and five as being those you "actually engaged in." Following this list are the activities you selected in which a discrepancy exists between the columns. Considering only these activities, what prevented you from "actually engaging in" those you saw as being the "most important?"

2. You described yourself on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire as having a _____ leadership style. Did this style change in any way while engaging in the activities necessary to adopt your program?

If so, what caused this adjustment in your leadership style.

Please return both sheets in the pre-addressed stamped envelope. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Joseph J. Matula has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor
Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin
Associate Professor
Administration and Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Robert L. Monks
Associate Professor
Administration and Supervision and
Director, Continuing Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

11-6-81
Date

MAOBailey
Director's Signature