

1-1-1974

# Some aspects of leader style, adaptability and effectiveness among western Massachusetts principals.

Lee Gordon Peters

*University of Massachusetts Amherst*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations\\_1](https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1)


---

## Recommended Citation

Peters, Lee Gordon, "Some aspects of leader style, adaptability and effectiveness among western Massachusetts principals." (1974).  
*Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 4587.  
[https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations\\_1/4587](https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/4587)

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@library.umass.edu](mailto:scholarworks@library.umass.edu).

UMASS/AMHERST



312066 0296 6350 6

**FIVE COLLEGE  
DEPOSITORY**

© 1974

Lee Gordon Peters

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SOME ASPECTS OF LEADER STYLE, ADAPTABILITY  
AND EFFECTIVENESS AMONG WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS PRINCIPALS

A Dissertation Presented

By

LEE GORDON PETERS

Submitted to the Graduate School of the  
University of Massachusetts in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 1974

Educational Administration

SOME ASPECTS OF LEADER STYLE, ADAPTABILITY  
AND EFFECTIVENESS AMONG WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS PRINCIPALS

A Dissertation

By

LEE GORDON PETERS

Approved as to style and content by:

*Kenneth H. Blanchard*

Dr. Kenneth Blanchard, Chairman

*Dr. C. Wolfe J.*

Dr. William Wolfe, Committee Member

*Norma Jean Anderson*

Dr. Norma Jean Anderson, Committee Member

*Paul Hersey*

Dr. Paul Hersey, Committee Member

*David Flight*

Dr. David Flight, Dean's Representative

*Dwight W. Allen*

Dr. Dwight W. Allen, Dean

Dedicated to:

Dr. Larry Watts (deceased)

He left a big shadow.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special Debts of Gratitude to:

Greece Central School District #1

For providing a young teacher with an environment causing growth and exploration

Dr. Richard Clark, Jr.

For guidance, opportunity, and friendship

Hadley and Hatfield

For a chance, hard knocks and helping me develop the understanding that leadership requires more than Divine guidance

Dr. Kenneth Blanchard

For patience, his spare room and special abilities

Dr. Paul Hersey

For ideas, suggestions, and drive

Dr. Norma Jean Anderson

For continuous support and guidance

Dr. William Wolfe

For assisting in the design of the study and support for its completion

Dr. Alfred Hartwell

For help, support, and debts unpaid

Dorothy, Lee G., and Jill

For being tough in the clutch

Dr. Dwight W. Allen

For bringing together the pieces of this environment

To all the above mentioned and countless others, my sincere appreciation for efforts, considerations, and support given to help the investigator successfully complete this study.

VITA

April 23, 1944                      Born - Oneonta, New York

1962                                  Graduated Lewis Rutherford  
Morris High School,  
Morris, New York

1966                                  B.S., State University of  
New York, Oneonta, New York

1966-  
1969                                  Teacher and Team Leader,  
Grades 3-6, Greece Central  
School District #1,  
Rochester, New York

1969                                  M.S., State University of  
New York, Brockport, New York

1969-  
1970                                  Administrative Assistant to the  
Superintendent, Hadley,  
Massachusetts

1972                                  Director of Elementary, South  
Orange-Maplewood Public Schools,  
South Orange, New Jersey



Some Aspects of Leader Style, Adaptability and  
Effectiveness Among Western Massachusetts Principals

Lee Gordon Peters

University of Massachusetts, 1974

Adviser: Dr. Kenneth H. Blanchard

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to examine the leader style and adaptability of school principals. The study investigated the relationships between staff and self perceptions of the principals' leader behavior as that behavior was seen to be either dominant in style or adaptable to situational changes. The study attempted to assess the relationships between perceived leader style, dominant or adaptable, and perceived leader effectiveness.

Procedures

Seventeen western Massachusetts principals and their staffs were selected to participate in the study. The communities in which their schools were located were required to be under thirty five thousand people in population. The staffs and principals of the schools were administered similar forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to obtain data concerning staff and self perceptions of the principals' leader styles. Both staffs and principals were administered the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory to obtain data concerning staff and self perceptions of the adaptability of the principals' leader behavior. Superintendents

of the participating principals were given a Principal's Effectiveness Rating Form, developed by a panel of experts, to provide an effectiveness rating for all participating principals.

The data of the study was analyzed by the use of analysis of variance, t-tests, and the quadrant method of analysis. Separate variance tests for paired observations were used to compare LBDQ staff and self responses.

#### Findings

With the level of significance set at the .01 level, the following differences were found to be significant.

1. As measured on the LASI, there was a significant positive relationship between the principals' self perceived adaptability scores and the mean of the staff perceived adaptability scores. The staffs rated their principals higher in adaptability than did the principals themselves.

2. The study demonstrated significant agreement between the staff perception of the principals' use of consideration behavior and the principals' self description of their use of consideration behavior.

3. The study demonstrated significant agreement between the staff perceived use of initiating structure behavior and the principals' self perception of initiating structure behavior.

## Conclusions

1. The study was unable to demonstrate that adaptable leader behavior is significantly related to being either an effective or an ineffective principal.
2. There was a close relationship demonstrated between the staff and self on the LBDQ dimension scores.
3. Further testing and refinement of the two new instruments, the LASI and The Principal Effectiveness Rating Form, may allow future researchers to make more generalizations from generated data.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TITLE	i
APPROVAL	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
VITA	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER I	NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY
	Introduction and Purpose 1
	Need for the Study 2
	Definition of Terms 4
	Limitations of the Study 5
	Organization of Report of the Study 6
	Statement of Hypotheses 7
CHAPTER II	SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE
	Leadership Studies Evolved 10
	Charismatic Leadership 11
	Traits or Characteristics of Leaders 12
	Trait Lists 13
	Conclusion - Trait School 14
	Situational-Functional Leadership 15
	Description of Situational Leadership 15
	Functional Leadership 17
	Summary Leadership Thought 18

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER II	
SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE (cont'd.)	
Leadership Defined	18
Organizational Theory - Schools of Thought	19
School of Scientific Management	19
Human Relations School of Thought	21
Revisionist School of Thought	22
Leader Style	25
Ohio State Leadership Studies	26
Managerial Grid	30
Managerial Grid Styles	32
Conclusion - Ohio State Studies and Managerial Grid	32
Adaptive Leader Behavior	33
Leader Effectiveness	34
Leadership and Power	35
Distinction Between Successful and Effective Leadership	35
Organizational Effectiveness	37
Integration of Goals	44
Situational Variables and Effectiveness	46
Life Cycle Theory of Leadership and its Relatedness to Other Theory	49
Life Cycle Theory as Related to Other Theory Life Cycle and Motivation Theory	55
Hierarchy of Needs	55
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire	62
Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory	64
Summary of Literature	65

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER III	THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY
	Sources of the Data 69
	Sampling Procedure 70
	Data Collection Procedure 70
	The Research Instruments
	The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire 72
	The Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory 80
	Situations from Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory 83
	Leader Actions Included in the LASI 85
	Effectiveness Rating Scale Procedure for Developing the Scale 87
	The Effectiveness Scale 88
	Global Scale 92
CHAPTER IV	FINDINGS OF THE STUDY
	Introduction 93
	Compilation of Data from the LBDQ and the LASI 93
	LBDQ Results 93
	Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory 96
	Observation on Table 9 97
	Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale 101
	Effectiveness Rating Compared to Other Principals In-District 103
	Examination of Hypotheses 105
	Hypothesis One 105
	Hypothesis Two 106

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER IV	FINDINGS OF THE STUDY (cont'd.)
	Hypothesis Three 107
	Hypothesis Four 108
	Hypothesis Five 108
	Hypothesis Six 109
	Hypothesis Seven 110
CHAPTER V	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS
	Introduction 111
	Summary 111
	Recapitulation of Hypotheses 112
	Conclusions 116
	The Study 118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	123
APPENDIX A	Letter of Permission to use the LDBQ 126
APPENDIX B	Letter of Invitation to Prospective Sample 128
APPENDIX C	List of Participating Schools, Principals and Superintendents 132
APPENDIX D	Instruments Used in the Study 134
APPENDIX E	LASI Data, Staff and Principal Scores, and Percentages 155
APPENDIX F	LBDQ Data, Staff and Principal Scores, and Percentages 173
FOOTNOTES	191

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Comparison of Management Actions	24
2	Types of Schools Participating in the Study	70 (b)
3	Total Participation in Study	70 (c)
4	Sample Participants - Teachers and Principals	70 (d)
5	Geographic Types of Communities Serviced by Participating Schools	70 (e)
6	LBDQ Scores	94
7	Conversion of Scores to LBDQ Styles	95
8	Style Placements, LBDQ	96
9	LASI Results	98
10	LASI Dominant Styles	99
11	Style Comparisons Between the LBDQ and the LASI	100
12	Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale Results	102
13	Effectiveness Rating Compared to Other Principals In-District	104



LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Cycle of Management By Objectives	27
2	Continuum of Leader Behavior	28
3	Ohio State Leadership Behavior Quadrants	29
4	The Managerial Grid	30
5	Successful/Unsuccessful Leadership Attempt	36
6	Successful and Effective/Ineffective Continuum	37
7	Relationship Among Causal, Intervening, and Output Variables	43
8	Interacting Components of an Organizational Setting	46
9	Life Cycle Theory of Leadership	51
10	Life Cycle Theory - Effective Leader Styles	54
11	Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs	56
12	Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory	57
13	Relationship between Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Motivation Theory	58
14	Integration of Maslow and Herzberg to Life Cycle Theory of Leadership	59
15	Argyris' Immaturity-Maturity Continuum	61
16	Steps in Data Gathering Process	70 (a)
17	Items in the Initiating Structure Scale, LBDQ	75
18	Scoring Key for Initiating Structure, LBDQ	76
19	Items in The Consideration Scale, LBDQ	77
20	Scoring Key for Consideration, LBDQ	78
21	Placement of LASI Items (Situations) by Diagnosed Maturity	85
22	Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale	90

# CHAPTER I

## NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

### Introduction and Purpose

The school principal today finds himself in a role that is far more complex than the traditional notion of his being "head teacher." The variety of groups, goals, and individual needs he must now deal with to be effective, require differing styles of leader behavior on his part.

The shifting emphasis of his role leans heavily on his ability to be adaptive. An adaptive leader is "one whom has the ability to vary his leader behavior appropriately in differing situations."<sup>1</sup>

The purposes of this study are the examination of five sets of relationships concerning the principal's leader behavior, adaptability, dominant leader style, and perceived effectiveness.

1. The relationships between the variance of the principal's perception of his own leader behavior (range) and the mean variance of his staff's perception of his leader behavior (range).
2. a. A description of the principal on a single quantitative scale, showing how his perception of his own leader behavior adaptability relates to the leader behavior adaptability prescribed by the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.
- b. A description of the principal on a single quantitative scale with the means and variances illustrating how the staff's perception of his leader behavior adaptability relates to leader behavior adaptability prescribed by the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.

3. a. The relationship between a scored dominant leader style on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and a scored dominant style on the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory as perceived by the principals themselves.
- b. The relationship between a scored dominant style on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and a scored dominant style on the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory as perceived by the staffs.
4. a. The relationship between the principals' self perception of variance of his leader behavior styles (range) and the effectiveness rating provided by the principals' superintendents.
- b. The relationship between the mean variance of the staff's perception of the principals' leader behavior styles and the effectiveness rating provided by the principals' superintendents.
5. a. The relationship between the principals' self perceptions of their leader behavior adaptability appropriate to Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, and the effectiveness ratings given the principals by their superintendents.
- b. The relationship between the principals' leader behavior adaptability appropriate to Life Cycle Theory of Leadership as perceived by the staffs and the effectiveness ratings given by the principals' superintendents.

#### Need for the Study

This study gains impetus from earlier research undertaken by the Ohio State Leadership Studies of the nineteen fifties, and specifically

from the study by Andrew Halpin, The Leader Behavior of School Superintendents, in 1957.<sup>2</sup>

At the heart of the Ohio State studies was an instrument developed and refined by the Ohio State staff called the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. This study will incorporate the use of two forms of the LBDQ, staff and self, but in addition, will also make use of a newly developed instrument, The Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory. The LASI will allow this study to expand the examination of principals' leader behavior beyond the parameters allowed by the LBDQ.

The LBDQ is elaborated further on in the study, so all that will be stated here regarding the instrument is that it limits the study of leader behavior if used exclusively in the study. This is due to the fact that it allows the researcher to obtain only a normative description of the leader's behavior in relation to a single situation. It does not allow for the measurement of the leader's variant or adaptive style in response to changing situations.

The newly developed instrument, The Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory, is designed to allow the respondents to describe a leader's behavior under changing situations. The LASI will also be elaborated more thoroughly in Chapter III. The LASI was developed as a result of collaboration between the author, and the developers of the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard. Its items were originally items in a situational management simulation training game<sup>3</sup> developed by the author and further refined by Hersey and Blanchard.

The study gains additional impetus from several assumptions presently operating in leadership writings. Three of those assumptions, are,

"the multiplicity of role demands require today's educational leader to be adaptive and able to vary his style in differing situations,"<sup>4</sup> the belief that there is no single all-purpose leadership style, and that the single most important element of a leadership act is the followers (subordinates.)<sup>5</sup>

The need is to provide preliminary research which examines the adaptability aspect of leader behavior from the situational perspective.

### Definition of Terms

Consideration - The extent to which a leader is likely to maintain personal relationships between himself and members of his group, followers in terms of socio-emotional support; characterized by friendship, mutual trust, and respect for followers' ideas. (Development of concept is discussed in Chapter II.)

Dominant or Normative Leader Style - The use of one of the four following styles of leader behavior in a majority of situations regardless of changing situational conditions.

1. High Initiating Structure and Low Consideration
2. High Initiating Structure and High Consideration
3. Low Initiating Structure and High Consideration
4. Low Initiating Structure and Low Consideration

The dominant or normative leader style is described by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, and can be illustrated through the use of the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory.

Group, Subordinates, Followers, Staff - A department, division, school staff or other unit or organization which is directly supervised by the manager or principal.

Initiating Structure - The extent to which a leader is likely to organize and define the relationships between himself and the members of his group; characterized by a tendency to define the role which he expects each member of the group to assume, endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done.

Leader Behavior - Observable behavior exhibited or perceived by the leader or his staff that is either characteristic of initiating structure, consideration or some combination of the two. This behavior is exhibited situationally with the intention of moving individuals or organizations toward the achievement of common goals.

Leader Behavior Adaptability - Situational variance in leader behavior style, appropriate to situational variance with the most chance of being effective according to the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.

Leader Behavior Variance or Range - Sheer spatial variance of leader behavior style in response to changing situations, regardless of appropriateness.

Maturity - A dimension of the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership. The major consideration in determining the appropriate leader style in changing situations. The appropriate leader style depends on the maturity of the followers involved in the particular situation. Maturity is a function of the group's achievement motivation, independence, and ability to assume responsibility. These variables may be influenced by the amount of task relevant education and experience the group possesses.

Principal - The appointed supervisor of an individual school building and its staff.

#### Limitations of the Study

1. The wide range of types of schools and their communities does a great deal to limit the amount of generalizing this study can do about other schools. The decision was made, therefore, to acquire the sample from Western Massachusetts Public Schools serving communities of less than thirty five thousand people. Consequently the information gathered and analyzed is based on seventeen public schools from the same geographical area of the country serving communities of nearly the same populations. This study will limit its generalizations to similarly located schools of comparable community size. No claim for pure homogeneity will be made.

2. The use of questionnaires or surveys has certain innate limitations. The participants will only respond to the instruments once. His or her perception of the principal's leader behavior might conceivably be influenced by a recent event, a sleepless night, or some other human variable that is operating upon the individual at the time he is responding to the instruments. The information obtained from the questionnaire is

limited to responses to pre-arranged questions. Little flexibility is provided for rephrasing questions or probing the reactions of respondents to the questions.

3. Though the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, staff and self forms have been used and refined numerous times since the nineteen fifties, the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory does not have the benefit of tested and established validity or reliability. As further research develops from the use of the LASI, it will become a better and better instrument. However, for the purpose of examining variance and adaptability of leader behavior, the instrument is considered adequate.

4. The study relies on self-reported data. The respondents describe leader behavior, style and adaptability as they perceive them. Their perceptions may or may not be true perceptions, but it should be remembered that staffs do react to leader's actions as they perceive them, whether or not their perceptions are accurate.

#### Organization of the Report of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters for the following purposes.

Chapter I is concerned with the nature and scope of the study, including; an explanation of the study's purposes, the need for this study, a definition of terms to be used in the study, a discussion of the study's limitations, the presentation of the hypotheses, and the organization of the report of the study.

Chapter II is a survey of the literature concerning the study of

leadership as it has evolved from a study of individual traits to the situational-functional school of thought, an examination of literature dealing with leader style, adaptability and effectiveness, a discussion of the development and usage of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, a discussion of the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership as an integrator of leadership theory and as a basis for the development of the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory.

Chapter III presents a description of the design of the study. This includes the sample and sampling procedures, a discussion of the research instruments, data collection techniques, and procedures for processing the data.

Chapter IV contains the findings of the study, making use of appropriate statistical tests, tables, and charts to facilitate the reader's ability to locate and understand the presented results.

Chapter V, as the final chapter, will include a discussion of the findings, and recommendations for further research.

#### Statement of Hypotheses

In following the intent of the purposes for this study, as described earlier in this chapter, the following hypotheses emerge to guide the collection of data. The data will be generated from three research instruments which are described in Chapter III. The first is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in two forms, staff and self, which will be referred to in the hypotheses as the LBDQ, the second is the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory which will be referred to as the LASI, and the last is the Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale which will



be referred to as the effectiveness scale.

1. As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significant difference between the staff-perceived mean variance of principals' leader behavior of those principals rated above the norm on the effectiveness scale and the staff-perceived mean variance of leader behavior for those principals rated below the norm on the effectiveness scale.

2. As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significant difference between the mean of the staff perceived adaptability scores of those principals with an above the norm rating on the effectiveness scale, and those principals with a below the norm rating on the effectiveness scale as perceived by the staffs.

3. As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significantly positive correlation between the principals' self perceived adaptability scores and the mean of the staff perceived adaptability scores.

4. As measured on the LBDQ, staff and self, there will not be a significant difference between the mean consideration scores of principals as perceived by the principals, and the mean consideration scores of the principals as perceived by their staffs.

5. As measured on the LBDQ, there will not be a significant relationship between those principals rated as above the norm on the effectiveness scale and those principals who are described by their staffs as having a dominant leader style of High Consideration - High Initiating Structure.

6. As measured on the LBDQ, staff and self, there will not be a significant difference between the mean initiating structure scores of principals as perceived by the principals, and the mean initiating structure scores of the principals as perceived by the staffs.

7. There will not be a significant relationship between the staff perceived use of a dominant leader style on the LASI, and the staff perceived use of a dominant leader style by the same principals on the LBDQ.

## CHAPTER II

## SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will deal with these five literature areas:

1. A general historical survey of the evolvement of leadership studies from the late nineteen thirties to the present, showing the evolution to "situational leadership" foci.
2. A survey of the literature dealing with leader style and effectiveness illustrating the evolution to "adaptive" leadership.
3. A discussion of the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership showing the theories Life Cycle obtained its roots from and the manner in which the theory integrates with others.
4. A discussion of the development and usage of the LBDQ and related research.
5. A discussion of the LASI concerning its development and projected usage.

Leadership Studies Evolved

Leadership as an occurrence has been examined and speculated about quite extensively in the last thirty-odd years. Though there are ample amounts of empirical evidence concerning leadership, they are often in conflict in the same way as are opinions, conjecture, and speculations about the phenomenon of leadership.

These four general approaches will be considered in this part of the chapter; Central Person Theory, Charismatic Leader, Trait or Characteristics School, and the Situational-Functional School of Thought.<sup>1</sup>

Freud,<sup>2</sup> pursuing a well-rooted linguistic custom, labeled as leader the person around whom a group crystallizes. The usage led to what may be called a Central Person Theory of Leadership. The theory assumes the presence of a central person around whom the processes of a group will unfold.

In his group formation studies, Redl, brought to bear several types of activities which have importance in group formation. One of these was nearly the same as the Central Person Theory, but when viewed in a more modern sense, these acts of group formation hardly seem to be acts of leadership.<sup>3</sup>

Central Person Theory is severely limited in its usefulness as a school of thought regarding leadership. As the chapter progresses, group formation as one leadership activity will gain credence.

#### Charismatic Leadership

Charisma is defined as, "a personal magic of leadership arousing special popular loyalty or enthusiasm for the leader."<sup>4</sup> Charismatic leadership is related to trait leadership as a school of thought, but by the mere fact that it is "magical" in nature makes it nearly impossible to measure. "Charisma indeed, has been found a useful word to describe an elusive charm, magnetism, persuasive power and capacity to excite and inspire others."<sup>5</sup>

As a trait, charisma borders on the mystical. It is a popular concept in prose, and is bewildering in that it could be thought of as a divinely conferred gift. If not divinely given, that at least it is a

trait of personal quality which provides influence or authority over group or groups of people.

The charismatic leader concept relates to all three of the other categories to be examined in this portion of the paper.

First, charisma is considered a trait and logically becomes an extension of the trait study of leadership.

Secondly, it seems logical to assume that if the charismatic leader is seen as central to group formation, then charismatic theory lends itself to the Central Person Theory.

If as Spiess states,<sup>6</sup> "Leaders with so-called charismatic appeal seem to use power and influence in specific situations in times of dire need and strife," then a third relationship exists, that being to the situational-functional school of thought. Such leaders would then be considered products of a situation. The relationships will become clearer as the above mentioned schools of thought are further elaborated.

#### Traits or Characteristics of Leaders

"For many years the most common approach to the study of leadership concentrated on traits per se, suggesting that there were certain qualities....., that were essential for effective leadership. These inherent physical qualities were transferable from situation to situation.....and only those leaders with these qualities would be considered potential leaders."<sup>7</sup>

The studies that were undertaken were designed to measure physical, intellectual, and personality traits as compared to the followers of the studied leaders. In other words, the studies tended to concentrate on

the leader to the exclusion of the followers or the situation in which either the leader or the led found themselves.

Scholars duly noted that leaders were older, taller, heavier, more athletic, better appearing, and brighter than followers. Leaders can be considered superior to followers in scholarship, knowledge, insight, originality, adaptability, initiative, responsibility, persistence, self-confidence, emotional control, sociability, diplomacy, tact, popularity, prestige, and cooperativeness.<sup>8</sup>

It stands to reason that in light of the above, leaders would also be more outgoing than followers and rank higher in socio-economic status. Cartwright and Zander,<sup>9</sup> supplied further data. "Evidence has been found that well accepted leaders tend to display better adjustment on various personality tests."

In the older approaches attention was given to "leadership as a personal quality" or a special combination of personal characteristics.<sup>10</sup> One of the problems has been the lack of constant definition of leadership. Without a common definition, investigators can't possibly agree to "what's being studied," and traits or characteristics to be studied are often unilaterally selected by the investigator. As a result, the important characteristics are apt to be no more than someone's opinion of the traits a leader should possess.

### Trait Lists

An examination of some of the trait lists developed over the years, allows one to see that very few have items in common. Bird,<sup>11</sup> made an extensive examination of the research relevant to leadership traits and characteristics which was conducted prior to nineteen forty. He was able to compile a long list of traits ostensibly differentiating leaders from non-leaders. Bird's results were discouraging however, in that only about

five percent of the traits were common to four or more investigators.

Stogdill's<sup>12</sup> similar efforts were only slightly more productive. He was able to find a few areas of commonality. The average person who occupies a position of leadership should tend to exceed the average member of his followers in intelligence, scholarship, dependability, activity, social participation, and socio-economic status. These conclusions were based on uniformly positive evidence from fifteen or more of the studies surveyed.

If factors in common in ten or more studies were considered, Stogdill's list would expand. Added would be sociability, initiative, persistence, knowing how to get things done, self-confidence, alertness to and insight into situations, cooperativeness, popularity, adaptability, and verbal facility.<sup>13</sup>

#### Conclusion - Trait School

It seems that leadership is not only a matter of specific traits applicable at all times to all situations. People do not become leaders just because of possessed traits, "the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers."<sup>14</sup>

Literature review of studies using the trait approach to leadership has revealed few significant or consistent findings.<sup>15</sup> "As Eugene E. Jennings concluded, 'Fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used to discriminate leaders and non-leaders.'<sup>16</sup>

Empirical studies suggest that leadership is a dynamic process, varying from situation to situation, with changes in leaders, followers, and situations. Current literature seems to support this situational approach to the study of leadership.<sup>17</sup>

### Situational-Functional Leadership

It would seem from the preceding discussion that leadership studies which attempt analyses of leadership, then, should involve not only the examination of leaders as individuals, but also of situations and groups involved in the specific situations.

"The focus in the situational approach to leadership is on observed behavior, not on any hypothetical inborn or acquired ability or potential for leadership. The emphasis is on the behavior of leaders and their group members (followers) and various situations. In situational leadership, the discussion is in terms of leader behavior rather than leadership traits, thus emphasizing the situational approach to leadership."<sup>18</sup>

### Description of Situational Leadership

"A situational-functional orientation to the leadership phenomenon literally cries out for some description of leadership as an act or process .....leadership situationally and functionally can be viewed as the performance of acts which assist a group in achieving its preferred outcome. Implicit in the description are the leader's responsibilities to help a group define its goals, assist in the selection of means to those desired ends, and direct activities along the lines selected as best means for achievement of objectives."<sup>19</sup>



"Much has been written on leadership of which at least two points are worth noting.

First, leadership is a function in the organization, rather than the trait of an individual. It is distributed among the members of a group or organization, and it is not automatically vested in the chairman or the person with the formal authority. Good leadership and good membership, therefore, blend into each other in an effective organization. It is just as much the task of a member to help the group reach its goals as it is the task of the formal leader.

Second, leadership has as a unique obligation to manage the relationships between a system and its environment, particularly in reference to the key functions of setting goals for the organization and defining the values or norms in terms of which the organization must basically develop a sense of identity.....this leadership function, which usually falls to the top executives of organizations is critical. If the organization does not have clear goals and cannot develop a sense of identity, there is nothing to be committed to and nothing to communicate. At the same time, no organization need have its goals and identity imposed. What top executives must do is insure that the goals are set somehow, but they may choose a variety of ways of allowing this to occur."<sup>20</sup>

Situational leadership is also functional, then, in that it consists of such actions as those which aid in (1) setting goals, (2) moving the group toward its goals, (3) improving the quality of interactions among members, (4) building cohesiveness of the group, and,

(5) making resources available to the group.

If as the situational school believes, leader actions required for the achievement of goals vary from group to group and situation to situation, it would seem that either the leader must be adaptive in his behavior, or the leader role should be moved to different people as the situation changes.

### Functional Leadership

In dealing with the issue of leadership, Cattell suggests that any member of the group leads to the extent that the group is modified by his presence, or that all group member actions which help the group in any way to achieve its goals are leadership functions.<sup>21</sup>

Leadership and group performance are meshed in Cattell's view. This allows thought to be given to questions of determining what goals are important for the group at a given point in time, which functions are important for attaining these goals, and which actions by members of the group contribute to the functions. Acts of leadership can be noted as contributing to goal achievement, group satisfaction, human relations and other aspects of group performance. One basic advantage of Cattell's view is that leadership can be viewed as something a person illustrates in varying degrees, as opposed to some of the preceding schools of thought (Central Person and Trait,) which stated that a person either has leadership completely or not at all.<sup>22</sup>

Krech and Crutchfield<sup>23</sup> prefer to restrict leadership to a set of functions in a task-functional approach specifically dealing with these fourteen tasks: executive, planner, policy-maker, expert, external

group representative, controller of internal relationships, purveyor of rewards and punishments, arbitrator, exemplar group symbol, surrogate for individual responsibility, ideologist, father figure, and scapegoat.

The point is not whether or not the above functions represent the breadth of leadership. What might be a more cogent point is that at one time or another, all these functions are vital to a group. If some fall under the heading of leadership, the multiplicity of leader functions becomes apparent.

#### Summary Leadership Thought

The preceding section of this chapter had as its intention, the tracing of the evolution of leadership schools of thought. Current literature supports the situational approach to the study of leader behavior.<sup>24</sup>

The situational approach to leadership focuses upon observed behavior, not on hypothetical or inborn traits, not on acquired ability or potential for leadership. The emphasis in studies of leadership should concentrate on the behavior of leaders and their group members in various situations.<sup>25</sup>

#### Leadership Defined

As a result of the preceding discussion, leadership emerges as a process rather than personal traits, and is concerned with ".....influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation."<sup>26</sup> Given this definition, it be-

comes apparent that the leader must be cognizant of both task accomplishment ( goal achievement,) and the maintenance of human relationships (group maintenance,) if he is to be effective.

### Organizational Theory - Schools of Thought

"Goal achievement" is a concept that preoccupied the Scientific Management School of Thought, and "group maintenance" was the concept that preoccupied the Human Relations School of Thought. The best of both worlds might summarize the focal point of the Revisionist School of Thought. The next part of the chapter will examine the three varying viewpoints of Organizational Theory, and be followed by a discussion of leader style and effectiveness.

### School of Scientific Management

Max Weber, Frederick Taylor, and Henri Fayol pioneered the scientific management movement. A desire to increase industrial efficiency through better management, caused these men to look at organizations as devoid of people. Its effects were felt for nearly a quarter of a century as "the way."

The obvious intention of the movement was to create a system of abstract depersonalization whereby a mechanism could supply solutions leading to greater efficiency without involving human emotion and error.

Taylor,<sup>28</sup> as the "Father of Scientific Management," developed a theory combining a study of physical capabilities of a worker with an economic approach which viewed man as driven by fear of hunger and the search for profit. The pervading theme seemed to be, if material rewards are closely

related to work efforts, the worker would respond with the maximum performance of which he is physically capable.

Fayol,<sup>29</sup> like Taylor, believed that the problem of workers and their management (manipulation) was the key to industrial success at all levels. He proposed a clearly delineated, "chain of command," with rigid channels of communication and pushed hard for matching of the employee to the position, as the important aspect of management.

Supervision has reflected these tenets and has been dominated by the "classical view" of man. According to McGregor<sup>30</sup> the "classical view," his theory X, is based on these assumptions about workers as held by the organization.

1. Work is inherently distasteful to most people.
2. Most people are not ambitious, have little desire for responsibility, and prefer to be directed.
3. Most people have little capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems.
4. Motivation occurs only at the physiological and security need levels.
5. Most people must be closely controlled and often coerced to achieve organizational objectives.

Workers were to be closely watched, directed, and to carry out tasks prescribed by management, with the motivation of external rewards or punishment.

Though inhumane, as an approach, in its beliefs about the nature of people, there were some notions generated by the scientific management movement that still maintain validity today.

"Organizational policies and practices continue to be affected by, and give consideration to, the function of goal setting, the systematic definition of tasks, the measurement of performance output, the design of physical work space, and the idea of separating the planning function from the performing function."<sup>31</sup>

#### Human Relations School of Thought

Government and labor dealt the scientific management movement and the concept of the economically motivated man a severe blow in the mid-nineteen thirties. Mayo,<sup>32</sup> in his Western Electric supported Hawthorne Studies, concluded that employees had to be viewed as individuals with psychological drives and social needs rather than simply as mass appendages to an industrial machine. That production output was closely related to the social satisfaction of the individual workers, and that the major problems of management are found in the realm of human relations, rather than the technical process, are the two major themes of Mayo's findings.

The overall theme of the human relations school of thought might be stated in the following manner. Man can be motivated to more productive work by helping him fulfill his social and psychological needs rather than furnishing adequate external rewards. This school of thought would be based on a set of assumptions contradictory to those of the "classical view" of man. McGregor<sup>33</sup> would present these assumptions in support of the human relations ideology. Following are the assumptions of his theory Y.

1. Work can be as natural as play, if the conditions are favorable.
2. Self control is often indispensable in achieving organizational goals.
3. The capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.
4. Motivation occurs at the affiliation, esteem and self-actualization need levels as well as at the physiological and security levels.
5. People can be self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated.

The human relations model does not recognize any conflict between organizational objectives and the provision of social need-satisfaction conditions. It is felt that satisfying the worker's social and psychological needs is entirely congruent with organizations' goals of effectiveness and productivity. However, high morale does not guarantee high productivity.

The attention to human social needs might possibly lead to neglect of responsibility for furthering the goals of the organization, and in cases lead to the creation of an "Ameoba-Like" existence.<sup>34</sup>

#### Revisionist School of Thought

35

Leavitt reexamined the human relations movement's participative beliefs, "I am not worried about manipulation, group think, softness, conformity, or any of the other recent criticisms. In fact, most theories and techniques of human relations are, to my mind, both sound

and progressive. The theme here is not that human relations theory is either correct or incorrect. My argument is that it is simply insufficient. It is too narrow a perspective from which to analyze the management or organizations." However, he also does not feel that we should turn back to earlier and narrower beliefs but to push ahead.

".....by viewing large organizations as differentiated sets of sub-systems rather than as unified wholes. Such a view leads to management by tasks - with the recognition that many sub-parts of the organization may perform many different kinds of tasks, and therefore call for many different kinds of managerial practices." <sup>36</sup>

The Revisionists or Structuralists, attempt to reconcile the Scientific Management Movement and the Human Relations ideologies. Their hope and intent is to eliminate the unrealistic aspects of the Human Relations approach without sacrificing the advantages of its departures from the Scientific Management viewpoint.

"In combining the positive values of the mechanists who emphasized the organizational goals, and those of the Human Relationists who emphasized the social goals of individuals, the Revisionists attempt to consider both individual and organizational goals in their proper perspectives. They recognize that the individual goals must be focused through commitment and leadership activity; and they hold the view that external economic factors must be considered along with productivity and formal status, but not to the exclusion of the human elements that the scientific theorists neglected." <sup>37</sup>



Table I

Comparison of approaches between Scientific Management School and Human Relations School.

<u>Dimensions of Approaches</u>	<u>Scientific Management</u>	<u>Human Relations</u>
1. Management's goal for worker	Productivity-by satisfying his economic needs	Productivity-by satisfying his social needs
2. Theoretical orientation	If material rewards are closely related to the employees' work efforts, they will respond with the maximum performance they are capable of	If work and organizational structure were related to social needs of employees, they would be happy; organization therefore would obtain full cooperation and effort and thus increase its efficiency
3. Regard for the worker	Individual compared to a machine	Individual considered with desires, emotions, feelings, and attitudes
4. Consideration of the work process	Standardized-worker is dependent upon the organization, hence no conflict between him and organization	Flexible-worker is independent hence conflict is inevitable; in a sense, conflict is considered desirable
5. Organizational structure	Firm and rigid supervision is a necessity; centralized	Informal and not much need for supervision; decentralized
6. Nature of authority	Autocratic - the top management decides	Democratic - anyone is allowed to take part
7. Participation in decision-making	Top manager's responsibility; therefore nil for low level management	Views and concerns of low level group are consulted and considered
8. Communications set-up	A one-way direction from top to bottom and almost nil among peers	Very permissive between and among horizontal and vertical levels of management
9. Management focus	On the task itself more than on the worker	On the worker as he relates to his work and social surroundings

The revisionists hold that work is a natural activity of man, that the goals of the organization can be used as incentives to intelligent work, that lack of control is undesirable in any organization, and that employee participation in decision-making is harmonious to organizational goals. They propose environments which reflect individual and institutional purposes and needs. Singular strong emphasis on the needs of either the individual or organization should be deweighted, but neither should be devalued at the expense of the other. More theoretical approaches to ways of integrating the task-serving and needs-serving purposes of organizations ought be pursued by school people in the business of creating or dealing with change.

#### Leader Style

"For some time it was believed that task and relationships, (two dimensions of leader behavior,) were either/or styles of leader behavior and therefore, should be depicted as a single dimension along a continuum, moving from very authoritarian (task) leader behavior at one end to very democratic (relationships) leader behavior at the other."<sup>38</sup>

Prior to the development of the quadrants based on the two dimensions of leader behavior proposed by the Ohio State Leadership Studies Staff, "Initiating Structure," and "Consideration," leader behavior had been depicted as being an either/or style falling along a continuum from "task" to "relationships." These two either/or styles have variously been labeled as "autocratic" and "democratic," "authoritarian" and "equalitarian," "employee-oriented" and "production-oriented," "goal achievement" and "group maintenance," "task-ability" and "likeability," "instrumental"

and "expressive," or "efficiency" and "effectiveness."<sup>39</sup> (See Figure 2)

### Ohio State Leadership Studies

Leadership studies initiated in 1945, by the Bureau of Business  
Research of Ohio State,<sup>40</sup> raised a doubt as to whether leader behavior  
can be conceived of as a single either/or continuum.

In their studies of leader behavior, the Ohio State staff identified "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration" as the two most  
important dimensions of leadership behavior.<sup>41</sup>

Pursuant studies by the Ohio State staff disclosed that leader styles fluctuated from leader to leader. Extensive use was made of an instrument the staff developed for their studies, The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. (The LDBQ is elaborated further in Chapter III.)

"Initiating Structure" was the task-oriented dimension, while "Consideration" was closely aligned with the realm of relationships behavior. "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration" were found to be separate and distinct dimensions, and during these studies leader behavior was plotted on two separate axes, opposed to a single continuum, for the first time. (See Figure 3)




Figure 1 - Cycle of Management By Objectives, George Odiorne, Management By Objectives (New York: Putnam Publishing Corp., 1965.)





Figure 2 - Continuum of Leader Behavior (Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969, p. 64.)




Figure 3 - Ohio State Leadership Behavior Quadrants

In the leadership studies that followed, the Ohio State staff found that leadership styles vary considerably from leader to leader. The behavior of some leaders is characterized by rigidly structuring activities of followers in terms of task accomplishments, while others concentrate on building and maintaining good personal relationships between themselves and their followers. Other leaders have styles characterized by both tasks and relationships behavior. There are even some individuals in leadership positions whose behavior tends to provide little structure or development of interpersonal relationships. No dominant style appears, instead various combinations are evident. Thus, task and relationships are not either/or leadership styles as an authoritarian - democratic continuum suggests. Instead, these patterns of leader behavior are separate and distinct dimensions which can be plotted on two separate axes, rather than a single continuum.

The Ohio State Studies resulted in the development of four quadrants to illustrate leadership styles in terms of "Initiating Structure" and "Con-<sup>42</sup>sideration" as shown in Figure 3.

#### Managerial Grid

A later development of the two dimension approach was proposed by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton.<sup>43</sup> Their Managerial grid, (figure 4), proposed five different leadership styles, based on the two dimensions of "concern for production" and "concern for people" located in quadrants similar to those presented by the Ohio State staff.<sup>44</sup>

The horizontal axis illustrates "concern for production." As production becomes more important to the leader, his rating advances toward the 9 on that axis. The vertical axis represents "concern for people." Advancing toward the 9 on this axis illustrates increasing concern for interpersonal relationships.




Figure 4 - The Managerial Grid (Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid (Houston, Gulf Publishing, 1964.)



### Managerial Grid Styles

Impoverished Leader (1-1) Typified by the exertion of minimum effort to get required work done as the way to appropriately sustain organizational membership.

Country Club Leader (1-9) Thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable friendly organizational atmosphere and work tempo.

Task Leader (9-1) Efficiency in operations results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.

Middle of the Road (5-5) Adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out the work while maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level.

Team (9-9) Work accomplishment is from committed people; interdependence through a "common stake" in organizational purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect.

45

### Conclusion - Ohio State Studies and Managerial Grid

The emphasis that both the Ohio State staff and Blake and Mouton placed on leadership being something other than an either/or continuum of behavior, allowed the study of leadership to move forward toward the notion of the "adaptable leader."

In both theories, however, a most appropriate dominant style was hypothesized. Andrew Halpin<sup>46</sup>, of the original Ohio State staff, in a study of school superintendents, pointed out that according to his findings "effective or desirable leadership behavior is characterized

by high ratings on both "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration." Conversley, ineffective or undesirable leadership behavior is marked by low ratings on both dimensions." Thus, Halpin seemed to conclude that the High Consideration and High Initiating Structure style is theoretically the ideal or best leader style, while the style low on both dimensions is theoretically the worst.

Blake and Mouton<sup>47</sup>, in their managerial grid, also imply that there is a most desirable leadership style, "Team Management" (maximum concern for production and people) and the existence of a least desirable style, "impoverished management" (minimum concern for people and production.) In fact, they have developed training programs designed to change the behavior of managers toward this "team" style.<sup>48</sup>

#### Adaptive Leader Behavior

Incorporating the notion from the situational-functional school of thought that leadership is a process which is a function of the leader, the followers, and other situational variables, the attempts by others to define leadership as possessing a single ideal type of leader behavior becomes unrealistic. "An effective leader is able to adapt his style of leader behavior to the needs of the situation and the followers."<sup>49</sup>

Korman<sup>50</sup> offers evidence which nicely illustrates that there is not a single all-purpose leadership style. After reviewing over twenty-five studies he concludes, "Despite the fact that "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure" have become almost by-words in American Industrial psychology, it seems apparent that very little is now known as to how

these variables may predict work group performance and the conditions which affect such predictions. At the current time, we cannot even say whether they have any predictive significance at all."

Korman's findings indicating that the use of "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure" were not of value in predicting effectiveness under changing situations, can only reinforce the point sought by the study, that leadership style must vary as does the situation in which the leader is involved.

In addition, some other writers<sup>51</sup> have concluded that different leadership situations require different leader styles.

In summary, the case for an "adaptive style" of leadership is based on the premise that successful leaders are those who can adapt their leader behavior to meet the needs of their followers and the particular situation, or in Hersey's words, "the more a manager adapts his style of leader behavior to meet the particular situation and the needs of his followers, the more effective he will tend to be in reaching personal and organizational goals."<sup>52</sup>

### Leader Effectiveness

In this section of the chapter, effectiveness will be examined as it relates to individual leader behavior as well as from the perspective of how that leader behavior relates to organizational effectiveness.

Before looking at leader effectiveness, Hersey and Blanchard encourage that a distinction be made between management and leadership. Management is thought of as a special kind of leadership in which the

accomplishment of organizational goals is the major concern. Leadership may also involve working with and through people to accomplish goals, these goals are not necessarily all organizational goals. "Thus in discussing effectiveness we must recognize the difference between individual goals, organizational goals, leadership, and management."<sup>54</sup>

### Leadership and Power

A leader's ability to induce or influence behavior depends on two types of power. Position power is power derived from an organizational office. If a leader can induce another to do a task because of his position, he possesses position power. Personal power is power derived from personal influence. If a leader derives his influence from his followers, he has personal power. A leader may have one or the other or both. Etzioni<sup>55</sup> believes that the best chance for the leader to be effective is when he has both position power and personal power.

### Distinction Between Successful and Effective Leadership

<sup>56</sup>  
Bernard Bass postulates the distinction between successful and effective leadership acts in the following manner.

Leadership is considered as an attempt to influence the behavior of others. When manager A tries to influence B to do a particular task, his leadership will either be considered successful or unsuccessful depending on the extent that B accomplishes the task. The accomplishment most likely will not be only successful or unsuccessful, but rather somewhere in between. (see figure 5)




Figure 5 - Successful/Unsuccessful Leadership Attempt

Leadership that is successful is not necessarily effective even though unsuccessful leadership is ineffective. If A's style does elicit a successful result, but B's behavior was a result of A's control of rewards and punishment, and not because B sees his needs being accomplished by meeting organizational goals (or if the response is to A's position power,) then the leader A was successful but not effective. However, if A's attempted leadership leads to a successful response and B acted because he wanted to and found it rewarding, then the leadership act is successful and effective. In this instance, A would be thought of as having both position and personal power, which results in B seeing A's request as consistent with his own personal goals. Effectiveness is also to be seen as something that falls in degrees along a continuum as opposed to being only effective or ineffective.




Figure 6 - Successful and Effective/Ineffective Continuum

"Success has to do with how the individual or group behaves. Effectiveness describes the internal state or predisposition of an individual or group and thus is attitudinal in nature. If an individual is interested only in success, he emphasizes position power.....However, if he is effective he will depend also on personal power or follower acceptance. The leader could be successful though ineffective having short run influence over follower's behavior, but if he is both successful and effective his influence should lead to long-run productivity and organization development."

The framework just illustrated has its usefulness in evaluating a specific behavioral event, and is not postulated to evaluate behavior over lengths of time.

### Organizational Effectiveness

Up to this point leadership effectiveness has been examined from the point of view of leader power. The most important aspect of effectiveness is its relation to the total organization.

To insure organizational effectiveness over time, is a topic many theorists have dealt with. Schein<sup>59</sup> lists four guidelines for enhancing organizational effectiveness.

1. Recruitment, Selection, Induction and Training of Human Resources

"If the organization is genuinely concerned about building long-range effectiveness, must it not develop a system for hiring employees which makes them feel wanted, secure, meaningfully engaged in their job, and positively committed to organizational goals, and must it not develop training and management development programs which stimulate genuine psychological growth in order to insure the flexibility and creativity that may be required at some future time? It would appear that one of the best guarantees of ability to cope with an unpredictable environment would be to develop everyone to a maximum degree, even at the expense of short-run efficiency.

2. Utilization of Employees and the Psychological Contract

.....if the organization expects its members to be committed, flexible, and in good communication with one another for the sake of overall organizational effectiveness, it is in effect asking them to be morally involved in the enterprise, to be committed to organizational goals and to value these. And if it expects them to be involved to this degree, the organization must for its part provide rewards and conditions consistent with such involvement. It cannot merely pay more money to obtain commitment, creativity, and flexibility; there must be the possibility of obtaining non-economic rewards such as autonomy, gen-

uine responsibility, opportunities for challenge and for psychological growth.

Probably the most important thing the organization can do in this regard is to develop assumptions about people which fit reality. This in turn, implies some willingness to find out what each man is like and what he truly wants. By making broad generalizations about people, the organization not only runs the risk of being wrong about the empirical realities, but perhaps worse, it insults its employees by assuming they are all alike.

### 3. Groups and Inter-group Conflict

There is little question that groups are an integral part of any organization and that the basic choice is not whether or not to have them, but rather how to create conditions under which group forces work toward organizational goals rather than counter to them. The first part of an answer is to be found in points 1 and 2 above, for the evidence seems quite clear that if employees feel threatened, demeaned, and unappreciated they will form together into anti-management groups. To prevent such groups from forming, therefore, requires management practices which are less threatening to the individual and more likely to enable him to integrate his own needs with organizational goals.

A second part of the answer lies in training for effective group membership and leadership. Though most of us have had much experience in groups, it is unlikely that we have had the opportunity to focus clearly on those factors which make groups



more or less effective. If members of the organization come to understand better how groups work, they are less likely to form groups which are bound to fail. If groups are formed which can achieve some degree of psychological success, and if this success is perceived to be in part the result of good management, the group forces are more likely to be turned toward organizational goals. The point is, however, that it takes more than good intentions to make an effective group. It requires knowledge and training of how groups work.

When we turn to problems of inter-group competition, the answer seems clear that competition between the units or groups of a single organization or system must in the long run reduce effectiveness because competition leads to faulty communication, to greater pressures for conformity and hence less flexibility, and to commitment to sub-group rather than organizational goals. The dilemma is that competition also produces very high levels of motivation and productivity. As many case examples have shown, however, when organizational units are stimulated into competition the short run gains of increased productivity are greatly outweighed by the long run losses of reduced internal communication channels between sub-parts open, and which maintain the focus on total, organizational performance rather than individual, sub-group performance.

#### 4. Leadership

First, leadership is a function of the organization, rather than the trait of an individual. It is distributed among the

members of a group or organization, and is not automatically vested in the chairman or the person with the formal authority. Good leadership and good membership, therefore, blend into each other in an effective organization. It is just as much the task of a member to help the group reach its goals as it is the task of the formal leader.

Second, leadership has a unique obligation to manage the relationships between a system and its environment, particularly in reference to the key functions of setting goals for the organization and defining the values or norms in terms of which the organization must basically develop a sense of identity. This function must be fulfilled by those members who are in contact with the organization-environment boundary and who have the power to set policy for the organization. This leadership function, which usually falls to the top executives of organizations, is critical. If the organization does not have clear goals and cannot develop a sense of identity, there is nothing to be committed to and nothing to communicate. At the same time, no organization need have its goals and identity imposed by its top executives. There is no reason why the organization cannot develop its goals and identity collaboratively and participatively, engaging every member down to the lowest echelons. What the top executives must do is to insure that goals are set somehow, but they must choose a variety of ways of allowing this to occur."

The rest of the discussion concerning organizational effectiveness will reinforce the four areas presented and discussed

by Schein.

60

Likert identifies three classes of variables which are useful in discussing organizational effectiveness.

1. Causal Variables - Those factors which influence the course of developments within an organization and its outcomes. Causal variables are independent variables which can be changed or altered by the organization such as leadership strategies, skills, behavior, management's decisions, policies and structure of the organization.
2. Intervening Variables - These are the variables that represent the current condition of the internal state of the organization and are reflected in its skills, loyalty, commitment to objectives, motivations, communications, decision-making and capacity for effective interaction.
3. Output or End-Result Variables - These are the Dependent variables which reflect achievements of the organization. Most evaluations of effectiveness are based on the measures of output. Won-lost records, profits, books published are all examples of output variables.

Causal Variables	Intervening Variables	Output Variables
Management Style	Perceptions,	Production,
Management Strategies	Expectations, Role Concepts, Attitudes,	Costs,
Organizational structure	Workgroup Tradition,	Sales,
Organizational Objectives	Values and Goals,	Earnings,
Technology, etc.	Motivational Forces, Behavior, etc.	Union-Co. Relations, Turnover, etc.

Figure 7 - Relationship Among Causal, Intervening, and Output Variables. Hersey and Blanchard, p.109.

The relationships among the three types of variables might be thought of as the stimuli (causal variables) acting upon the organism (intervening variables) and eliciting certain responses (output variables.)<sup>61</sup>

Intervening variables are those concerned with building and developing an organization, and attention to these tend to build long term goals. Most organizations base rewards and promotion on the basis of short-run output variables such as increased production and earnings and neglect the long-run organizational development.<sup>62</sup>

To summarize, attention to intervening variables and emphasis upon long run goals is critical to organizational effectiveness overtime.

### Integration of Goals

The extent that individuals and groups perceive their own goals as being satisfied by the accomplishment of organizational goals is the degree of integration of goals.

McGregor<sup>63</sup> after doing studies in three different industrial situations, claims four important variables are responsible for increasing organizational effectiveness.

1. Nurturing the appropriate sub-system
2. Accenting self control
3. Applying appropriate supervision and management strategies
4. Tending to motivation

He goes on to say,....."the task of management is to create relationships among these variables such that they can achieve their goals best by directing their efforts toward the goals of the enterprise. The most appropriate management strategy according to this theory is to create an organizational environment in which man perceives the most attractive opportunities for achieving his dominant goals to be in expending his efforts toward organizational goals."

The hope in an organization is to create a climate in which one of two things occurs. The individuals in the organization (both managers and workers) either perceive their goals as being the same as the goals of the organization, or although different, they see their own goals being satisfied as a direct result of working for the goals of the organization.<sup>64</sup>

The preceding reinforces Schein's feelings about the importance of goal integration and Likert's emphasis upon the role of intervening varia-

bles in determining organizational effectiveness. Owens<sup>65</sup>, also speaks to the role of intervening variables, "Between the inputs and outputs of an organization something occurs to induce the goal achievement that is noted and changes that appear."

In evaluating for organizational effectiveness, Bennis<sup>66</sup> proposes the use of three criteria.

1. Adaptability - The ability to solve problems and react with flexibility to changing environmental demands.
2. A Sense of Identity - Knowledge and insight on the part of the organization of what it is, what its goals are, and what it is to do. Pertinent questions are: To what extent are goals shared widely by members of the organization, and to what extent is self perception on the part of the organization members in line with perceptions of the organization by others?
3. Capacity to Test Reality - The ability to search out, accurately perceive, and correctly interpret the real properties of the environment, particularly those which have relevance for the functioning of the organization.

In addition, Argyris<sup>67</sup> suggests a direction for the organization which seeks to be effective. ".....find those conditions which will permit an integration of individual needs and organizational goals." What he regards as unhealthy or ineffective are restrictions on output, destructive competition, and apathy among employees in order to fulfill personal goals at the expense of organizational goals.

### Situational Variables and Effectiveness

The leader, in an effort to promote organizational effectiveness, should be aware of personal and environmental variables that are operating at all levels.

As has already been stated, all the basic leader behavior styles may be effective or ineffective dependent upon the situation.

The manager must first be able to diagnose his own leader behavior in light of his environment. The other variables which he should examine include the organization, superiors, associates, followers, and job demands.




Figure 8 - Interacting Components of an Organizational Setting, (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969, p.92.)

It is crucial then, that the leader understand the situational variables of the organizational environment in order to be effective.

To help further specify what the interacting components of the leader's environment are, the following list is presented in a non-rank order.

Leader's personality  
 Leader's expectations  
 Followers' personalities  
 Followers' expectations  
 Superiors' personalities  
 Superiors' expectations  
 Associates' personalities  
 Associates' expectations  
 Organization's personality  
 Organizations's expectations  
 Job demands  
 Time 68

Personality - Somewhat synonymous with style, the consistent behavior patterns of an individual as perceived by others. These patterns emerge as an individual begins to respond in the same fashion under similar conditions.

Expectations - Perceptions of appropriate behavior for one's own role or position or one's perception of the roles of others within the organization.

Shared Expectations - Each of the individuals involved in the situation perceives accurately and accepts his role and the role of the other.

If expectations are to be compatible, it is important that people within the organization share common goals.

Leader's Personality and Expectations - The leader's personality (style) is one of the more important elements of the leadership situation. The personality is not how he thinks he behaves, but rather how others perceive his behavior. He ought to know how he is perceived. The difficulty in obtaining this information comes from people's reluctance to be open with one another.

How people interpret the expectations of the leader, most often determines their behavior.



Followers' Personalities and Expectations- At least one writer<sup>69</sup> believes that the followers are the most crucial factor in any leadership act. Acceptance or rejection of the leader (personal power) is determined by the personality of the group. For this reason, the leader may find that even if he wants to change their styles, he might instead be better to adapt his style to their present behavior.

A leader should know the expectations followers have about the way he should behave in certain situations. If a problem arises between leader style and follower expectations, then either the leader must change his style, or change the followers' expectations.

Superiors' Personalities and Expectations - Meeting your superior's expectations is an important factor affecting a leader's style. Operating with a style contrary to your boss's expectations of how you should operate may limit your effectiveness.

Associates' Personalities and Expectations - The styles and expectations of one's associates are important to be understood when a leader has frequent interaction with them.

Organization's Personality and Expectations - The personality and expectations of an organization are determined by the history and tradition of the organization as well as by the organizational goals and objectives which reflect the style and expectations of top management.

Members of an organization soon become conscious of a value system operating within the institution and guide their actions from many expectations derived from these values. The organization's expectations are most often expressed in forms of policy, operating procedures and controls, as well as informal customs and mores developed over time.

Job Demands - Another important aspect of the leadership situation is the demands of the job the leader's group has been assigned to perform. The nature of the task to be performed may have dramatic implications for the leader style necessary to effectively complete that task.

Time - The variable refers to time duration available for decision-making. If that span of time is short (emergency or crisis situation) the leader's style might well be task-oriented while on the other hand, longer time spans allow a variety of possible styles.<sup>70</sup>

Though there most certainly are other situational variables to be considered, the preceding list conveys the intent, that organizational effectiveness is also dependent on far more than simple leader action. "Effectiveness results from a leader using a behavior style which is appropriate to the demands of the environment. Therefore, an effective leader must be able to diagnose the demands of the environment, and then either adapt his leader personality (style) to fit these demands, or develop the means to change some or all of the other variables."<sup>71</sup>

### Life Cycle Theory of Leadership and Its Relatedness to Other Theory

The school principal today is faced with a role that far exceeds the traditional notion of his being "head teacher." The variety of groups, goals, and individual needs he now deals with require differing styles of leader behavior on his part. The emphasis is upon his being able to be an "adaptive leader" - "an individual who has the ability to vary his leader behavior appropriately in differing situations."<sup>72</sup>

73

Hersey and Blanchard in developing the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, made an attempt to provide answers to these questions; How does

leadership depend on a situation? and What style tends to be effective with particular individuals and groups in changing environments?

The author's objective in elaborating the theory evolves from the relationship of the theory to the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory, an instrument developed to facilitate some of the major goals of the study. (The instrument will be discussed later in the study.)

The development of Life Cycle Theory is based on a curvilinear relationship between "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration" behavior and the Maturity of the followers.<sup>74</sup> The attempted goal of the theory is to aid people in a leadership position in developing an understanding of the relationship between an effective leader style and the level of the "maturity" of the followers.

The theory emphasizes the importance of the followers, and the leader's diagnosis of the "maturity" of the followers in a leadership situation.

Before further elaborating the Life Cycle Theory, a few definitions are in order. The quadrants formed by plotting the two dimensions of "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration" originate with the previously discussed Ohio State Leadership Studies. The behavioral dimensions plotted are defined similarly in Life Cycle Theory as in the Ohio State Studies.




Figure 9 - Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, Hersey and Blanchard, 1969, p. 69.

1. Initiating Structure - The extent to which a leader is likely to organize and define the relationships between himself and the members of his group (followers); characterized by a tendency to define the role which he expects each member of the group to assume, endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs done.
2. Consideration - The extent to which a leader is likely to maintain personal relationships between himself and the members of his group ( followers ) in terms of socio-emotional support; characterized by friendship, mutual trust, and respect for followers' ideas.<sup>75</sup>
3. Maturity - In Life Cycle Theory, maturity is defined in terms of three dimensions. They are achievement-motivation, independence and responsibility. These dimensions may be influenced by the workers' level of task relevant education and work experience.
  - a. Achievement-Motivation - McClelland<sup>76</sup> characterizes "achievement motivation" as a function of achievement-motivated people. This type of person works on solving a problem rather than letting it solve itself. They are interested in tasks that are challenging but not to an impossible extent, one which can be solved if the person works to the extent of his efforts and talents. Achievement-motivated people are more concerned with experiencing a sense of accomplishment than with attaining the rewards of success such as money or recognition; they thrive on concrete task-related feed-back involving money and recognition as opposed to social acceptance.

"On the achievement-motivation dimension, high scorers will exhibit aspiration to accomplish challenging tasks, desire to maintain

high standards, willingness to work toward future goals, positive response to competition, and willingness to put forth effort to attain increasing degrees of excellence. Low scorers will indicate preference for easy rather than challenging tasks. They will exhibit a willingness to accept mediocre standards, a short term view of goals and a lack of responsiveness to competitive stimuli."<sup>77</sup>

b. Independence - The independent person is one who relies on his own potential, prefers to select and define his own activities (rationally) and is not immediately controlled by his physical and social environment.<sup>78</sup>

"High scorers on the independence dimension will manifest a tendency to break away from restraints, confinement or restrictions. They will express a preference for making their own decisions and for being unattached and free. Low scorers will indicate a tendency to conform more closely to social conventions and to accept restrictions on their activities more readily. They will exhibit a willingness to seek guidance in decision making and to be dependent upon other people."<sup>79</sup>

c. Responsibility - As related to maturity, this dimension refers to the ability to take responsibility, that is, with the responsibility to accept task assignments and carry them through to completion.

"High scorers on the responsibility dimension will exhibit willing acceptance of tasks which they will complete conscientiously and dependably. Socially, they will reveal alertness to ethical and moral issues. Low scorers will indicate a tendency to accept a minimum required number of work tasks, and they will indicate a lack of concern for social issues of an ethical and moral nature."<sup>80</sup>




Figure 10 - Life Cycle Theory - Effective Leader Styles

The theory hypothesizes that an appropriate style for working with very immature followers is quadrant #1, while the styles represented by quadrants #2 and #3 seem appropriate for moderately mature followers, and quadrant #4 tends to be a style appropriate for very mature followers.

With the Life Cycle, the leader has the responsibility to diagnose the maturity of the group, in terms of the situation the group is in, and then apply the appropriate leader behavior in terms of structure (task) and/or consideration (socio-emotional support.) Therefore, effectiveness would be reliant upon adaptive leader behavior based on the maturity of the group in the particular situation.

Quadrant #1 is a high task leader style which the theory assumes ap-

appropriate for working with immature people. As the maturity of the group or individual increases, so should the leader style differ reflecting the diagnosis of increased maturity of the followers.

Life Cycle Theory suggests that leader behavior should move through the four quadrants as the followers progress from immaturity to maturity.

### Life Cycle Theory as Related to Other Theory

#### Life Cycle and Motivation Theory

The leader must not only be concerned with his behavior, and group maturity, but must also pay attention to those things which motivate followers to act in a certain manner.

At a basic level of understanding behavior, it is important to realize that motives (needs, wants, drives, desires) directed toward goals (incentives, hoped for rewards) result in behavior. If needs (motives) are the reasons underlying behavior and at any one time individuals have hundreds of needs operating, then what determines which of these needs will motivate a person to act at any one moment? The answer logically is the need with the greatest strength at that time.

#### Hierarchy of Needs

Since the behavior of an individual is determined by his strongest need at a particular moment, leaders need to develop an understanding about needs most commonly important to people.

<sup>82</sup>  
Maslow has developed a hierarchy of needs into which human needs arrange themselves.






Figure 11 - Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969.)

Physiological needs are shown at the top because they have the greatest strength until satisfied. They are the basic human needs to sustain life - food, clothing, shelter. Until these needs are satisfied to an acceptable degree, most activity will be at this level and little else will motivate a person.

Upon gratification of physiological needs, Security or safety needs will become predominant. They are self-preservation needs, freedom from fear of physical harm or deprivation of physiological needs. Until a man can feel that his safety or security is out of danger, other things seem unimportant.

Gratification of the first two need levels allows the Affiliation or acceptance needs to emerge as predominant. These needs are associated with man's need to be accepted. They are gratified by establishing meaningful relationships with others.

Once an individual has satisfied his need to belong, the need for Self Esteem or recognition from others dominates.

Self-Actualization represents the final need level. It is the need to maximize one's potential.

Maslow felt that the hierarchy was a typical pattern operating most of the time. It should not be thought of as an absolute scale, that you must completely satisfy one level before dealing with another. Most people only partially satisfy each need level.

Herzberg's work<sup>83</sup> relates well to Maslow's hierarchy. He concluded that man has basically two categories of needs. Hygiene needs and Motivator needs which are essentially independent of each other and affect behavior in different ways.

<u>Hygiene Factors</u>	<u>Motivators</u>
Policies and Administration	Achievement
Supervision	Recognition for Accomplishment
Working Conditions	Challenging Work
Interpersonal Relations	Increased Responsibility
Money, Status, Security	Growth and Development

Figure 12 - Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Hygiene factors describe man's environment and serve the primary function of preventing job dissatisfaction. Motivators seem to be effective in motivating people to better performance.

The hygiene factors do not increase productivity, but prevent losses in performance due to work restriction. Motivators are related to the job itself. By tending to factors related to the job itself, these factors have the potential of increasing job satisfaction and productivity.

Hersey and Blanchard,<sup>84</sup> in relating the two theories, placed physio-

logical, security, affiliation and the status part of esteem as hygiene factors while recognition are self-actualization are motivators.




Figure 13 - Relationship between Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Motivation Theory (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969, p.48.)

The two theories can be explained in Life Cycle Theory in terms of those leadership styles which have a high probability of satisfying those needs. No pretense was made by Hersey and Blanchard that these were absolutes and would always plot true.

Upon examining the curvilinear function of the cycle, the styles tending to correspond with Maslow's high strength needs can be positioned. Leadership styles in the first three quadrants tend to watch those needs in terms of Herzberg's Hygiene factors, while quadrant four would seem to be the leader behavior appropriate to providing the motivators.




Figure 14 - Integration of Maslow and Herzberg to Life Cycle Theory of Leadership. (Hersey and Blanchard, Unpublished.)

It could be illustrated how other theories could be integrated with the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership. For example; McGregor's Theory X and Y, Likert's Management Systems, and Schein's rational-economic man, social and self-actualizing men can be plotted on the Life Cycle Effective style and maturity dimensions.

The "Maturity" dimension and its relationship to adaptive leader behavior, is consistent with Argyris' Immaturity-Maturity continuum.

Argyris<sup>86</sup> contends that there are seven changes which should take place in the life of an individual as he moves from immature to mature.

First, an individual moves from a passive state as an infant, to a state of increasing activity as an adult. Second, an individual develops from a state of dependency upon others as an infant to a state of relative dependence as an adult. Third, an individual behaves in only a few ways as an infant, but as an adult, he is capable of behaving in many ways. Fourth, an individual has an erratic, casual, and shallow interests as an infant, but develops deeper and stronger interests as an adult. Fifth, a child's time perspective is very short, involving only the present, but as he matures, his time perspective increases to include the past and future. Sixth, an individual as an infant is subordinate to everyone, but he moves to an equal or superior position with others as an adult. Seventh, as a child, an individual lacks an awareness of a "self" but as an adult, he is not only aware of, but he is able to control this. Argyris postulates that these changes reside on a continuum and that the healthy personality develops along this continuum from immaturity to maturity.

It should be noted that few if any people are apt to ever reach full maturity.<sup>87</sup>




Figure 15 - Argyris' Immaturity - Maturity Continuum. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969, p. 43.)

Remembering that Hersey and Blanchard's concept of "maturity" included achievement, independence, and responsibility, and that these were also seen as operating along a continuum, it becomes apparent as to the interrelatedness of the two concepts. Both have importance in determining appropriate leader behavior, depending upon where the group or individuals maturity levels are in relation to the continuum.

Therefore, accepting that the most important element of a leadership act is the followers, the need for the leader to accurately assess the maturity of the followers becomes paramount if he is to be effective in being a "Leader."

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was developed as a part of the Ohio State Leadership studies initiated in 1945, by Hemphill, and subsequently expanded by a cooperative effort of other involved scholars.

The LBDQ has been administered in a wide variety of situations. It has been used for the study of the commanders and crew members of bomber crews in the Department of the Air Force; commissioned officers, non-commissioned personnel and civilian administrators in the Department of the Navy; foremen in a manufacturing plant; executives in regional cooperative associations, college administrators; school superintendents; principals and teachers; and leaders in a wide variety of student and civilian groups and organizations. Successive adaptations and revisions were made in the process of using the questionnaire.<sup>88</sup>

The LDBQ was initiated in an attempt to develop an objective method for describing how a leader carries out his activities.

Defining leadership as, the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal, the Ohio State Staff initially developed nine dimensions of leader behavior. But, the findings were chiefly inconclusive. One hope the staff had was that the dimensions might show a moderate degree of independence. Such hope was soon dispelled by substantial intercorrelations between dimensions.

The present dimensions (factors); consideration, initiating structure, production emphasis, and social awareness resulted from a factor analysis of the intercollations among eight hypothesized dimensions of leader be-

havior in a study run by Halpin and Winer examining the leader behavior of air commanders and bomber crews. The factors, consideration and initiating structure, accounted for 83.2 percent of the total factor variance.<sup>89</sup>

Since the other two factors, production emphasis and Sensitivity, accounted for such a small percentage of the common variance, Halpin and Winer dropped their concern for all except consideration and initiating structure. The result was an eighty item form of the questionnaire, with fifteen items for measuring consideration and fifteen for measuring initiating structure. The remaining fifty items were not scored.<sup>90</sup>

The two scales are correlated to a moderate degree, but are sufficiently independent to permit the use of the Consideration and Initiating Structure scales as measures of different kinds of behavior. Different persons describing the same leader show significant similarity in their descriptions.<sup>91</sup>

This study will employ the forty item LBDQ with fifteen items for measuring the principal's use of consideration behavior and fifteen items measuring the extent to which the principal uses initiating structure behavior. (The instrument is discussed in detail in the third chapter, and enclosed in the appendix.)

Halpin<sup>92</sup> while reporting upon a study of fifty school superintendents who had been described by the LBDQ, came to the following conclusions.

Descriptions of the superintendent's leader behavior were gathered from three sources, the superintendent himself, the members of his staff, and members of the Board of Education of his district. Two forms of the LBDQ were given to the three sets of respondents, the LBDQ real and the



LBDQ ideal. "Real" described the superintendents in terms of actual perceived behavior, while the "ideal" described the respondent's perceptions of "ideal" leader.

#### Findings of Halpin's Study:

1. For both Consideration and Initiating Structure, respondents within their own groups tended to agree in their descriptions of superintendents.
2. While respondent groups agreed among themselves, no two groups agreed with each other.
3. School boards perceive superintendents as initiating structure to a greater extent than either staffs or superintendents themselves.
4. With respect to consideration, superintendents are given the lowest rating by their staffs. They and their boards see themselves as exhibiting more consideration.
5. With respect to the LBDQ ideal, there is general agreement that the norm for a good superintendent includes high rating on both consideration and initiating structure.

93

#### Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory

The similarities between the LBDQ and the LASI rest in the common use of the two dimensions of leader behavior, "consideration" and "initiating structure," and in the fact that a dominant style of leader behavior may be plotted with either instrument.

The primary difference rests in the "situational adaptability" element. When using the LBDQ one dominant normative style is plotted. The LASI builds in a variety of situations with follower groups high-

lighted at different levels of maturity. The principal can be described as to how he is apt to behave in the various situations. In order to examine "range" and "adaptability" in leader behavior, an instrument had to be used which allowed the participants a chance to illustrate or be illustrated as one who made use of variant leader styles.

The instrument originated with components of a game created by the author which was designed as a teaching device to aid in teaching the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership. By extracting the maturity descriptors and the leader action choices, and further modifying these through trial runs and interviews, the twenty-four item LASI evolved.

In summary, the basic intent of the instrument was to provide principals and their staffs the opportunity to describe their perceptions of the principals' leader behavior in response to changing situations. This concern is resultant from the emphasis placed on effective leadership being situational as is pointed out in the previously discussed literature review.

Chapter III will further elaborate the three research instruments used in this study; the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory, and the Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale.

#### Summary of Literature

1. The study of leadership has evolved through "Central Person Theory," "Charismatic," and The Study of Traits (all concerned with the study of leadership as being an individual phenomenon) to a position of

situational considerations. Situational leadership study concerns not only the examination of leaders as individuals, but also of specific situations and groups involved in those situations. One other distinction involves the fact that the focus of situational leadership is on observed leadership behavior, not hypothetical inborn traits.

2. Situational leadership is also functional in that it consists of such actions as those which aid in (1) goal setting, (2) moving the group toward its goals, (3) improving the quality of interactions among members, (4) building cohesiveness of the group, and (5) making resources available to the group.

3. There were two distinct groups of thought concerning formulation of organizational theory. Scientific Management, pioneered by Taylor and Fayol, was based on assumptions about workers similar to McGregor's "Theory X", and had a theme which intimated that if material rewards are closely aligned to work efforts, the worker would respond with the maximum performance of which he is physically capable. This approach is by design dehumanizing and was followed by the development of the Human Relations School. Pioneered by Mayo's Western Electric Studies, the Human Relations School was based on assumptions similar to McGregor's "Theory Y," and might state its theme in this manner. Man can be motivated to more productive work by helping him fulfill his social and psychological needs rather than by providing external rewards. In response to the de-personalized approach of the Scientific Management movement and the apparent lack of concern for securing organizational goals by the Human Relations School, the Revisionists came to the fore. Basically, the Revisionists proposed work environments which reflect individual and in-

stitutional purposes and needs.

4. Leader style has been described in terms of two types of behavior, "Task" and "Relationships." Numerous other terms, meaning nearly the same things have emerged in the literature. The important evolution pointed out by the literature involves the movement away from describing leader behavior in terms of an either/or phenomenon. The Ohio State studies, using the dimensions of "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration," began plotting leadership style on a two dimensional axis. Subsequent investigations led to another important evolution of thought. Normative leader style, and the plotting thereof, was of little value considering the realization that in order to be effective, a leader must be able to adapt his style of leader behavior to the needs of the situation and the followers.

5. Effectiveness is thought of as being important from two levels. First, there is effectiveness at the individual leader level, and secondly, the level of organizational effectiveness. At the individual leader level, the leader is thought to be effective if he can not only induce insubordinates to accomplish goals (position power,) but can also cause the follower to feel he is meeting personal needs while accomplishing those goals. This occurrence, it is thought, will lead to long term productivity.

In order to insure organizational effectiveness, the organization should operate from a set of assumptions about the workers that is not dehumanizing. The organization should pay attention to ways of involving workers intrinsically in their jobs, find mechanisms to integrate individual and organizational goals, the organization should regard leadership as a function of the organization rather than traits of an individual, and

see that leadership manages the relationships between individuals and the organization, that the organization pay much attention to "intervening variables" and group formation, and finally that the leader or management style be adaptive in response to changing situations.

6. Life Cycle Theory of Leadership is formulated from the bases of situational leadership, with the most important part of a leadership act being the followers. The responsibility for diagnosing the "maturity" of the group (considered the most important part of the situation) is the leader's. He is then expected to apply an appropriate leader style (adaptability) enhancing the possibility of obtaining effective results.

The theory has been demonstrated as an effective integrator of many other theories in the literature.

C H A P T E R   I I I  
T H E   D E S I G N   O F   T H E   S T U D Y

In design the study had five purposes.

1. To obtain descriptions of the variance of the principals' leader behavior as perceived by:
  - a. the staffs
  - b. the principals themselves
2. To obtain descriptions of the principals' leader behavior adaptability as perceived by:
  - a. the staffs
  - b. the principal himself
3. To relate the findings of #2 to the leader behavior adaptability of the principals prescribed as being appropriate by the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.
4. To obtain descriptions of the principals' dominant leader styles as perceived by:
  - a. the staffs
  - b. the principals themselves
5. To obtain descriptions of the principals' effectiveness from their respective superintendents and to explore the relationships between those ratings and the descriptions found in numbers 2, 3, and 4.

Sources of the Data

The sample school districts from which the data was generated, were geographically located in the Western half of Massachusetts in communities of less than thirty-five thousand people.

For the purpose of facilitating a representative sample, twenty member schools of the Cooperative School Service Center, a service organization based at the University of Massachusetts whose membership includes Western Massachusetts schools, were randomly selected from the total membership of thirty-five.

The initial contact means was a letter approved and signed by Nathaniel French, the Executive Secretary of that organization, and accompanied by a brief prospectus of the study. Also included in the initial package was a self-addressed postcard upon which superintendents could indicate their interest in participating.

A combination of phone calls and follow-up visits was necessary to secure participation of the required number of schools.

#### Sampling Procedure

In an attempt to avoid biasing the sample any further than their representativeness had already done, each member school of the CSSC was assigned a number, one through thirty-five, and the numbers were then placed in a bowl. The bowl was shaken, and then consecutively, twenty numbers were drawn. The districts matching the numbers were invited to participate via the above described procedure.

#### Data Collection Procedure

Upon receiving an indication of interest from district superintendents, the next step in all cases was obtaining interest and approval from building principals within districts. Districts were not asked to provide more than one building and staff each, however, in several instances the inter-




Figure 16 - Steps in Data Gathering Process



SCHOOL	ELEMENTARY	JUNIOR	JUNIOR & SENIOR	SENIOR
A	X			
B	X			
C			X	
D	X			
E	X			
F	X			
G	X			
H			X	
I				X
J			X	
K	X			
L	X			
M	X			
N			X	
O	X			
P			X	
Q		X		
TOTALS	19	1	5	1 = 17

Table 2 - Types of Schools Participating in the Study

SUPERINTENDENTS	PRINCIPALS	STAFF
1	Q	41
	O	15
	A	17
2	G	7
	H	31
	F	7
3	L	29
* 4	D	13
	E	13
* 5	I	39
6	B	15
7	P	46
8	N	37
9	C	56
10	J	42
	K	6
11	M	19
—	—	—
TOTALS	17	433

Table 3 - Total Participation in Study

\* Two superintendents failed to follow through with the rating scales of their principals.

SCHOOL	PRINCIPALS	STAFF	PERCENTAGE
A	1	17 of 20	85
B	1	15 of 18	83
C	1	56 of 65	86
D	1	13 of 16	81
E	1	13 of 16	81
F	1	7 of 8	87
G	1	7 of 7	100
H	1	31 of 41	76
I	1	39 of 50	78
J	1	42 of 46	91
K	1	6 of 8	75
L	1	29 of 32	91
M	1	19 of 20	95
N	1	37 of 49	76
O	1	15 of 18	83
P	1	46 of 48	96
Q	1	41 of 41	100
<hr/>			
TOTALS	17	17 of 17 = 100%	433 of 493 = 88%

Table 4 - Sample Participants - Teachers and Principals

SCHOOL	SUBURBAN	RURAL	REGIONAL	SMALL CITY		
A	X					
B				X		
C			X			
D	X					
E	X					
F		X				
G		X				
H			X			
I				X		
J		X				
K		X				
L		X				
M				X		
N			X			
O	X					
P			X			
Q	X					
—	—	—	—	—		
TOTALS	17	5	5	4	3	= 17

Table 5 - Geographic Types of Communities Serviced by Participating Schools

est in the study generated requests for more than one building to participate.

The author personally directed each session of questionnaire taking, providing the same instructions to each participating staff and principal, and limiting clarification to a reiteration of previously given directions.

The required time was approximately forty-five minutes per group from direction giving till task completion. This varied due to occasional logistical problems, but in all cases enough time was allotted for all participants to complete the questionnaire.

There were three different types of data collected. The first and most voluminous was the collection of the staff responses to the two questionnaires describing their perception of their principal's leader behavior. The second involved the collection of the principals' responses to the two questionnaires describing their perceptions of their own leader behavior. The final set of data collected was the effectiveness rating scales filled out by superintendents to rate their participating principals.

The Effectiveness Scale was developed cooperatively by the author and a panel of judges. The panel is listed in the appendix as is the resultant scale. The scale as a research instrument will be further discussed in this chapter. Procedurely, the Effectiveness Scale was sent to superintendents following the actual data collection dates from the principals and their staffs. The superintendent in charge of the principal was asked to rate that principal's effectiveness, by the scales, while at the same time providing a description of his other principals' effectiveness ratings. The purpose for including the comparisons of the other principals was to

help the author determine whether or not only effective principals were recommended for the study by the superintendents.

All participating schools were asked to be sure that at least seventy-five percent of their staff participated in answering the questionnaire. The questionnaires were combined into one packet of two parts. This allowed the questions to be numbered sequentially, thereby making possible the use of one answer form and preventing possible confusion in answering the questions. The questionnaire packet also included a sheet to be used to collect data concerning the respondent's age, sex, years in teaching, years in the building, and school name which was also coded and included on the digatec answer form.

No names were asked for or used, and the only means of identification was a letter and number coding system. Each school was assigned a letter, A-Q. The principals and their staffs were assigned numbers which were keyed to the letter for their school. All principals were given the number 99. The staffs were numbered sequentially from 1-the total number participating. For security reasons, each participant was asked to write the name of their school on both the answer form and the additional data sheet.

### The Research Instruments

#### The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

The LBDQ has been used many times since the nineteen fifties when it was developed. In response to the increased usage, the developers of the LBDQ, have developed a manual for proper usage. It was also necessary to secure permission from the research staff at Ohio State.

All the following material about the LBDQ was taken directly from that manual.

"The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) provides a technique whereby group members may describe the leader behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations. The LBDQ contains items, each of which describes a specific way in which a leader may behave. The respondent indicates the frequency with which he perceives the leader to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, never. These responses are obtained from the members of the leader's immediate work group, and are scored on two dimensions of leader behavior. For each dimension, the scores from the several group members are then averaged to yield an index of the leader's behavior. For each dimension, the scores from the several group members are then averaged to yield an index of the leader's behavior in respect to that dimension.

The LBDQ was developed by the staff of the Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, as one project of the Ohio State Leadership Studies, directed by Dr. Carroll L. Shartle. Hemphill and Coons (1) constructed the original form of the questionnaire; and Halpin and Winer (2), in reporting the development of an Air Force adaptation of the instrument, identified Initiating Structure and Consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. These dimensions were identified on the basis of a factor analysis of the responses of 300 B-29 crew members who described the leader behavior of their 52 aircraft commanders. Initiating Structure and Consideration accounted for approximately 34 to 50 percent respectively of the common variance. In a subsequent study based upon a sample of 249 aircraft commanders, the correlation between the scores on the two dimensions was found to be .88.

Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of the group he supervises, and in endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationship between the leader and his group.

Only 30 of the 40 items are scored; 15 each for the two dimensions. The 10 unscored items have been retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire. The scored items for each of the two dimensions are listed on the next few pages.

The score for each of the dimensions is the sum of the scores assigned to responses marked on each of the 15 items in the dimension. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 0-60.

The estimated reliability by the split half method is .83 for the Initiating Structure scores, and .92 for the Consideration scores, when corrected for attenuation.

In several studies (3,4,5,6,7) where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a "between vs. within group" analysis of variance, the F ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly.

The LBDQ has been used for research in industrial, military, and educational settings. Fleishman (8,9,10) and Fleishman, Harris and Burt (11) have used the LBDQ for use in their studies of factory foreman and have found the two leader behavior dimensions useful in evaluating the results of a supervisory training program. Halpin (12) has reported the relationship between the aircraft commander's behavior on these dimensions and evaluations of his performance made both by his superiors and his crew members; and has presented evidence (13) which indicates that the most effective commanders are those who score high on both dimensions of leader behavior. Similarly, Hemphill (14) in a study of 22 departments in a liberal arts college, found that the departments with the best campus reputation for being well administered were those whose leaders were described as above the average on both dimensions of leader behavior. Halpin has reported the LBDQ descriptions of a sample of 50 school superintendents (15) and elsewhere has compared the leader behavior of aircraft commanders and school administrators (16)....." 17



<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Item</u>
2.	He makes his attitudes clear to the group.
4.	He tries out his new ideas with the group.
7.	He rules with an iron hand.
9.	He criticizes poor work.
11.	He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
14.	He assigns group members to particular tasks.
16.	He schedules the work to be done.
17.	He maintains definite standards of performance.
22.	He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.
24.	He encourages the use of uniform procedures.
27.	He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by all group members.
29.	He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
32.	He lets group members know what is expected of them.
35.	He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.
39.	He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

Figure 17 - Items In The Initiating Structure Scale

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
2	4	3	2	1	0
4	4	3	2	1	0
7	4	3	2	1	0
9	4	3	2	1	0
11	4	3	2	1	0
14	4	3	2	1	0
16	4	3	2	1	0
17	4	3	2	1	0
22	4	3	2	1	0
24	4	3	2	1	0
27	4	3	2	1	0
29	4	3	2	1	0
32	4	3	2	1	0
35	4	3	2	1	0
39	4	3	2	1	0

Figure 18 - Scoring Key for Initiating Structure

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.	He does personal favors for group members.
3.	He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
6.	He is easy to understand.
8.	He finds time to listen to group members.
12.	He keeps to himself.*
13.	He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
18.	He refuses to explain his actions.*
20.	He acts without consulting the group.*
21.	He backs up the members in their actions.
23.	He treats all group members as his equals.
26.	He is willing to make changes.
28.	He is friendly and approachable.
31.	He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.
34.	He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
38.	He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.

Items 5, 10, 15, 19, 30, 33, 36, 37, and 40 are not scored on either dimension.

\*These items are scored in reverse.

Figure 19 - Items in The Consideration Scale

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
1	4	3	2	1	0
3	4	3	2	1	0
6	4	3	2	1	0
8	4	3	2	1	0
12	0	1	2	3	4
13	4	3	2	1	0
18	0	1	2	3	4
20	0	1	2	3	4
21	4	3	2	1	0
23	4	3	2	1	0
26	4	3	2	1	0
28	4	3	2	1	0
31	4	3	2	1	0
34	4	3	2	1	0
38	4	3	2	1	0

Figure 20 - Scoring Key for Consideration

REFERENCES

1. Christner, Charlotte A. & Hemphill, J. K. Leader behavior of B-29 commanders and changes in crew members' attitudes toward the crew. Sociometry, 1955, 18, 82-87.
2. Fleishman, E. A. "Leadership climate" and supervisory behavior: A study of the leadership role of the foreman in an industrial situation. Columbus, Ohio.
3. Fleishman, E. A. The description of supervisory behavior. J. appl. Psychol. 1953, 37, 1-6.
4. Fleishman, E. A. The measurement of leadership attitudes in industry, J. appl. Psychol., 1953, 37, 153-158.
5. Fleishman, E. A., Harris, E. F. & Burt, H. E. Leadership and Supervision in Industry. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research Monograph No. 33, 1956.
6. Halpin, A. W. Studies in aircrew composition, III. The combat leader behavior of B-29 aircraft commanders. Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C. Human Factors Operations Research Laboratory, Sept. 1953. (HFORL Memo No. TN-54-7.)
7. Halpin, A. W. The leadership behavior and combat performance of airplane commanders. J. abnorm. & Soc. Psychol., 1954, 49, 19-22.
8. Halpin, A. W. The leader behavior and leadership ideology of educational administrators and aircraft commanders. Harvard Educ. Rev., 1955.
9. Halpin, A. W. The leadership ideology of aircraft commanders. J. appl. Psychol., 1955, 39, 82-84.
10. Halpin, A. W. The leadership behavior of school superintendents: A study of 50 Ohio superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, School-Community Development Study Monograph (in press.)
11. Halpin, A. W. & Winer, B. J. The leadership behavior of the airplane commander. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1952. (Technical Report III prepared for Human Resources Research Laboratory, Dept. of the Air Force, under Contracts AF 33(038)-10105 & AF 18(600)-27 mimeographed.)
12. Hemphill, J. K. Patterns of leadership behavior associated with administrative reputation of the department of a college. J. Educ. Psychol., (in press.)
13. Rush, C. H., Jr. Group dimensions of aircrews. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1953. (Out of Print.)

14. Stogdill, Ralph M. & Coons, Alvin E., Editors. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research Monograph No. 88, 1957.

(This is the original BIBLIOGRAPHY from the manual. The preceding footnotes will match.)

### The Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory

The development of this instrument is not yet complete. This study and subsequent usage will undoubtedly affect the format for future use. One of the secondary goals of the study is to further refine and improve the instrument.

To this point, the items have evolved from a simulation designed to train administrators to think in terms of situational behavior, and to use leader styles appropriate to the "maturity" of the staff as posed in the situations, as prescribed by the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.

Since the items are based on the principals' ability to diagnose the group in the situation, each situation contains some indicators as defined under "maturity" in Chapter I.

Maturity is thought of as falling in one of three categories, low moderate or high. The three degrees depend on the level of the group's achievement motivation, independence, and ability to assume responsibility. These variables may be affected by the amount of task relevant education and experience the group possesses.

Life Cycle Theory, like this instrument and the LBDQ, makes use of the Ohio State developed leader behavior dimensions of "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure." The four choices of leader actions in the LASI are representative of quadrants from the Ohio State Studies.

In accordance with the Life Cycle Theory, the effective leader appropriately applies a leader style in response to the diagnosed maturity of the group. The range of styles moves through High Initiating Structure and Low Consideration to Low Initiating Structure and Low Consideration as the group moves from low maturity to high maturity.

In the use of the instrument the respondent is presented with a situation containing indications of the group's maturity, and asked to apply one of four possible leader actions to that situation, or to describe the action his superior would most likely initiate.

The illustration below demonstrates one set of four leader actions from the LASI, and how they are representative of the four quadrants of leader behavior developed by the Ohio State Staff and incorporated within the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.

Low Initiating Structure 3 High Consideration	High Initiating Structure 2 High Consideration
Low Initiating Structure 4 Low Consideration	High Initiating Structure 1 Low Consideration

Range of Leader Actions LASI

- A. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions. (4)
- B. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met. (2)
- C. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, don't push. (3)
- D. Redefine goals and supervise carefully. (1)

In terms of the Life Cycle Theory, you would use either a high initiating structure or low initiating structure in combination with either a high consideration or low consideration leader style. The four actions above are taken from one of the situations on the LASI.



Note how each can be placed on the quadrants. The study is interested in exploring the frequency with which respondents select certain styles, whether or not they select differing styles in response to changing situations. The instrument also is designed to allow examination of whether or not the principal being described uses differing styles appropriate to the prescribed behavior of Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.

In order to satisfy one of the purposes of the study, measuring the principals' "appropriate adaptability," a game score (theory based answers) were created against which the participants' descriptions could be compared. The scoring sheet for that is enclosed in the appendix. In not all cases within the LASI is there a decisively clear cut distinction between the possible styles and the quadrants they represent. For this reason, some responses are given a +1 rating. The +1 indicates that it is not the most acceptable response, according to theory, but is relatively appropriate and the respondent should not be given a negative score.

Appropriateness in choosing an action is dependent upon the respondent's interpretation of the situationally described group's maturity, and the ensuing application of a leader style considered appropriate by the Life Cycle of Leadership. The relationships sought are not based on the absolute, irrevocable truth of the theory but rather on the appropriateness as given by theory.

The LASI consists of twenty-four situations and sets of possible actions.

There are only twelve original situations. Twenty-four items are arrived at by using each of the situations twice. The situations are never used twice in conjunction with the same set of possible leader ac-

tions.

There are six different sets of responses, each of which contains four representative leader actions.

The twelve situations will be presented here, and then placed by their number on the quadrants depending on the level of maturity they present.

Situations from Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory

1. Your principal's staff is not responding lately to his obvious concern for their welfare and friendly conversation. Productivity is in a tailspin. He would most likely....
2. Your principal's staff has been dropping in productivity during the last few months. It has been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Role defining on his part has helped in the past. The staff has continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time. He would most likely....
3. The observable performance of your staff is increasing. Your principal has been making sure that all members were aware of their roles and standards of performance. He would most likely....
4. Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among his staff. The staff has a remarkable record of accomplishment. They have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task. Your principal would most likely....
5. Your principal's staff, usually able to take responsibility, is not responding to his recent redefining of standards. He would most likely....

6. Your principal's superintendent appointed him to head a task force that is far overdue in making request recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help. Your principal would most likely....
7. Productivity and group relations are good. Your principal feels somewhat unsure about his lack of direction of the group. He would most likely....
8. Your principal has been promoted to a new position. The previous administrator was uninvolved in the affairs of the staff. The staff has adequately handled their tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good. Your principal would most likely....
9. Your principal stepped into a smoothly running situation. The last administrator ran a tight ship. Your principal wants to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment. He would most likely....
10. Your principal's staff has responded well to his spelling out tasks specifically and dealing firmly with those who didn't demonstrate appropriate behavior. Lately this style hasn't been achieving results. He would most likely....
11. Your principal has been considering instituting a major change. The staff has tended to resist change that they didn't initiate. They have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change. He would most likely....
12. Your principal has been considering making major changes in your organizational structure. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The staff has demonstrated flexibility in their day-to-day operations. Your principal would most likely....




Figure 21 - Placement of LASI items (situations) by diagnosed maturity.

The answer sets used with the situations contained behaviors representative of the quadrants. There were six different sets of four choices. The sets will be illustrated in the next section, and each choice will be labeled as to the quadrant it represents.

#### Leader Actions Included in the LASI

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| A) Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.   | <u>1</u>   |
| B) Involve the staff in problem solving.  | <u>3</u>   |
| C) Individually talk with staff members and set goals.                                      | <u>2</u>   |
| D) Do what he can to make staff feel important and involved.                                | <u>2-3</u> |
|   |            |
| A) Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.                                       | <u>4</u>   |
| B) Incorporate staff recommendations but see that objectives are met.                       | <u>2</u>   |
| C) Allow the staff involvement in setting goals, but do not push.                           | <u>3</u>   |
| D) Redefine goals and supervise carefully.  | <u>1</u>   |
|   |            |
| A) Engage in friendly interaction, but see that the staff follows rules and regulations.    | <u>2</u>   |
| B) Take no definite action.   | <u>4</u>   |
| C) Acquire the staff's approval on a course of action and allow them to structure the task. | <u>3</u>   |
| D) Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and necessity of task accomplishment.            | <u>1</u>   |

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| A) Avoid confrontation, do not apply pressure.   | <u>4</u>   |
| B) Make himself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.                      | <u>3</u>   |
| C) Make his feelings about goals clear, and do all he can to help in goal completion.          | <u>2</u>   |
| D) Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.   | <u>1</u>   |
|  |            |
| A) Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.                             | <u>2-3</u> |
| B) Discuss results, reset standards  | <u>1</u>   |
| C) Intentionally do not intervene.   | <u>4</u>   |
| D) Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.             | <u>2</u>   |
|  |            |
| A) Take steps to direct the staff towards working in a well defined manner.                    | <u>1</u>   |
| B) Try out solutions and new directions with the staff and examine the need for new practices. | <u>2</u>   |
| C) Be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by pushing.                                | <u>3</u>   |
| D) Allow the staff to continue as it has.  | <u>4</u>   |

It should be noted that five of the six leader action sets allow the respondent the full range of leader action behaviors to choose from. The one set provides all but the fourth quadrant with the combination of two choices from the middle maturity range.

The range of choices allowed for selection enables the respondent to describe his principal, or the principal to describe himself, as making use of a dominant style, as making use of a variety of styles, or making use of a variety of style as the situation differs. It naturally follows that the study will be able to examine the descriptions of the principals' behavior from those perspectives as well as comparing their actions to Life Cycle prescribed "appropriate adaptability."

## Effectiveness Rating Scale

### Procedure for Developing the Scale

Many of the stated purposes for the study involve the comparisons of the questionnaire generated data (principals' styles, variance of behavior, and "appropriate adaptability") to the effectiveness rating given the principals by their superintendents.

In lieu of the fact that the author was unable to uncover adequate pre-developed rating scales which dealt with effectiveness from the standpoints of output and intervening variables, and the felt need to be more specific in these areas than was the literature, the decision was made to create an original scale.

A panel of judges, see appendix for participants, was formed to help the author establish specific criteria statements within the two categories of "output variables" and "intervening variables." It was Likert's contribution in the literature, p. 40-41, that gave the impetus for the resultant format.

The literature reviewed, indicated that effectiveness was more than a function of pure output by the individual or his organization, and his failure to attend to the "intervening variables" would greatly limit long term effectiveness.

Taking all of this into account, it was decided to develop a scale which would provide the superintendent with a set of effectiveness indicators to rate his principal(s) on "output variables" (tangible measurable productivity) and another set of effectiveness indicators to rate his principal(s) on "intervening variables" (intangible management of human relationships within the school.)

The panel proposed that there be a final "Global" scale wherein the superintendent would weigh the two categories as he saw fit, in order that he would arrive at a final overall effectiveness rating.

The panel of judges met one morning for three hours. The first thirty minutes were spent talking about the purpose of the scale within the study, and the two categories of effectiveness criteria needed. The judges then split into two teams to brainstorm criteria for each of the two categories of criteria. Each team was made up of a superintendent, principal and a member of the staff of the Center for Leadership and Administration at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts. Approximately forty minutes were spent in small groups. The final ninety minutes were spent in total group discussing and comparing criteria statements and measures.

#### The Effectiveness Scale

The panel of judges recommended a rating form which provided the investigator with the opportunity to obtain data regarding the superintendent's perception of how well the principal "managed human relationships" (see category one, questions 1-8,) and his "output of productivity" (see category two, questions 1-8.) Each category was followed by an overall rating of +3 to -3.

After the superintendents rated the two categories, they were asked to supply a "global rating" of their perception of the principal's overall effectiveness. This scale was also based on a range of +3 to -3. Plus three represented maximum effectiveness with the other number representing declining effectiveness down to minus three which represented

maximum ineffectiveness.

In addition to filling out the rating forms on their principal's effectiveness, the superintendents were asked to list all other principals in their district and give them a corresponding global score. The reason for including this page was to enable the investigator to ascertain whether or not the superintendents were providing the investigator with only their best principals for participation in the study. The results of the findings will be found in Chapter IV.



Figure 22 - Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale

Instructions:

The following items are divided into two categories of principal leadership actions. Each item has a scale from +3 to -3 for your rating. (+3) represents optimum effectiveness and (-3) represents optimum ineffectiveness. At the end of each set of items is an overall rating scale for that set of items. At the end of the instrument is an overall rating scale for your "global" rating of your principal.

Category One

Please circle one number for each item.

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 1. The principal resolves conflict among students, staff, and parents at the building level.              | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |
| 2. The principal solicits and uses the help and opinions of his staff in planning and decision-making.    | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |
| 3. The principal clearly communicates his ideas and goals to his staff, students, parents, and superiors. | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |
| 4. The principal has developed commitment and support from his staff and students.                        | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |
| 5. The principal builds and maintains school morale.  | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |
| 6. The principal encourages experimentation by the staff.   | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |
| 7. The principal makes efforts to provide an environment that offers alternatives for students and staff. | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |
| 8. The principal adapts his leader style to changing situations.  | +3+2+1-1-2-3 |

This set of items was designed to help you rate your principal on his managing of human relationships in his building. Based on such information showing increasing or decreasing levels of participatory decision-making, teacher turnover, absenteeism and grievance levels, as well as, community complaints, student absenteeism and vandalism, drop out rates and the like, how would you rate the principal on his overall management of the above items?

Optimum Effective  $\leftarrow +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \rightarrow$  Optimum Ineffectiveness

Category TwoPlease circle one number for each item

1. The principal initiates and participates in staff in-service as well as personally supervising and improving the quality of instruction in his building. +3+2+1-1-2-3
2. The school's program is meeting the academic needs of the students as evidenced by measured growth on testing instruments. +3+2+1-1-2-3
3. The principal's budget requests show cost-effectiveness and evidence of long range program planning. +3+2+1-1-2-3
4. The principal skillfully handles the routine management duties with which he is charged. +3+2+1-1-2-3
5. In building his program, the principal attends workshops, conferences, visits other schools, and is attentive to his own professional growth. +3+2+1-1-2-3
6. The principal effectively works with his non-professional staff as evidenced by their productivity. +3+2+1-1-2-3
7. The principal builds and maintains a program that is accepted by the parents as adequately meeting their childrens' needs. +3+2+1-1-2-3
8. The professional staff is encouraged and does attend to their renewal by continuing course work, attending conferences and workshops, and visiting other schools. +3+2+1-1-2-3

This set of items was designed to help you rate your principal on the tangible output of his program and leader actions. Based on measurable evidence of productivity such as student performance growth, teacher retention, teacher academic growth, building cleanliness, attendance at in-service functions, conferences, budget requests, handling of routine duties, how would you rate the principal on his overall productivity output?

Optimum Effective ← +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 → Optimum Ineffectiveness

-----

GLOBAL SCALE

Based on your ratings of the two preceding sets, and your feelings of which items are most important, please make an overall rating on the scale below of your perception of how effective your principal is.

+3      +2      +1      -1      -2      -3

Addendum

For purposes of checking the nature of the sample, it is necessary to obtain a reading of the principal's comparative effectiveness within your district. Would you please provide a global score for your other principals without giving the name or the school?

I have \_\_\_\_\_ other principals in my district.

They would be rated?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

---

Before returning, would you please check to see if:

1. You have furnished a rating score on all three levels.
2. You have indicated a score for your other principals.

Please accept my appreciation for the time and effort you have given this project. The sooner this form is returned, the sooner the final analysis can be completed.

## CHAPTER IV

## FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

It is the intent of this chapter to demonstrate the significance of the data collected, illustrating for the reader, the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses as well as related findings.

Compilation of Data from the LBDQ and the LASI

The seventeen participating schools were lettered from A to Q for purposes of comparing the data, yet maintaining anonymity. Each school was charted as to the frequency of selection and the corresponding scores on both the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In addition, the leadership style of the action selected on the LASI was also recorded to allow a comparison of dominant style between the LBDQ and the LASI.

LBDQ Results

The following chart (Table 6) illustrates the overall leadership scores for the LBDQ dimensions of "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure," as perceived by the principals and their staffs. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 0-60, with sixty being the highest possible score. Fifteen items from the LBDQ are used to assess the scores in each dimension. (See Chapter III.) A similar form of the LBDQ, the LOQ, was given to the principal, to describe his perception of his leader behavior, and to the staff to describe their perceptions of his leader behavior.

## LDBQ Results, cont.

School	Consideration		Structure	
	Staff	Self	Staff	Self
A	53	52	49	50
B	47	45	40	40
C	50	45	48	50
D	48	52	34	38
E	51	42	37	42
F	50	48	40	41
G	57	56	35	38
H	42	44	44	43
I	39	40	33	34
J	30	41	37	50
K	54	48	51	42
L	44	41	43	30
M	51	49	49	41
N	47	42	38	38
O	56	41	47	51
P	52	36	46	44
Q	51	55	40	41
MEAN	48	46	42	42

Table 6 - LBDQ Scores

Table 7 - Conversion of Scores to LBDQ Styles

School	Staff	Self
A	High Consideration High Structure	High Consideration High Structure
B	Low Consideration Low Structure	Low Consideration Low Structure
C	High Consideration High Structure	Low Consideration High Structure
D	High Consideration Low Structure	Low Consideration High Structure
E	High Consideration Low Structure	Low Consideration High Structure
F	High Consideration Low Structure	High Consideration Low Structure
G	High Consideration Low Structure	High Consideration Low Structure
H	Low Consideration High Structure	Low Consideration High Structure
I	Low Consideration Low Structure	Low Consideration Low Structure
J	Low Consideration Low Structure	Low Consideration High Structure
K	High Consideration High Structure	High Consideration High Structure
L	Low Consideration High Structure	Low Consideration Low Structure
M	High Consideration High Structure	High Consideration Low Structure
N	Low Consideration Low Structure	Low Consideration Low Structure
O	High Consideration High Structure	Low Consideration High Structure
P	High Consideration High Structure	Low Consideration High Structure
Q	High Consideration Low Structure	High Consideration Low Structure

In nine of the seventeen schools there was agreement between the principals and their staffs as to his described leader style.

Table 8 - Style Placements, LBDQ

Self Descriptions		Staff Descriptions	
High Consider. Low Structure  4	High Consider. High Structure  2	High Consider. Low Structure  5	High Consider. High Structure  6
Low Consider. Low Structure  4	Low Consider. High Structure  7	Low Consider. Low Structure  4	Low Consider. High Structure  2

It is notable that the principals as a group, described themselves more often as being in the High Structure, Low Consideration quadrant than did the collective staffs. At the same time, the staffs described the principals more often in the High Consideration quadrants than did the principals themselves.

#### Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory

The LASI was administered at the same time as the LBDQ by being presented as the second part of one large questionnaire. Both the staff and the principals answered the same form of the questionnaire except for more personalized wording on the principal's form. The personalized wording was used to help the principals realize that he was to choose the situational response he would be apt to make in the given situation.

The following table (Table 9) will illustrate the manner in which the seventeen principals and their staffs responded to the LASI in terms of adaptability scores and perceived dominant styles.

The adaptability scores were of a possible range of -48 to +48. The minus score would indicate complete unadaptability while the plus extreme would indicate maximum adaptability according to theoretical interpretation.

#### Observations on Table 9

The most notable observation of this set of data concerns the comparison of adaptability scores. With the exception of School I, every staff perceived score of adaptability was higher than the self-perceived score by principals. The mean adaptability score for all responding staffs was 18.9, while the mean for all participating principals was a lower 8.3.

To determine dominant styles from the LASI, it was necessary to determine from the staff, the most frequently selected for each situation. Each action was designed to be reflective of one of four behavior styles designed by the original Ohio State research (p. 29.)

It is interesting to note that twelve of the seventeen principals perceived their dominant styles to be the same as the style described by their staffs, and that in all twelve cases the agreed upon style was High-Consideration-High Initiating Structure. In all but two cases, the principals described their dominant styles as High Consideration - High Structure.



Table 9 - LASI Results

School	Adaptability Scores		Dominant Style *	
	Staff	Self	Staff	Self
A	+22	+11	HC,HS	HC,HS
B	+25	+ 8	NONE	HC,HS
C	+20	+ 7	HC,HS	HC,HS
D	+14	+13	HC,HS	HC,HS
E	+13	+ 4	HC,HS	HC,HS
F	+23	+10	HC,HS	HC,HS
G	+11	+ 6	HC,HS	HC,HS
H	+23	+ 8	HC,HS	HC,HS
I	+ 7	+14	HC,LS	HC,HS
J	+ 9	+ 8	LC,HS	HC,HS
K	+15	+13	HC,HS	HC,HS
L	+21	- 6	HC,HS	NONE
M	+24	+13	HC,HS	HC,HS
N	+17	+15	HC,HS	HC,HS
O	+21	+15	HC,HS	HC,HS
P	+18	0	HC,HS	HC,HS
Q	+16	+ 2	HC,HS	HC,HS
Mean	+18.9	+ 8.3		

\*

HC = High Consideration

LC = Low Consideration

HS = High Structure

LS = Low Structure

NONE = No dominant style emerged

As a group, the principals described their dominant styles as per Table 10a. The staffs reflected the style determination of the same group of principals as reflected in Table 10b. As was illustrated in the two tables, there was a very close frequency in style choice between the two groups.

Table 10 - LASI Dominant Styles

High Consider. Low Structure 1	High Consider. High Structure 15
0 Low Consider. Low Structure	0 Low Consider. High Structure

One with no dominant style determined.

High Consider. Low Structure 1	High Consider. High Structure 14
Low Consider. Low Structure	1 Low Consider. High Structure

Table 11 - Style Comparisons Between the LBDQ and the IASI

Schools	LBDQ		IASI	
	Staff HC,HS	Self HC,HS	Staff HC,HS	Self HC,HS
A	LC,LS	LC,LS	NONE	HC,HS
B	HC,HS	LC,HS	HC,HS	HC,HS
C	HC,LS	LC,HS	HC,HS	HC,HS
D	HC,LS	LC,HS	HC,HS	HC,LS
E	HC,LS	HC,LS	HC,HS	HC,HS
F	HC,LS	HC,LS	HC,HS	HC,HS
G	LC,HS	LC,HS	HC,HS	HC,HS
H	LC,LS	LC,LS	HC,LS	HC,HS
I	LC,LS	LC,HS	LC,HS	HC,HS
J	HC,HS	HC,HS	HC,HS	HC,HS
K	LC,HS	LC,LS	HC,HS	NONE
L	HC,HS	HC,LS	HC,HS	HC,HS
M	LC,LS	LC,LS	HC,HS	HC,HS
N	HC,HS	LC,HS	HC,HS	HC,HS
O	HC,HS	LC,HS	HC,HS	HC,HS
P	HC,LS	HC,LS	HC,HS	HC,HS
Q				

HC = High Consideration

LC = Low Consideration

HS = High Structure

LS = Low Structure

NONE = No dominant style emerged

In comparing the staff's descriptions of the principals across the two instruments, the researcher found that in Schools A, C, K, M, O, and P, or thirty-five percent of the schools, the staffs described their principals' leader style as being the same on both the LBDQ and the IASI.

In comparing the principals' self descriptions of their leader styles, the researcher found that in only schools A and K, or twelve percent of the schools, did the principals' descriptions of their styles match. In fact, in a greater percentage of cases the principals described themselves as completely opposite in leader styles on the two instruments.

#### Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale

Once the researcher had collected the data from the seventeen principals and their staffs, the Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale was sent to all the superintendents of the participating school districts. Even though the researcher had clearly communicated the total procedure of the study to all the superintendents prior to data collection, three of the superintendents failed to provide an effectiveness rating for their participating principals. Therefore, in Table 12, data is provided for only fourteen principals.

The Effectiveness Rating Scale included three sub-sections. They included his effectiveness in managing human relationships, his effectiveness in attending to productivity, and a "global" rating of his overall effectiveness. The scale ranged from -3 (optimum ineffectiveness) to +3 (optimum effectiveness.)

Table 12 - Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale Results

School	Management of Human Relations	Attention to Productivity	Global Rating
A	+2	+2.5	+2
B	+2	+2	+2
C	+2	+2.2	+2.5
D	----- Did Not Respond -----		
E	----- Did Not Respond -----		
F	-1	+1	+1
G	+2.6	+2	+2
H	+1	+1	+1
I	----- Did Not Respond -----		
J	+2	+2	+2
K	+2	+2	+2
L	+2	+3	+2
M	+2.5	+2.5	+2.5
N	+3	+3	+3
O	+2.8	+2.8	+2.8
P	+3	+3	+3
Q	+2	+2	+2
Mean	+2	+2.2	+2.1

The significance of the "global" ratings will become more important when applied to the hypotheses later in this chapter and in Chapter V. It is important to note at this point, that five principals (C, M, N, O, P) were rated above the mean in global effectiveness, while nine were below the mean (A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, Q.) This rating does not necessarily

mean that the nine principals are generally ineffective, but rather, that in this sample, they were rated below the mean for effectiveness. The fact that they were so numerically close may in fact mean that the sample is overall an effective group.

#### Effectiveness Rating Compared to Other Principals In-District

The researcher included an addendum to the Principal's Effectiveness Rating Scale for the purpose of providing a means of determining whether or not superintendents recommended only their most, least, or a combination of most and least effective principals.

The addendum asked the superintendents how many additional principals were in their district, and the global rating of the others. The following chart, Table 13, illustrates that data and the relationship of the participating principals to their colleagues.

Table 13, illustrates the fact that fifty-seven percent of all participating principals were considered by their superintendents as the most effective principals in the district, while only fourteen percent of the participating principals were considered as relatively ineffective by their superintendents. The implications of these findings will be discussed in Chapter V.

Table 13 - Effectiveness Rating Compared to Other Principals  
In-District

Participating Principal	Principal's Rating	# Other Principals	Their Ratings	Relative Position of Participating Principal
A	+2	4	+2,+2,+3,+3	Low
B	+2	4	+1,+1,+2,+3	Middle
C	+2.5	5	-1,+1,+1,+2	High
D	-----	No Data Given -----		
E	-----	No Data Given -----		
F	+1	4	-1,+1,+2,+2	Middle
G	+2	4	-1,+1,+2,+2	High
H	+1	4	-1,+1,+2,+2	Middle
I	-----	No Data Given -----		
J	+2	7	-1,-1,+1,+1,+1,+1,+2	High
K	+2	7	-1,-1,+1,+1,+1,+1,+2	High
L	+2	1	+1	High
M	+2.5	10	-2,+1,+1,+1,+1, +2,+2,+2,+2,+2	High
N	+3	3	+1,+2,+2	High
O	+2.8	4	+2,+2,+3,+3	Middle
P	+3	3	+2,+3,+3	High
Q	+2	4	+2,+2,+3,+3	Low

### Examination of Hypotheses

In this section of the study the hypotheses, statistical tests, and results rendered will be presented. The discussion of those results will occur in Chapter V.

#### Hypothesis One

As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significant difference between the staff-perceived mean variance of principals' leader behavior of those principals rated above the norm on the effectiveness scale and the staff-perceived mean variance of leader behavior for those principals rated below the norm on the effectiveness scale.

A. To determine variance of perceived principal's leader behavior, the mode responses for each quadrant were compared to maximum variance. Thus for school A, the obtained quadrants were:

A		Max. Variance
4	17	6
0	3	6

Each school in turn was compared to the maximum variance.

An  $x^2$  was computed for the differences between the obtained and the theoretical variances of each school.

$$x = \frac{2 (o-E)^2}{E}$$

b. The  $x^2$  scores were grouped according to those principals who were rated above the norm and those below:



High Effectiveness

C 16.73  
M 17.54  
N 8.54  
O 10.83  
P 18.11

Low Effectiveness

A 12.66      J 8.17  
B 1.09      K 17.54  
F 11.23     L 10.83  
G 10.63     Q 15.66  
H 8.55

A "t" test was computed to compare the means of the two groups  
(above and below the norm.)

The results were not significant.

$$t = 1.45$$

$$df = 4.8 \quad p = .196, p > .05$$

Hypothesis One is accepted.

Hypothesis Two

As measured on the Lasi, there will not be a significant difference between the mean staff perceived adaptability scores of those principals with an above the norm rating on the effectiveness scale, and those principals with a below the norm rating on the effectiveness scale.

School	A	B	F	G	H	J	K	L	Q	C	M	N	O	P
Eff. Score	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	3
LASI	22	25	23	11	23	9	15	21	16	20	24	17	21	18
LASI Rnk.	4	1	3	11	3	12	10	5	9	6	2	8	5	7
Eff. Rnk.	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	1

Spearman's RHO =  $-.171$     df 15 n.s.

A t test for differences between the means of the two

groups showed no significance:

	<u>High Effectiveness</u>	<u>Low Effectiveness</u>
Means	20.00	18.33
S.D.	2.74	5.77

t = .732      p = .503      p > .05  
df = 4.8

Hypothesis Two is accepted.

### Hypothesis Three

As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significantly positive correlation between the principals' self-perceived adaptability scores, and the mean of the staff perceived adaptability scores.

School	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
Self Score	11	8	7	13	4	10	6	8	14	8	13	-6	13	15	15	0	2
Staff Score	22	25	20	14	13	23	11	23	7	9	15	21	24	17	21	18	16
Self Rank	4	6	7	3	9	5	8	6	2	6	3	12	3	1	1	11	10
Staff Rank	4	1	6	11	12	3	13	3	15	14	10	5	2	8	5	7	9

Spearman's RHO = .020 n.s.

Pearson's R = .056 n.s.

An analysis of variance test was run to test to see if overall there was a difference in staff and self scores.

Overall there was a difference with principals consistently rating themselves as less adaptable than their staffs.

	<u>Means</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Self Scores	8.29	5.79
Staff Scores	17.59	5.46

F = 23.18 at 1 and 32 df significant, at .01

Hypothesis Three is rejected.

### Hypothesis Four

As measured on the LDBQ, there will not be a significant difference between the mean consideration scores of principals as perceived by the principals, and the mean consideration scores of the principals as perceived by their staffs.

School	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
Self	52	45	45	52	42	48	56	44	40	41	48	41	49	42	41	36	55
Staff	53	47	50	48	51	50	57	42	39	30	54	44	51	47	56	52	51
Self Rank	3	6	6	3	8	5	1	7	10	9	5	9	4	8	9	11	2
Staff Rank	4	9	7	8	6	7	1	11	12	13	3	10	6	9	2	5	6

Spearman's RHO = .344 n.s.  
 Pearson's R = .429

	Mean	S.D.
Self Scores	45.71	5.69
Staff Scores	48.35	6.68

Mean consideration scores were compared by an analysis of variance.

F = 1.55      p = .22 n.s.  
                   p    .05

Hypothesis Four is accepted.

### Hypothesis Five

As measured by the LBDQ, there will not be a significant relationship between those principals rated as above the norm on the effectiveness scale and those principals who are described by their staffs as having a dominant leader style of high consideration and high initiating structure.

<u>High Effectiveness</u>		<u>Low Effectiveness</u>			
School	Style	School	Style		
C	HC,HS	A	HC,HS	J	LC,LS
M	HC,HS	B	LC,LS	K	HC,HS
N	LC,LS	F	HC,LS	L	LC,HS
O	HC,HS	G	HC,LS	Q	HC,LS
P	HC,HS	H	LC,HS		

Of the principals rated as High Effective, four had a dominant style of HC,HS.

Of the principals rated as below the norm on the effectiveness scale, only two had a dominant style of HC,HS.

An x with Yates correction was not significant.

$$x = 3.34 \text{ (1df)} \quad p > .05$$

Hypothesis Five is accepted.

#### Hypothesis Six

As measured on the LBDQ, there will not be a significant difference between the mean initiating structure scores of principals as perceived by the principals, and the mean initiating structure scores of the principals as perceived by the staffs.

School	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
Self	50	40	50	38	42	41	38	43	34	50	42	30	41	38	51	44	41
Staff	49	40	48	34	37	40	35	44	33	37	51	43	48	38	47	46	40
Self Rank	2	7	2	8	5	6	8	4	9	2	5	10	6	8	1	3	6
Staff Rank	2	8	3	12	10	8	11	6	13	10	1	7	2	9	4	5	8

An analysis of variance was used to compare the mean staff and self scores.

Self Scores	<u>Mean</u> 41.94	<u>S.D.</u> 5.81
Staff Scores	41.82	5.77

F = .0035 n.s.  
 p = .50                      p > .05

Hypothesis Six is accepted.

Hypothesis Seven

There will not be a significant relationship between the staff-perceived use of a dominant leader style on the LASI, and the staff-perceived use of a dominant leader style by the same principals on the LBDQ.

School	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
LASI Style	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
LBDQ Style	2	4	2	3	3	3	3	1	4	4	2	3	2	4	2	2	3

An analysis of variance was used to compare the mean LASI style placements and the mean LBDQ style placements.

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
LBDQ style placements	2.76	.815
LASI style placements	2.00	.125
F = 6.52 n.s. at .05		

Hypothesis Seven is accepted.

## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In Chapter IV, the investigator illustrated the data and its statistical significance. This chapter will be concerned with what that data meant, in terms of the purposes of the study, factors in the instrumentation, nature of sample or method which may have helped account for those findings, and some recommendations from the investigator to aid in further study of this topic.

Summary

On page 69, the investigator outlined five purposes of the study's design.

1. To obtain descriptions of the variance of the principals' behavior as perceived by the staff members and the principals.
2. To obtain descriptions of the principals' adaptability as perceived by both the staff members and the principals.
3. To relate the staff and principal's descriptions of adaptability to the Life Cycle Theory's prescribed "appropriate adaptability."
4. To obtain descriptions of the principals' dominant leader styles as perceived by the staff members and the principals.
5. To obtain descriptions of the principals' effectiveness from their respective superintendents and to explore the relationships between those ratings and the descriptions found in numbers 2,3, and 4.

Chapter IV illustrates the fact that the design purposes were completed. The completion of that data collection allows the investigator to test the study's hypotheses. The statistical treatments of the hypotheses were illustrated in Chapter IV.

#### Recapitulation Of Hypotheses

1. As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significant difference between the staff perceived mean variance of principals' leader behavior of those principals rated above the norm on the effectiveness scale.

#### Discussion

As measured on the LASI, there was not a significant difference between the staff perceived mean variance of principals' leader behavior between those principals rated above the norm on the effectiveness scale and those rated below the norm on the same scale.

This study cannot demonstrate that variance of leader style is significantly related to his effectiveness in so far as the instruments used by this investigator are able to show. There is little reason to suspect that sheer variance of behavior should relate to effectiveness, at least as far as the improving of effectiveness is concerned. Variability could range from erratic, impulsive actions to calculated style changes in line with a theoretical base.

2. As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significant difference between the mean of the staff perceived adaptability scores of those principals with an above the norm rating on the effectiveness scale and those principals with a below the norm rating on the effectiveness

scale as perceived by their staffs.

### Discussion

As measured on the LASI, there is not a significant difference between the mean staff perceived adaptability scores of those principals rated above the norm on the effectiveness scale and those rated below the norm on the effectiveness rating scale.

This study cannot demonstrate that adaptability prescribed as appropriate by the Life Cycle Theory is related significantly to principal effectiveness, at least in as much as this study's instrumentation and the superintendents' perception are able to indicate.

3. As measured on the LASI, there will not be a significantly positive correlation between the principals' self perceived adaptability scores and the mean of the staff perceived adaptability scores.

### Discussion

As measured on the LASI, there is a significant positive correlation between the principals' self perceived adaptability scores and the mean of the staff perceived adaptability scores.

This study can demonstrate with this particular sample, that the staffs tend to rate their principals higher in adaptability than do the principals themselves. In fact, only one of seventeen principals rated himself higher in adaptability than did his staff.

4. As measured on the LBDQ, there will not be a significant difference between the mean consideration scores of principals as perceived by the principals, and the mean consideration scores of the principals as perceived by their staffs.



### Discussion

As measured on the LBDQ, there was not a significant difference between the mean consideration scores of principals as perceived by the principals, and the mean consideration scores of the principals as perceived by their staffs.

This study demonstrated significant agreement between the staff descriptions of the principals' use of consideration behavior and the principals' self description of their use of consideration behavior. This contradicts Halpins' findings as discussed in Chapter IV.

5. As measured on the LBDQ, there will not be a significant relationship between those principals rated as above the norm on the effectiveness scale and those principals who are described by their staffs as having a dominant leader style of high-consideration and high-initiating structure.

### Discussion

As measured by the LBDQ, there was not a significant difference between principals rated above the norm on the effectiveness scale and those principals described by their staffs as having a dominant leader style of high-consideration and high-initiating structure.

This study can demonstrate that of the principals rated by their superintendents as being above the norm on the effectiveness scale, eighty percent were rated by their staffs as having a style of high-consideration and high-initiating structure. Of the nine principals rated below the norm on the effectiveness scale, only twenty two percent were described as having a leader style of high-consideration and high-initiating structure.

6. As measured on the LBDQ, there will not be a significant difference between the mean initiating structure scores of principals as perceived by the principals, and the mean initiating structure scores of the principals as perceived by the staffs.

#### Discussion

As measured on the LBDQ, there is not a significant difference between the mean initiating structure scores described by the principals and their staffs.

This study demonstrates that this particular sample illustrated close agreement between the principals' descriptions of their initiating scores and the staffs' descriptions of the principals' initiating structure scores. In fact, the means were nearly identical.

7. There will not be a significant relationship between the staff perceived use of a dominant leader style on the LASI, and the staff perceived use of a dominant leader style by the same principals on the LBDQ.

#### Discussion

There was not a majority relationship between the staff perceived use of a dominant leader style on the LASI, and the staff perceived use of a dominant leader style for the same principals on the LBDQ.

This study cannot demonstrate that the LASI measures dominant leader style consistent with the LBDQ. That is reasonable since the intent for which the instrument was developed, measuring variance and adaptability of leader behavior, is not the same as the intent for which the LBDQ was developed, providing a single description of dominant leader style.

### Conclusions

1. This study was unable to demonstrate that either sheer variance of leader behavior or appropriate adaptability of leader behavior to changing situations is related significantly to being an effective principal.

Even if the results had shown a significant relationship, the investigator would have been unable to generalize about the findings due to the fact that both the LASI and the Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale have not been validated or proven reliable.

The data on "adaptability" taken from this study sample demonstrate an interesting fact. All participating staffs, with one exception, scored the principals as more effective than did the principals themselves. The mean staff score was 18.9, while the mean principal self score was 8.3.

2. This study demonstrates a close relationship between the staff's perception of the principals' use of initiating structure behavior and use of consideration behavior, to the principals' self perceptions of their use of both these behaviors.

The mean of the staff perceived consideration behavior was 48 as compared to a mean of 46 for the principals' self descriptions of their consideration behavior. Seventy percent of the participating staffs rated their principals higher in consideration than did the principals themselves. This contradicts Halpin's findings which illustrated that leaders tend to rate themselves as higher in consideration than their subordinates.

The means of the participating staff descriptions of the principals' use of initiating structure was identical to the mean of the principals' self described scores for initiating structure. In fact, sixty five percent of the participating principals rated themselves as higher in initiating structure than did their staffs. Halpin's study reported that subordinates generally tended to rate their leaders as higher in initiating structure than did the leader themselves.

3. This study demonstrates a significant relationship between principals described as having a dominant style of high-consideration and high-initiating structure on the LBDQ, by their staffs, and an above the norm rating on the effectiveness scale. Of the five principals rated as above the norm on the effectiveness scale, four, or eighty percent were described as having a dominant leader style of high-consideration and high-initiating structure by their staffs. Of the nine principals rated below the norm on the effectiveness scale, only twenty two percent were described as having a high-consideration and high-initiating structure leader style.

There are two reasons why the investigator cannot generalize about these findings. First, the sample is so small that the significance is questionable, and, secondly, is the fact that the Effectiveness Rating Scale does not possess proven validity or reliability.

4. Hypothesis seven was designed to help test for validity of the LASI. It was thought that even though the purposes of the instruments were different, the LBDQ is used to gain a description of dominant leader style, while the LASI was designed to gain a description of the principal's variance or adaptability to changing situations, the chance for

comparison of dominant style descriptions would be possible by comparing the frequency of selection of actions (styles) on the LASI to the mean style descriptions on the LBDQ.

Though data was collected and illustrated for this hypothesis, it was unreasonable to expect significant findings. The LDBQ reflects one situation while the LASI provides several different situations causing the staff to perceive of their leader in a situation he may never have occasion to be found in. Their intent is different and it is therefore reasonable to expect different results.

### The Study

#### Instrumentation

One of the major weaknesses of this study was the fact that two instruments, The Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale and the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory, were new. Using two instruments with unproven validity or reliability to test the major hypotheses, makes interpretation or generalization of the findings highly suspect.

The results obtained from the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire were partially contradictory to at least one study quoted earlier in this investigation.

The Principal Effectiveness Rating Scale was used in an attempt to discriminate between effective and ineffective principals in the sample. There was no uniform, wholly objective method available for the participating superintendents to rate the effectiveness of their principals in precisely expressed criteria. Subjectivity, in providing a "global" rating score, was necessary. Not all superintendents value the same behavior in

their principals. The adaptable principal may not have been considered highly effective by all superintendents. In addition to the previously discussed, only fourteen of the seventeen principals received effectiveness ratings. With such a small sample to begin with, the three missing ratings had a significant deleterious effect on the findings.

For the stated reasons, this investigator is unable to generalize about the relationship between leader style, adaptability, and perceived effectiveness.

In designing the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory, the investigator worked from a certain assumption about leadership. It was assumed that leader behavior varies along two dimensions - "consideration" and "initiating structure." The weighting of these two factors, however is not constant, but varies depending upon the maturity of the group being led. The leader must assess the level of the group's maturity and then decide what weighting of consideration and structure is appropriate in order to gain the desired response from the group.

The most basic assumption, then, was that the situation for a leader is not constant, that the maturity level of his followers is not stable and that a degree of flexibility in the leader's behavior is necessary if he is to be successful.

Given this assumption, one would have predicted that the effective leader is the "adaptive" leader.

Since the LBDQ measures the leader in terms of a stable situation, a new instrument needed to be used to measure leadership in changing situations.

The LASI was intended to assess the principals' and the staffs' perceptions of the principal's ability to adapt his behavior to changing maturity levels and situations.

The staffs and principals did not agree on the amount of adaptability exhibited by the principals. The problem may well have been that the school situations in fact were rather stable, and the instrument provided situations that only a few staff members might ever see the principal react to. In any event, the fact that there was no significant relationship between adaptability scores and effectiveness ratings in this study, the assumption upon which the instrument (LASI) was designed is not substantiated.

#### Recommendations For Further Study

The recommendations for further study are presented in three categories. Instrumentation recommendations, sample recommendations, and study recommendations. These recommendations are based on the investigator's analysis of the study and its methodology.

#### Instrumentation Recommendations

1. The method of gathering data should follow the same basic pattern with these instrumentation considerations:
  - a. That the LASI be refined and shortened to make the situations more relevant and the actions more easily distinguishable from one another.
  - b. That the effectiveness scale be revised in such a manner that it more clearly correlates with the dimensions of style and adaptability.

- c. That this study's findings which contradict the earlier findings of Halpin, be further tested with a similar sample to see if this study's findings were significant.
- d. That consideration be given to developing audio visual aids to better illustrate the situations presented in the IASI.

#### Sample Recommendations

1. That in building the next sample, special attention be given to incorporating schools which have recently been through a significant crisis, i.e. strike, riot, bomb scare, etc., so that the staff may have a better understanding of how the principal reacts to changing situations.
2. That schools with first year principals be left out of the sample, and first year teachers not participate with the staff in describing the principal's leader style and adaptability.
3. That a deliberate attempt be made to incorporate principals with a wide range of perceived effectiveness.
4. That a seminar be offered for all participating superintendents, to help develop a more uniform and objective basis for providing the effectiveness scale's "global" rating.
5. That the sample be expanded to fifty or more participating schools.

#### Study Recommendations

1. That hypotheses be proposed for study which do not depend upon so many different variables causing such a complex analysis. For example, the study of the factors of adaptability and variance in isolation from the effectiveness variable.



2. That extensive field testing of the revised LASI be conducted to allow for appropriate refinement prior to its further use in the study.
3. That the effectiveness scale be redesigned to more closely correlate its content with that of the LASI, and it also be appropriately field tested prior to use in research.
4. That a similar study be conducted to retest the LBDQ findings concerning the relationship of this study's findings concerning perceptions of leader behavior and Halpin's earlier findings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ASCD. Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions. Washington, D.C., NEA, 1967.
- Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization, New York, Wiley, 1964.
- Bainand, Chester. Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Bales, Robert F. "Task Roles and Social Roles in Problem Solving Groups," Readings in Social Psychology. New York, Holt Reinhart and Winston, 1958.
- Bass, Bernard. Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior. New York, Harper and Bros., 1960.
- Bennis, W.G. "Toward a Truly Scientific Management: The Concept of Organizational Health," General Systems Yearbook, Vol. 7, 1962.
- Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid. Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.
- Blake, Robert et al. "Breakthrough in Organizational Development," Harvard Business Review, Nov. - Dec., 1964.
- Bravelas, Alex. "Leadership: Man and Function," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 4, March 1960, pp.488-494.
- Cartwright, Darwin and Alvin Zander. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 3rd Edition. New York, Harper and Row, 1968.
- Cartwright, Darwin and Alvin Zander. Research and Theory: Group Dynamics. New York, Row Paterson Co., 1960.
- Cattell, Raymond B. "New Concepts for Measuring Leadership In Terms of Group Syntality," Human Relations, Vol. 4, 1951.
- Duccharme, David J. "The Relationship Between Maturity Level and Leader Behavior Preference Among Urban Elementary School Teachers," unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1970.
- Editors, Webster's Seventh Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass., G. & C. Merriam Co., 1963.
- Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organization. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Fayol, Henri. General and Industrial Management, London, Sir Issac Pitman and Sons, 1949.
- Fielder, Fred. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Freud, Sigmund. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. New York, Bantam Books, 1960.
- Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership," in Lindzey, Gardiner Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Addison Wesley, 1954.
- Halpin, Andrew. Leader Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Halpin, Andrew W. and B. James Winer. "A Factorial Study of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," in Stogdill and Coons.
- Heath, D.H. Explorations in Maturity: Studies of Mature and Immature College Men. New York, Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1965.
- Hemphill, John K. Situational Factors In Leadership, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Educational Research, The Ohio State University, 1949.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth Blanchard. "A Leadership Theory for Educational Administrators," Education, April-May 1970.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth Blanchard. "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership," Training and Development Journal, XXIII, 5, May, 1969.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilization of Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Hersey, Paul. Management Concepts and Behavior: Programmed Instruction for Managers. Little Rock, Arkansas, Marven Publishing Co., 1967.
- Herzberg, Frederick, B. Snauser, and B. Syndemann. The Motivation To Work. New York, Wiley, 1959.
- Jennings, Eugene E. "The Anatomy of Leadership," Management of Personnel Quarterly, Vol. I, No. I, Autumn, 1961.
- Katz, D., N. Macoby and Nancy Morse. Productivity, Supervision and Morale In An Office Situation. Durel Press, 1950.

- Korman, A.K. "Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria - A Review," Personnel Psychology: A Journal of Applied Research, Vol. 19, No. 4, Winter, 1966.
- Krech, David and Richard S. Crutchfield. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1948.
- Leavitt, Harold J. "Unhuman Organizations," Harvard Business Review, 40:90, July - August, 1962.
- Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. New York, Harper and Bros., 1954.
- Mayo, Elton. The Human Problems of An Industrial Civilization. Boston, Harvard Business School, 1933.
- McClelland, David C., J.W. Atkinson, R.A. Clark and E.C. Lowell. The Achievement Motive. New York, Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1953.
- McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York, McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1960.
- Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior In Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Pelz, D.C. "Leadership Within a Hierarchical Organization," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 7, 1961.
- Redl, Fritz. "Group Emotion and Leadership," Psychiatry, Vol. 4, No. 4 1942, pp. 574-578.
- Schein, Edgar, Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Spiess, Jack. Leadership For Team Leaders. (Working paper written for National Team Leader Development Committee, Spring, 1971.)
- Stanford, Filmore H. Authoritarianism and Leadership. Philadelphia Institute for Human Relations, 1950.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. and Alvin Coons. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement Research Monograph No. 88. Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
- Stogdill, Ralph. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," in Browne, C.G. and Cohn, Thomas (Eds). The Study of Leadership. Danville, Illinois, Interstate Printers, 1958.
- Taylor, Frederick W. Scientific Management. New York, Harper and Bros., 1947.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Letter of Permission to use the LBDQ

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

1775 SOUTH COLLEGE ROAD  
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210

127

COLLEGE OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE

DIVISION OF RESEARCH

PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH IN  
LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

TELEPHONE: 614 293 2120

September 10, 1971

Mr. Lee G. Peters  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst 01002


Dear Mr. Peters:

You have our permission to use the Leader Behavior  
Description Questionnaire in your doctoral research.

Since the questionnaire is copyrighted by The Ohio State  
University, we also grant permission to the University  
Microfilms Library Services to duplicate it when it is  
included as an appendix in your dissertation. We suggest  
that you file a copy of this letter in order that it will  
be available when requested after your dissertation is  
completed. The address of the microfilm service, which  
duplicates filed dissertations is as follows:

University Microfilms Library Services  
Xerox Corporation  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Sincerely,




Ralph M. Stogdill  
Director

RMS/az



APPENDIX B

Letter of Invitation to Prospective Sample



COOPERATIVE SCHOOL SERVICE CENTER  
at the University of Massachusetts

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS

November 16, 1971

WALD J. FITZGERALD  
PRESIDENT  
SUPERINTENDENT  
AMHERST-PELHAM  
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

WILLIAM RUSSELL  
PRESIDENT  
SUPERINTENDENT  
ANDOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT

FRANK COOK  
RECORDING SECRETARY  
SUPERINTENDENT  
ALPH. C. MAHAR  
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

THANIEL S. FRENCH  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
2848  
ADMINISTRATION  
UNIVERSITY

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ALAN BUTEAU  
MURICE BOULANGER  
STUART CHASE  
JOHN CURRY  
MARCELLA KELLY  
ANNETH O'NEIL  
FRENCE TRUESDELL  
ANDREW WEEKS  
WILLIAM WRIGHT

LITERATURE ADVISORY BOARD

JUL GIBLIN  
CHAIRMAN

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY

ERNEST ANDERSON  
ANNETH BLANCHARD  
JOHN BUDDE  
RICHARD CLARK  
WILLIAM FLIGHT  
THANIEL S. FRENCH  
DONN KESSELHEIM

BERT E. SAUNDERS  
GRADUATE ASSISTANT

Dear

The Cooperative School Service Center has been invited to participate in a study of Principal's leadership behavior. Needless to say, I would not bring this to your attention unless convinced that you will find the study, in process and findings, to be of value to you.

As elaborated in the enclosed study overview, the participation time necessary for each Principal and his or her staff would be one forty-five minute session per participating school.

The forty-five minutes would be used responding, anonymously, to a questionnaire, the purpose of which, is to discover how teachers and Principals view the adaptability and style of the Principal's leader behavior, and how closely those views align. One of the beneficial outcomes might well be that both teachers and Principals will discover the nature of their interaction, and so be better able to understand the "ins and outs" of their daily relationships.

In order to insure that the results obtained are reliable, the process asks of participating schools at least seventy-five per cent of its staff be in attendance during the forty-five minute session.


Mr. Lee Peters, a staff associate at the University of Massachusetts, will be in charge of the study, and is looking for participation of at least sixteen schools from the Western Massachusetts area.

COOPERATIVE SCHOOL SERVICE CENTER

at the University of Massachusetts

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS

130



ALD J. FITZGERALD  
SIDENT  
ERINTENDENT  
ERST- PELHAM  
IONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

ED RUSSELL  
PRESIDENT  
ERINTENDENT  
ONER SCHOOL DISTRICT

MIT COOK  
ORDING SECRETARY  
ERINTENDENT  
PH C. MAHAR  
IONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

DANIEL S. FRENCH  
CUTIVE SECRETARY  
148  
INISTRATION  
ERSITY

CUTIVE COMMITTEE

BUTEAU  
RICE BOULANGER  
UART CHASE  
I CURRY  
MARCELLA KELLY  
NETH O'NEIL  
RENCE TRUESDELL  
AND WEEKS  
IAM WRIGHT

ORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

GIBLIN  
RMAN

OL OF EDUCATION  
ERSITY

NEST ANDERSON  
ETH BLANCHARD  
BUDE  
ARD CLARK  
D FLIGHT  
DANIEL S. FRENCH  
INN KESSELHEIM

ERT E. SAUNDERS  
DUATE ASSISTANT

Following the completion of the study, Mr. Peters has arranged a management workshop to be held free of charge for all participating Superintendents, Principals and selected school staff. Each participating school will be limited to five representatives. The workshop will be conducted by Dr. Kenneth Blanchard and Dr. Paul Hersey, two highly regarded management specialists, and would be held on a weekday in late January or early February.

Hopefully, if you are interested in participating in the study and the workshop, you will make a preliminary contact with one or more of your supervising principals to ascertain their interest.

Mr. Peters has randomly selected a group of schools in Western Massachusetts and hopes to obtain a positive response from sixteen of the schools selected.

Enclosed find a postcard which you should return to indicate your interest. Due to budgetary limitations, the first sixteen to respond will be asked to participate.

I hope you will find it possible to participate in both the study and workshop.

Many thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Nathaniel French  
Executive Secretary

Encl.  
NSF/fw

Study Prospectus:

SOME ASPECTS OF LEADER STYLE, ADAPTABILITY, AND EFFECTIVENESS  
AMONG SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The study will examine the leader behavior of at least sixteen Western Massachusetts Principals, based on the staff's perception of the Principal's leader behavior and the Principal's self perception of his own behavior.

The study varies from many earlier leader behavior studies in that this one will be attempting to examine leader adaptability, or the ability of the Principal to alter his behavior as the situation changes.

In order to gather the information necessary to formulate some findings about leader adaptability, participating school districts would be asked to:

- A. Bring the staff of the school together for one forty-five minute session in order to respond to a questionnaire which will allow the researcher to obtain a picture of the Principal's leader behavior as perceived by his staff.
- B. The participating Principal's would also be asked for one forty-five minute session to respond to the same questionnaire, to gain his self perception of his leader behavior.  
(It is intended for both A & B to be accomplished simultaneously.)
- C. Each participating Superintendent would be asked to fill out a short effectiveness scale for each participating Principal. This scale will be developed by a panel of your peers, and will, as all information in the study, be treated in absolute professional confidence.

The study should in no manner be thought of as being an evaluation of individual Principals, staffs or school districts. The intent is to examine the interaction between Principals and their staffs to determine if they have comparable views of the principal's leadership behavior. The study has no need for specific names of schools, individuals or other identifying features. Schools and principals will be referred to only as numbers.

The research staff will reciprocate your investment of time and effort by doing two things. First, all participating schools will receive a copy of the findings. Second, all principals, Superintendents, and representative members of the staff will be invited to attend an expense free management workshop following the conclusion of the study. The workshop will be conducted by Dr. Kenneth Blanchard and Dr. Paul Hersey, two highly regarded management specialists.

Mr. Lee Peters, a staff associate at the University of Massachusetts, will be heading the study, and will be in contact with you in the very near future.

Thank you for your consideration and time.

## APPENDIX C

List of Participating Schools, Principals and  
Superintendents

	<u>School</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Superintendent</u>
1.)	Birchland Park Jr. High East Longmeadow, Mass.	Mr. Fasnacht	Dr. Wayne Porter
2.)	Blandford Elementary Blandford, Mass.	Mr. Lutat	Dr. Richard Holzman
3.)	Cold Springs Elementary Belchertown, Mass.	Mr. Barrett	Mr. John Curry
4.)	Converse Street Elementary Longmeadow, Mass.	Mr. Hoyt	Dr. Robert Russell
5.)	Easthampton High School Easthampton, Mass.	Mr. Caoette	Mr. Neil Pepin
6.)	Four Corners Elementary Greenfield, Mass.	Mr. Hayden	Mr. William Wright
7.)	Frontier Regional Jr. Sr. High School South Deerfield, Mass.	Mr. Laude	Mr. Warren Bennett
8.)	Gateway Regional Jr. Sr. High School Huntington, Mass.	Mr. Sullivan	Dr. Richard Holzman
9.)	Greenwood Park Elementary Longmeadow, Mass.	Mr. Tripp	Dr. Robert Russell
10.)	Hampshire Regional Jr. Sr. High School Westhampton, Mass.	Mr. Zalot	Mr. Don Buss
11.)	Maple Shade Elementary East Longmeadow, Mass.	Mr. Lafayette	Dr. Wayne Porter
12.)	Mountain View Elementary East Longmeadow, Mass.	Mr. Martin	" " "
13.)	Monument Mountain Reg. Jr. Sr. High School Great Barrington, Mass.	Mr. Wood	Mr. George Lane
14.)	Murdock Jr. Sr. High School Winchendon, Mass.	Mr. Driscoll	Dr. Richard Porter
15.)	Russell Elementary Russell, Mass.	Mr. Wyman	Dr. Richard Holzman
16.)	Ryan Road Elementary Northampton, Mass.	Mr. Finn	Dr. John Buteau
17.)	Tucker Elementary Winchendon, Mass.	Mr. Rollins	Dr. Richard Porter

## APPENDIX D

## Instruments Used in the Study

LEADER ADAPTABILITY AND STYLE INVENTORY

Developed By Lee G. Peters  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, Mass.

Directions:

This instrument contains twenty-four situations in which your Principal is presumed to be involved. Each situation has four possible actions he might initiate according to your perception of his leadership behavior.

Note: Please Do Not Write On This Question Book.

Record your answers in the appropriate spaces on the answer form.



Please mark the space on your answer form that corresponds to the number of the action you have selected as best typifying the action your Principal would take in the situation.

---

- (41) Your Principal's staff is not responding lately to his obvious concern for their welfare and friendly conversation. Productivity is in a tailspin. He would most likely.....
1. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
  2. Involve the staff in problem solving.
  3. Individually talk with staff members and set goals.
  4. Do what he can to make staff feel important and involved.
- (42) Your Principal's staff has been dropping in productivity during the last few months. It has been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Role defining on his part has helped in the past. The staff has continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time. He would most likely..
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow the staff involvement in setting goals, but not push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (43) The observable performance of your staff is increasing. Your Principal has been making sure that all members were aware of their roles and standards of performance. He would most likely....
1. Engage in friendly interaction, but see that the staff follows rules and regulations.
  2. Take no definite action.
  3. Acquire the staff's approval on a course of action and allow them to structure the task.
  4. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and necessity of task accomplishment.
- (44) Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among his staff. The staff has a remarkable record of accomplishment. They have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task. Your Principal would most likely..
1. Avoid confrontation, not apply pressure.
  2. Make himself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
  3. Make his feelings about goals clear, and do all he can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (45) Your Principal's staff, usually able to take responsibility, is not responding to his recent redefining of standards. He would most likely...
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow the staff involvement in setting goals, but not push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.

- (46) Your Principal's Superintendent appointed him to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help. Your Principal would most likely
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally do not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.
- (47) Productivity and group relations are good. Your principal feels somewhat unsure about his lack of direction of the group. He would most likely...
1. Take steps to direct the staff towards working in a well defined manner.
  2. Try out solutions and new directions with the staff and examine the need for new practices.
  3. Be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by pushing.
  4. Allow the staff to continue as it has.
- (48) Your Principal's staff is not responding lately to his friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Productivity is in a tailspin. He would most likely...
1. Avoid confrontation, not apply pressure.
  2. Make himself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
  3. Make his feelings about goals clear, and do all he can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (49) Your Principal has been promoted to a new position. The previous administrator was uninvolved in the affairs of the staff. The staff has adequately handled their tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good. Your Principal would most likely....
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.
- (50) Your Principal stepped into a smoothly running situation. The last administrator ran a tight ship. Your Principal wants to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment. He would most likely.....
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate the staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, but not push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.

- (51) Your Principal's staff, usually able to take responsibility, is not responding to his recent redefining of standards. He would most likely.....
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally do not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.
- (52) Your Principal's staff has responded well to his spelling out tasks specifically and dealing firmly with those who didn't demonstrate appropriate behavior. Lately this style hasn't been achieving results. He would most likely....
1. Avoid confrontation, not apply Pressure.
  2. Make himself available for discussion without pushing for completion.
  3. Make his feelings about goals clear, and do all he can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (53) Your Principal has been considering instituting a major change. The staff has tended to resist change that they didn't initiate. They have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change. He would most likely...
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, but not push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (54) The observable performance of your staff is increasing. Your Principal has been making sure that all members were aware of their roles and standards of performance. He would most likely....
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.
- (55) Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among your Principal's staff. The staff has a fine record of accomplishment. They have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task. Your boss would most likely
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, but not push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (56) Your Principal has been considering making major changes in your organizational structure. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The staff has demonstrated flexibility in their day-to-day operations. Your Principal would most likely.....
1. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
  2. Involve the staff in problem solving.
  3. Individually talk with members, and set goals.
  4. Do what he can to make the staff feel important and involved.

- (57) Productivity and group relations are good. Your Principal feels somewhat unsure about his lack of direction of the staff. He would most likely..
1. Avoid confrontation, not apply pressure.
  2. Make himself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
  3. Make his feelings about goals clear and do all he can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act firmly and quickly to correct and redirect.
- (58) Your Principal stepped into a smoothly running situation. The last administrator ran a tight ship. Your Principal wants to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment. He would most likely..
1. Engage in friendly interaction, but see that the staff follows rules and regulations.
  2. Take no definite action.
  3. Acquire the staff's approval on a course of action and allow them to structure tasks.
  4. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity of task accomplishment.
- (59) Your Principal's Superintendent has appointed him to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially, they have the talent necessary to help. Your Principal would most likely...
1. Allow group to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate group recommendations but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow group involvement in setting goals, but not push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (60) Your Principal has been promoted to a new position. The previous administrator was uninvolved in the affairs of the staff. The staff has adequately handled their tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good. Your Principal would most likely..
1. Take steps to direct the staff towards working in a well defined manner.
  2. Try out his solutions and new directions with the staff and examine the need for new practices.
  3. Be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by pushing.
  4. Allow the staff to continue as it has.
- (61) Your Principal has been considering instituting a major change. The staff has tended to resist change that they didn't initiate. They have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change. He would most likely...
1. Engage in friendly interaction, but see that they follow rules and regulations.
  2. Take no definite action.
  3. Acquire the staff's approval on a course of action, and allow them to structure the task.
  4. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity of task accomplishment.

- (62) Your Principal's staff has responded well to his spelling out tasks specifically and dealing firmly with those who didn't demonstrate appropriate behavior. Lately this style hasn't been achieving results. He would most likely...
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, but not push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (63) Your Principal has been considering making major changes in your organizational structure. Members of the staff have made suggestions about needed change. The group has demonstrated flexibility in their day-to-day operations. Your Principal would most likely...
1. Avoid confrontation, not apply pressure.
  2. Make himself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
  3. Make his feelings about goals clear, and do all he can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (64) Your Principal's staff has been dropping in productivity during the last few months. It has been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Role defining has helped in the past. His staff has continually needed reminding to have tasks done on time. The staff is relatively new to the task. Your Principal would most likely...
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally do not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.

## LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members  
of The Ohio State Leadership  
Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your principal. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

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

## Directions:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the principal engages in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
- d. MARK THE SPACE on your answer form that corresponds to the number you have selected.

- 1 - Always
- 2 - Often
- 3 - Occasionally
- 4 - Seldom
- 5 - Never

1 - Always, 2 - Often, 3 - Occasionally, 4 - Seldom, 5 - Never

1. He does personal favors for group members. 1 2 3 4 5
2. He makes his attitudes clear to the group. 1 2 3 4 5
3. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. 1 2 3 4 5
4. He tries out his new ideas with the group. 1 2 3 4 5
5. He acts as the real leader of the group. 1 2 3 4 5
6. He is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
7. He rules with an iron hand. 1 2 3 4 5
8. He finds time to listen to group members. 1 2 3 4 5
9. He criticizes poor work. 1 2 3 4 5
10. He gives advance notice of changes. 1 2 3 4 5
11. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned. 1 2 3 4 5
12. He keeps to himself. 1 2 3 4 5
13. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. 1 2 3 4 5
14. He assigns group members to particular tasks. 1 2 3 4 5
15. He is the spokesman of the group. 1 2 3 4 5
16. He schedules the work to be done. 1 2 3 4 5
17. He maintains definite standards of performance. 1 2 3 4 5
18. He refuses to explain his actions. 1 2 3 4 5
19. He keeps the group informed. 1 2 3 4 5
20. He acts without consulting the group. 1 2 3 4 5
21. He backs up the members in their actions. 1 2 3 4 5
22. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. 1 2 3 4 5
23. He treats all group members as his equals. 1 2 3 4 5
24. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. 1 2 3 4 5



- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 25. He gets what he asks for from his superiors.                                    | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 26. He is willing to make changes.  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 27. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 28. He is friendly and approachable.  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 29. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.               | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 30. He fails to take necessary action.  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 31. He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 32. He lets group members know what is expected of them.                            | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 33. He speaks as the representative of the group.                                   | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 34. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.                           | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 35. He sees to it that group members are working up to their capacity.              | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 36. He lets other people take away his leadership in the group.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 37. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.              | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 38. He gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.                 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 39. He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.                    | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 40. He keeps the group working together as a team.                                  | 1 2 3 4 5 |

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT QUESTIONNAIRE. START WITH 41 ON YOUR ANSWER

FORM.

LEADER ADAPTABILITY AND STYLE INVENTORY

Developed By Lee G. Peters  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, Mass.

( PRINCIPAL'S FORM)

Directions:

This inventory contains twenty-four situations with which you are presumed to be involved. Each situation has four possible actions you might initiate according to your perception of which is the most appropriate.

Note: Please Do Not Write On This Question Book!

Record your answers in the appropriate spaces on the answer form.

Please mark the space on your answer form that corresponds to the number of the action you have selected as best typlifying the action you would take in the situation.

---

- (41) Your staff is not responding lately to your friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Productivity is in a tailspin.
1. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
  2. Involve the staff in problem solving.
  3. Individually talk with staff members and set goals.
  4. Do what you can to make your staff feel important and involved.
- (42) Your staff's productivity has been dropping during the last few months. It has been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Role defining has helped in the past. They have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time.
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, don't push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (43) The observable performance of your staff is increasing. You have been making sure that all staff members were aware of their roles and standards of performance.
1. Engage in friendly interaction, but see that rules and regulations are followed.
  2. Take no definite action.
  3. Acquire staff's approval on a course of action and allow them to structure the task.
  4. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity of task accomplishment.
- (44) Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among your staff. The group has a remarkable record of accomplishment. They have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for their tasks.
1. Avoid confrontations, don't apply pressure.
  2. Make yourself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
  3. Make your feelings about goals clear, and do all you can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (45) Your staff, usually able to take responsibility, are not responding to your recent redefining of standards.
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, don't push.
  4. Redefine goals, supervise carefully.

(46) Your superintendent has appointed you to head a task force that is far overdue in making recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help.

1. Involve staff members in planning and reinforce good contributions.
2. Discuss results, reset standards.
3. Intentionally do not intervene.
4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.

(47) Productivity and group relations are good among members of your staff. You feel somewhat unsure about your lack of direction of the group.

1. Take steps to direct staff towards working in a well defined manner.
2. Try out your new thoughts with the staff, and examine the need for new practices.
3. Be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by pushing.
4. Allow the staff to continue as it has.

(48) Your staff is not responding lately to your friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Productivity is in a tailspin.

1. Avoid confrontation, don't apply pressure.
2. Make yourself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
3. Make your feelings about goals clear, and do all you can to help in the goal completion.
4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.

(49) You've been promoted to a new position. The previous administrator was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has adequately handled their tasks and direction. Group relations are good.

1. Involve staff members in planning and reinforce good contributions.
2. Discuss results, reset standards.
3. Intentionally do not intervene.
4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.

(50) You stepped into a smoothly running situation. The last administrator ran a tight ship. You want to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment.

1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
2. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
3. Allow group involvement in setting goals, don't push.
4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.

- (51) Your staff, usually able to take responsibility, are not responding to your recent redefining of standards.
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally do not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.
- (52) Your staff has responded well to your spelling out tasks specifically and dealing firmly with those who didn't demonstrate appropriate behavior. Lately this style hasn't been achieving results.
1. Avoid confrontation, don't apply pressure.
  2. Make yourself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
  3. Make your feelings about goals clear, and do all you can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (53) You have been considering instituting a major change. The staff has tended to resist change that they didn't initiate. They have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change.
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, don't push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (54) The observable performance of your staff is increasing. You have been making sure that all members were aware of their roles and standards.
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally do not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.
- (55) Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among members of your staff. The group has a remarkable record of accomplishment. They have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task.
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, don't push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (56) You have been considering making major changes in your organizational structure. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The group has demonstrated flexibility in their day-to-day operations.
1. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
  2. Involve the staff in problem solving.
  3. Individually talk with members, and set goals.
  4. Do what you can to make group feel important and involved.

(57) Productivity and group relations are good among your staff. You feel somewhat unsure about your lack of direction of the group.

1. Avoid confrontation and don't apply pressure.
2. Make yourself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
3. Make your feelings about goals clear, and do all you can to help in goal completion.
4. Act firmly and quickly to correct and redirect.

(58) You stepped into a smoothly running situation. The last administrator ran a tight ship. You want to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment.

1. Engage in friendly interaction, but see that the staff follows rules and regulations.
2. Take no definite action.
3. Acquire the staff's approval on a course of action and allow them to structure the task.
4. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity of task accomplishment.

(59) Your superintendent has appointed you to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially, they have the talent necessary to help.

1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
2. Incorporate group recommendations but see that objectives are met.
3. Allow group involvement in setting goals, don't push.
4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.

(60) You've been promoted to a new position. The previous administrator was uninvolved in the affairs of the staff. The staff has adequately handled their tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good.

1. Take steps to direct the staff towards working in a well defined manner.
2. Try out your solutions and new directions with the staff and examine the need for new practices.
3. Be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by pushing.
4. Allow the staff to continue as it has.

(61) You have been considering instituting a major change. The staff has tended to resist change that they didn't initiate. They have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change.

1. Engage in friendly interaction, but see that the staff follows rules and regulations.
2. Take no definite action.
3. Acquire group's approval on a course of action, and allow them to structure the task.
4. Emphasize the importance of uniform procedures and the necessity of task accomplishment.

- (62) Your staff has responded well to your spelling out of tasks specifically and dealing firmly with those who didn't demonstrate appropriate behavior. Lately this style hasn't been achieving results.
1. Allow the staff to formulate their own directions.
  2. Incorporate staff recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
  3. Allow staff involvement in setting goals, don't push.
  4. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (63) You have been considering making major changes in your organizational structure. Members of the staff have made suggestions about needed change. The group has demonstrated flexibility in their day-to-day operations.
1. Avoid confrontation, don't apply pressure.
  2. Make yourself available for discussion, without pushing for completion.
  3. Make your feelings about goals clear, and do all you can to help in goal completion.
  4. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (64) Your staff's productivity has been dropping during the last few months. It has been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Role defining has helped in the past. They have continually needed reminding to have tasks done on time. The group is relatively new to the task.
1. Involve the staff in planning and reinforce good contributions.
  2. Discuss results, reset standards.
  3. Intentionally do not intervene.
  4. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain performance objectives.

PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS RATING SCALE

Lee G. Peters  
University of Mass.  
School of Education  
February, 1972

Superintendent \_\_\_\_\_  
School District \_\_\_\_\_  
Principal \_\_\_\_\_  
School \_\_\_\_\_



## PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS RATING SCALE

Instructions:

The following items are divided into two categories of principal leadership actions. Each item has a scale from +3 to -3 for your rating. (+3) represents optimum effectiveness and (-3) represents optimum ineffectiveness. At the end of each set of items is an overall rating scale for that set of items. At the end of the instrument is an overall rating scale for your "global" rating of your principal.

Category One

Please circle one number for each item.

1. The principal resolves conflict among students, staff, and parents at the building level. +3+2+1-1-2-3
2. The principal solicits and uses the help and opinions of his staff in planning and decision-making. +3+2+1-1-2-3
3. The principal clearly communicates his ideas and goals to his staff, students, parents, and superiors. +3+2+1-1-2-3
4. The principal has developed commitment and support from his staff and students. +3+2+1-1-2-3
5. The principal builds and maintains school morale. +3+2+1-1-2-3
6. The principal encourages experimentation by the staff. +3+2+1-1-2-3
7. The principal makes efforts to provide an environment that offers alternatives for students and staff. +3+2+1-1-2-3
8. The principal adapts his leader style to changing situations. +3+2+1-1-2-3

This set of items was designed to help you rate your principal on his managing of human relationships in his building. Based on such information showing increasing or decreasing levels of participatory decision-making, teacher turnover, absenteeism and grievance levels, as well as, community complaints, student absenteeism and vandalism, drop out rates and the like, how would you rate the principal on his overall management of the above items?

Optimum Effective ← +3      +2      +1      -1      -2      -3 → Optimum Ineffectiveness

Category Two

Please Circle One Number For Each Item

- 1. The principal initiates and participates in staff in-service as well as personally supervising and improving the quality of instruction in his building. +3+2+1-1-2-3
- 2. The school's program is meeting the academic needs of the students as evidenced by measured growth on testing instruments. +3+2+1-1-2-3
- 3. The principal's budget requests show cost-effectiveness and evidence of long range program planning. +3+2+1-1-2-3
- 4. The principal skillfully handles the routine management duties with which he is charged. +3+2+1-1-2-3
- 5. In building his program, the principal attends workshops, conferences, visits other schools, and is attentive to his own professional growth. +3+2+1-1-2-3
- 6. The principal effectively works with his non-professional staff as evidenced by their productivity. +3+2+1-1-2-3
- 7. The principal builds and maintains a program that is accepted by the parents as adequately meeting their childrens' needs. +3+2+1-1-2-3
- 8. The professional staff is encouraged and does attend to their renewal by continuing course work, attending conferences and workshops, and visiting other schools. +3+2+1-1-2-3

This set of items was designed to help you rate your principal on the tangible output of his program and leader actions. Based on measurable evidence of productivity such as student performance growth, teacher retention, teacher academic growth, building cleanliness, attendance at in-service functions, conferences, budget requests, handling of routine duties, how would you rate the principal on his overall productivity output?

Optimum Effective  $\leftarrow$  +3    +2    +1    -1    -2    -3  $\rightarrow$  Optimum Ineffectiveness

-----  
GLOBAL SCALE

Based on your ratings of the two preceding sets, and your feelings of which items are most important, please make an overall rating on the scale below of your perception of how effective your principal is.

      +3        +2        +1        -1        -2        -3

Addendum

For purposes of checking the nature of the sample, it is necessary to obtain a reading of the principal's comparative effectiveness within your district. Would you please provide a global score for your other principals without giving the name or the school?

I have \_\_\_\_\_ other principals in my district.

They would be rated?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

---

Before returning, would you please check to see if:

1. You have furnished a rating score on all three levels.
2. You have indicated a score for your other principals.

Please accept my appreciation for the time and effort you have given this project. The sooner this form is returned, the sooner the final analysis can be completed.

APPENDIX E

LASI Data, Staff and Principal Scores, and Percentages

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	3	42	2	2	-2	2	3
42	4	65	2	2	0	1	2
43	1	39	2	1	2	2	2
44	2	41	1	3	-1	3	2
45	4	53	-2	4	-2	1	1
46	1	47	-1	4	1	2-3	2
47	1/4	35	-2/1	1	-2	1/4	1
48	3	59	2	3	2	2	2
49	1	59	1	4	0	2-3	2
50	2	47	2	2	2	2	2
51	4	53	2	1	1	2	2-3
52	3	59	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	47	0	3	2	2	3
54	4	53	1	4	1	1	2
55	2-3	35	0/1	3	1	2-3	3
56	2	41	2	4	1	3	2-3
57	2	53	1	3	-1	3	2
58	1	41	2	1	2	2	2
59	2	53	1	3	-2	2	3
60	2	53	-1	4	2	2	4
61	3	71	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	59	1	4	2	2	1
63	3	65	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	4	42	<u>-1</u>	4	<u>-1</u>	2	2

Staff +22

Self +11

Same on 12 items.

4	17	5	15
	3	1	3

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	2	73	-2	2	-2	3	3
42	4	47	2	3	-2	1	3
43	3	47	0	1	2	3	2
44	2	40	1	4	-2	3	1
45	2	33	2	3	1	2	3
46	1/2	40	-1/2	1	-1	2-3/1	2-3
47	4	47	1	1	-2	4	1
48	2/3	40	-1/2	4	1	3/2	1
49	4	53	0	1	1	2	2-3
50	2	40	2	2	2	2	2
51	2	47	-1	1	1	1	2-3
52	3	47	2	4	1	2	1
53	2	40	0	3	2	2	3
54	3	40	-2	4	1	4	2
55	1/3	40	2/1	3	1	4-3	3
56	2	53	2	2	2	3	3
57	1	40	2	4	-2	4	1
58	1	47	2	1	2	2	2
59	2/3/4	27	1/2/-1	2	1	2/3/1	2
60	4	47	2	2	-1	4	2
61	3	73	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	40	1	2	1	2	2
63	3	60	-1	4	-2	2	1
64	2/4	36	<u>2/-1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	1/2	<u>2-3</u>

Staff +25

Self +8

Same on 9 items.

6	9	7	11
4	5		6

Staff

Self

Item No.	<u>Staff</u>			<u>Self</u>		<u>Style</u>	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	2	36	-2	4	-1	3	2-3
42	4	41	2	2	0	1	2
43	1	38	2	2	-2	2	4
44	2	38	1	2	1	3	3
45	2	50	2	2	2	2	2
46	1	43	-1	1	-1	2-3	2-3
47	2	43	-1	4	1	2	4
48	3	45	2	2	-1	2	3
49	1	45	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
50	2	54	2	2	2	2	2
51	4	34	2	1	1	2	2-3
52	3	48	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	55	0	2	0	2	2
54	1	41	2	3	-2	2-3	4
55	2	52	0	2	0	2	2
56	2	66	2	4	1	3	2-3
57	3	52	-1	2	1	2	3
58	1	45	2	1	2	2	2
59	2	41	1	3	-2	2	3
60	2	50	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	3	55	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	50	1	2	1	2	2
63	3	57	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	1	41	<u>1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	2-3	2-3

Staff +20

Self +7

Same on 14 items.

4	19	5	16
	1		3

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	3	39	2	3	2	2	2
42	3	46	-2	4	2	3	1
43	2	39	-2	3	0	4	3
44	2	69	+1	3	-1	3	2
45	2	46	2	3	1	2	3
46	1	54	-1	4	1	2-3	2
47	2	62	-1	2	-1	2	2
48	2	62	-1	3	2	3	2
49	1	46	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
50	3	46	-1	3	-1	3	3
51	1	62	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
52	3	69	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	46	0	2	0	2	2
54	1	54	2	2	-1	2-3	1
55	3	54	1	2	0	3	2
56	2	54	2	4	1	2	2-3
57	2	62	1	3	-1	3	2
58	1	46	2	3	1	2	3
59	2/3	39	1/-2	2	1	2-3	2
60	2	46	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	3	54	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	46	1	2	1	2	2
63	2/3	46	1/-1	3	-1	2-3	3
64	1	46	<u>1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	2-3	2-3

Staff +14

Self +13

Same on 13 items.

7	16	6	16
1			2

Staff

Self



Item No.	<u>Staff</u>			<u>Self</u>		<u>Style</u>	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	2	69	-2	2	-2	3	3
42	2	46	0	4	2	2	1
43	3	61	0	3	0	3	3
44	2	46	1	2	1	3	3
45	2	54	2	2	2	2	2
46	1	46	-1	1	-1	2-3	2-3
47	2	54	-1	4	1	2	4
48	2	62	-1	3	2	3	2
49	1	67	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
50	3	54	-1	3	-1	3	3
51	1	62	1	4	2	2-3	2
52	3	77	2	2	-1	2	3
53	2	62	0	2	0	2	2
54	1	46	2	3	-2	2-3	4
55	3	39	1	4	-2	3	1
56	2	69	2	2	2	3	3
57	3	46	-1	3	-1	2	2
58	1	54	2	3	1	2	3
59	2	62	1	1	-2	2	4
60	4	54	2	2	-1	4	2
61	3	54	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	54	1	3	-1	2	3
63	3	69	-1	2	1	2	3
64	1	54	<u>1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	2-3	2-3

Staff +13

Self +4

Same on 12 items.

8	15	10	9
1		3	2

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	3	57	2	2	-2	2	3
42	2	71	0	2	0	2	2
43	1/2/4	29	2/-2/-1	3	0	2/4/1	3
44	4	57	-2	3	-1	1	2
45	2	71	2	1	0	2	4
46	2	57	2	1	-1	1	2-3
47	4	57	1	2	-1	4	2
48	3	71	2	3	2	2	2
49	1	43	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
50	2	57	2	2	2	2	2
51	2	43	-1	2	-1	1	1
52	3	57	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	71	0	2	0	2	2
54	4	43	1	1	2	2	2-3
55	2	43	0	2	0	2	2
56	2	57	2	2	2	3	3
57	3	57	-1	3	-1	2	2
58	1	71	2	3	1	2	3
59	2	57	1	4	2	2	1
60	2/4	43	-1/2	2	-1	2/4	2
61	3	57	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	71	1	4	2	2	1
63	3	71	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	1	43	<u>1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	2-3	2-3

Staff+23

Self +10

Same on 14 items.

2	17	5	15
1	4	1	3

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	4	57	-1	4	-1	2-3	2-3
42	3	43	-2	3	-2	3	3
43	3	57	0	3	0	3	3
44	2/3	43	1/-1	3	-1	2-3	2
45	3	57	1	1	0	3	4
46	4	43	1	1	-1	1	2-3
47	4	43	1	2	-1	4	2
48	3	86	2	3	2	2	2
49	1/4	43	1/0	4	0	2	2
50	3	57	-1	3	-1	3	3
51	1	71	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
52	3	57	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	57	0	3	2	2	3
54	4	57	1	4	1	2	2
55	3	71	1	2	0	3	2
56	2	57	2	2	2	3	3
57	3	57	-1	3	-1	2	2
58	3	71	1	3	1	3	3
59	2	57	1	2	1	2	2
60	2	71	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	3	86	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	57	1	2	1	2	2
63	3	71	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	4	43	<u>-1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	2	2-3

Staff +11

Self +6

Same on 18 items.

8	14	7	16
1	1	1	

Staff      Self

Item No.	Staff		Score	Self		Style	
	Choice	%		Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	3	39	2	4	-1	2	2-3
42	2	45	0	2	0	2	2
43	1	39	2	1	2	2	2
44	2	32	1	3	-1	3	2
45	2/4	39	2/-2	2	2	3/1	3
46	1/4	32	-1/1	1	-1	2	2-3
47	4	39	1	4	1	4	4
48	3	36	2	2	-1	2	3
49	4	42	0	1	1	2	2-3
50	2	45	2	2	2	2	2
51	4	39	2	1	1	2	2-3
52	3	48	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	55	0	2	0	2	2
54	3	35	-2	1	2	4	2-3
55	2	48	0	2	0	2	2
56	2	48	2	3	0	3	2
57	3	39	-1	3	-1	2	2
58	1	48	2	1	2	2	2
59	4	48	2	3	-2	1	3
60	2	42	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	3	45	2	1	0	3	2
62	2	42	1	2	1	2	2
63	3	45	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	2	39	<u>2</u>	1	<u>1</u>	1	2-3

Staff +23

Self +8

Same on 14 items.

3	16	3	20
2	3	1	

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	4	28	-1	3	2	2-3	2
42	3	39	-2	3	-2	3	3
43	1	39	2	4	-1	2	1
44	1/2	36	2/1	3	-1	4-3	2
45	3	39	1	3	1	3	3
46	2	36	2	4	1	1	2
47	4	33	1	2	-1	4	2
48	2	46	-1	3	2	3	2
49	4	36	0	1	1	2	2-3
50	3	33	-1	2	2	3	2
51	2	33	-1	4	2	1	2
52	1/2	33	-2/-1	3	2	3/4	2
53	2	36	0	3	2	2	3
54	3	51	-2	4	1	4	2
55	3	39	1	2	0	3	2
56	2	41	2	2	2	3	3
57	1	41	2	3	-1	4	2
58	1	36	2	3	1	2	3
59	3	39	-2	2	1	3	2
60	4	39	2	2	-1	4	2
61	3	36	2	3	2	3	3
62	3	46	-1	2	1	3	2
63	3	41	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	1	41	<u>1</u>	4	<u>-1</u>	2-3	2

Staff +7

Self +14

Same on 5 items.

11	7	6	17
4	2		1

Staff

Self

Item No.	<u>Staff</u>			<u>Self</u>		<u>Style</u>	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	1	55	1	4	-1	1	2-3
42	4	50	2	4	2	1	1
43	1	36	2	1	2	2	2
44	1	38	2	4	-2	4	1
45	4	52	-2	2	2	1	2
46	2	43	2	2	2	1	1
47	4	43	1	4	1	4	4
48	1	31	-2	2	-1	4	3
49	3	36	2	4	0	4	2
50	4	41	1	2	2	1	2
51	2/4	33	-1/2	3	-2	1/2	4
52	3	50	2	4	1	2	1
53	2	43	0	2	0	2	2
54	3	31	-2	4	1	4	2
55	4	49	-2	2	0	1	2
56	1	48	-2	3	0	1	2
57	3	43	-1	4	-2	2	1
58	2	36	-2	1	2	4	2
59	4	45	2	2	1	1	2
60	4	36	2	2	-1	4	2
61	4	43	-2	3	2	1	3
62	4	44	2	4	3	1	1
63	3	49	1	4	-2	2	1
64	2	35	<u>2</u>	4	<u>-1</u>	1	2

Staff +9

Self +8

Same on 6 items.

	5	2	13
7	12	2	7

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	2	67	-2	2	-2	3	3
42	2	83	0	2	0	2	2
43	1	83	2	1	2	2	2
44	3	67	-1	4	-2	2	1
45	2	50	2	2	2	2	2
46	1	67	-1	2	2	2-3	1
47	2	67	-1	2	-1	2	2
48	3	67	2	2	-1	2	3
49	1	67	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
50	2	67	2	2	2	2	2
51	1	83	1	2	-1	2-3	1
52	3	50	2	4	1	2	1
53	2	67	0	2	0	2	2
54	4	50	1	1	2	2	2-3
55	2	67	0	2	0	2	2
56	2	83	2	2	2	3	3
57	3	67	-1	2	1	2	3
58	1	100	2	1	2	2	2
59	2/4	33	1/2	2	1	2/1	2
60	2	67	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	1/3/4	33	2/-2/0	1	2	2/3/1	2
62	2	83	1	2	1	2	2
63	2/3	50	1/-1	2	1	2/3	3
64	4	50	<u>-1</u>	4	<u>-1</u>	2	2

Staff +15

Self +13

Same on 16 items.

2	20	5	15
	2		4

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	1/2/3	31	2/1/-1	4	-1	1/2/3	2-3
42	2	41	0	3	-2	2	3
43	1	52	2	2	-2	2	4
44	3	38	-1	4	-2	2	1
45	2	45	2	2	2	2	2
46	1	41	-1	1	-1	2-3	2-3
47	4	52	1	1	-2	4	1
48	3	48	2	4	1	2	1
49	4	35	0	1	1	2	2-3
50	3	45	-1	3	-1	3	3
51	4	35	2	1	1	2	2-3
52	3	52	2	4	1	2	1
53	2	62	0	3	2	2	3
54	4	41	1	3	-2	2	4
55	2	62	0	2	0	2	2
56	2	45	2	2	2	3	3
57	1	45	2	4	-2	4	1
58	1	55	2	3	1	2	3
59	2	52	1	3	-2	2	3
60	4	41	2	2	-1	4	2
61	3	48	2	3	2	2	2
62	2	46	1	1	-2	2	4
63	3	57	-1	4	-2	2	1
64	4	43	<u>-1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	2	2-3

Staff +21

Self -6

Same on 6 items.

3	17	7	8
3	1	3	6
Staff		Self	



Item No.	<u>Staff</u>			<u>Self</u>		<u>Style</u>	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	3	37	2	3	2	2	2
42	2	68	0	2	0	2	2
43	1	47	2	3	0	2	3
44	3/4	47	1/-1	3	1	2/1	2
45	2	79	2	2	2	2	2
46	1/2/4	32	2/1/-1	4	1	2	2
47	2	47	-1	2	-1	2	2
48	4	53	1	3	2	1	2
49	1	63	1	4	0	2-3	2
50	2	79	2	3	-1	2	3
51	4	47	2	4	2	2	2
52	3	74	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	79	0	3	2	2	0
54	1/4	37	2/1	4	1	2	2
55	2	68	0	2	0	2	2
56	2	63	2	3	0	3	2
57	3	53	-1	3	-1	2	2
58	1	68	2	1	2	2	2
59	2	53	1	2	1	2	2
60	2	74	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	3	79	2	1	0	3	2
62	2	72	1	2	1	2	2
63	3	89	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	1	39	<u>1</u>	4	<u>-1</u>	2-3	2

Staff +24

Self +13

Same on 16 items.

2	20	3	21
	2		

Staff

Self

Item No.	<u>Staff</u>			<u>Self</u>		<u>Style</u>	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	1/4	27	1/-1	4	-1	1/2/3	2-3
42	3	38	-2	2	0	3	2
43	1	38	2	2	-2	2	4
44	3	46	-1	2	1	2	3
45	2	41	2	2	2	2	2
46	1	41	-1	1	-1	2-3	2-3
47	4	46	1	4	1	4	4
48	3	51	2	2	-1	2	3
49	4	39	0	4	0	2	2
50	2	49	2	2	2	2	2
51	4	46	2	1	1	2	2-3
52	3	70	2	3	2	2	2
53	2	60	0	3	2	2	3
54	3	38	-2	1	2	4	2-3
55	2	43	0	2	0	1	1
56	2	46	2	4	1	3	2-3
57	3	41	-1	2	1	2	3
58	1	41	2	1	2	2	2
59	2	46	1	2	1	2	2
60	4	46	2	3	1	4	3
61	3	51	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	38	1	2	1	2	2
63	3	70	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	1	41	<u>1</u>	4	<u>-1</u>	2-3	2

Staff +17

Self +15

Same on 13 items.

3	16	6	15
3	2	2	1

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	3	60	2	3	2	2	2
42	2/4	40	0/-2	3	-2	2/1	3
43	1	53	2	1	2	2	2
44	2	40	1	3	-1	3	2
45	2	73	2	2	2	2	2
46	1/2	47	-1/2	4	1	1/2/3	2
47	2	47	-1	4	1	2	4
48	3	53	2	2	-1	2	3
49	4	40	0	1	1	2	2/3
50	2	53	2	2	2	2	2
51	4	47	2	2	-1	2	1
52	3	53	2	2	-1	2	3
53	2	67	0	2	0	2	2
54	3	33	-2	1	2	4	2-3
55	2	53	0	2	0	2	2
56	2	67	2	3	0	3	2
57	3	40	-1	1	2	2	4
58	1	53	2	1	2	2	2
59	2	47	1	2	1	2	2
60	2	53	-1	3	1	2	2
61	3	53	2	3	2	3	3
62	2	67	1	3	-1	2	3
63	3	87	-1	2	1	2	3
64	2	40	<u>2</u>	1	<u>1</u>	1	2-3

Staff +21

Self +15

Same on 9 items.

3	17	6	15
1	3	2	1

Staff

Self

Item No.	Staff		Score	Self		Style	
	Choice	%		Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	4	41	-1	2	-2	2-3	3
42	2/4	37	0/2	2	0	2/1	2
43	1	54	2	2	-2	2	4
44	3	48	-1	3	-1	2	2
45	2	46	2	2	2	3	3
46	1	59	-1	4	-2	2-3	1
47	2	59	-1	2	-1	2	2
48	3	61	2	4	1	2	1
49	1	46	1	4	0	2-3	2
50	2	57	2	3	-1	2	3
51	1	46	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
52	3	60	2	4	1	2	1
53	2	67	0	2	0	2	2
54	1	46	2	3	-2	2-3	4
55	2	59	0	1	2	2	4
56	2	59	2	3	0	3	2
57	3	59	-1	2	1	2	3
58	1	52	2	1	2	2	2
59	2	44	1	4	2	2	1
60	2	57	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	3	80	2	4	-2	3	1
62	2	59	1	2	1	2	2
63	3	60	-1	3	-1	2	2
64	1	41	<u>1</u>	2	<u>2</u>	2-3	1

Staff +18

Self 0

Same on 10 items.

3	20	4	11
	1	3	6

STAFF

Item No.	Staff			Self		Style	
	Choice	%	Score	Choice	Score	Staff	Self
41	3	42	2	2	-2	2	2
42	2	54	0	3	-2	2	2
43	3	56	0	3	0	3	3
44	2/3	39	1/-1	2	1	3-2	3
45	2	42	2	3	1	2	2
46	1	51	-1	1	-1	2-3	2-3
47	2	46	-1	2	-1	2	2
48	2	42	-1	2	-1	3	3
49	1	59	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
50	2	42	2	3	-1	2	2
51	1	42	1	1	1	2-3	2-3
52	3	51	2	2	-1	2	2
53	1	56	1	3	2	4	4
54	1	51	2	3	-2	2-3	2-3
55	2	51	0	3	1	2	2
56	2	51	2	2	2	3	3
57	3	51	-1	2	1	2	2
58	3	54	1	3	1	3	3
59	2	44	1	3	-2	2	2
60	2	49	-1	2	-1	2	2
61	3	68	2	3	2	3	3
62	2/3	39	1/-1	2	1	2-3	2
63	3	68	-1	2	1	2	2
64	1	51	<u>1</u>	1	<u>1</u>	2-3	2-3

Staff +16

Self +2

Same on 13 items.

5	18	6	17
1		1	
Staff		Self	

## APPENDIX F

LBDQ Data, Staff and Principal Scores, and Percentages

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	53	3	2	4	47	3
3	3	53	4	4	3	53	3
6	4/3	47	3	7	2	41	2
8	4	53	4	9	2	41	3
12	3	47	3	11	2	35	4
13	4	47	3	14	4/3	47	3
18	4	47	2	16	4	53	3
20	3	41	2	17	4	47	4
21	4	65	4	22	3	41	4
23	4	65	4	24	4	41	2
26	4/3	47	4	27	4	53	4
28	4	71	4	29	4	59	4
31	4	65	4	32	4	59	4
34	3	59	4	35	2	58	3
38	3	65	4	39	3	47	4
—				—			
Staff 53			Self 52	Staff 49			Self 50

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	67	2	2	3	40	3
3	3	47	2	4	3/2	40	3
6	2	40	3	7	1/0	33	1
8	4	40	3	9	1	33	2
12	2	47	3	11	2	33	3
13	4/2	33	3	14	2	40	3
18	3/4	40	4	16	2	33	3
20	3	47	3	17	4	40	3
21	3	47	3	22	3	47	2
23	4/3/2	33	2	24	3/2	27	2
26	3	60	3	27	4	33	3
28	4	73	4	29	3/2	33	2
31	4	73	4	32	4/3	40	4
34	2	53	3	35	2	47	3
38	3	47	3	39	3	40	3
<hr/> Staff 47				<hr/> Staff 40			
<hr/> Self 45				<hr/> Self 40			



<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	33	1	2	4	57	4
3	3	54	4	4	4	38	3
6	3	50	2	7	2	38	2
8	4	66	4	9	2	39	4
12	3	43	1	11	3/2/1	27	3
13	3	36	2	14	3	45	4
18	4	48	4	16	3	42	3
20	3	54	2	17	4/3	43	4
21	4	57	4	22	3	43	3
23	3	41	4	24	3	46	3
26	4	48	3	27	4	48	3
28	4	59	4	29	3	46	4
31	4	63	3	32	4	54	3
34	3	70	3	35	3	48	4
38	3	57	4	39	3	57	3
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Staff 50		Self 45		Staff 48		Self 50	

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	3	46	3	2	2	54	3
3	3	46	4	4	3	54	4
6	4/3/2	31	3	7	1	54	1
8	4	62	4	9	2	69	3
12	3	77	2	11	1	46	1
13	3	54	3	14	3	46	3
18	3	46	4	16	2	54	3
20	2	39	2	17	3	39	3
21	3	46	4	22	2	54	3
23	3	39	4	24	1	31	1
26	3	54	4	27	3	54	3
28	4	77	4	29	3	46	2
31	4	46	4	32	3	54	3
34	3	69	3	35	3	42	3
38	3/2	31	4	39	3/2	39	3
—				—			
Staff 48			Self 52	Staff 34			Self 38

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	3	39	3	2	3	54	3
3	3	54	2	4	3	69	3
6	3	62	3	7	1	46	2
8	4	85	3	9	2	46	2
12	4	54	2	11	1	46	2
13	3	46	3	14	2	54	2
18	4	69	2	16	2	54	2
20	3	39	2	17	4	46	3
21	3	54	2	22	2	46	2
23	4	77	3	24	1	54	2
26	3	54	4	27	3	54	3
28	4	100	3	29	3	31	3
31	4	85	3	32	4/3	46	3
34	3	77	3	35	3	39	4
38	3	54	3	39	3	77	3

Self 51

Self 42

Staff 37

Self 42

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	57	3	2	3	57	3
3	3/2/1	29	4	4	2	43	2
6	3	71	2	7	2	43	3
8	4/3	43	4-	9	2	43	2
12	2	57	3	11	1	43	1
13	4/2	43	4	14	4/3/2	29	2
18	4	43	4	16	2	57	3
20	2	57	1	17	3	43	3
21	4/3/2	29	4	22	3	43	3
23	4	57	2	24	3	43	2
26	4/3	29	3	27	3	57	4
28	4/3	43	4	29	4/3	43	3
31	4	57	4	32	3	43	3
34	3/2	43	3	35	3	43	4
38	3	57	3	39	3/2	43	3
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Staff 50		Self 48		Staff 40		Self 41	

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	3	43	4	2	4/3	43	4
3	4	57	3	4	3	71	4
6	4	57	3	7	1	57	0
8	4	57	4	9	2	43	2
12	3	43	4	11	1	43	3
13	4	57	4	14	2	71	2
18	4	86	4	16	1	43	2
20	2/3/4	29	3	17	3	71	3
21	4	57	4	22	2	43	2
23	4	71	4	24	0	43	1
26	4	57	4	27	4/3	43	3
28	4	100	4	29	3/2	43	2
31	4	100	4	32	3	57	4
34	3	71	3	35	3	57	3
38	4/3	43	4	39	3	43	3
	—		—		—		—
	57		56		35		38

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	3	45	3	2	3	39	3
3	3	42	3	4	3	39	3
6	3	39	3	7	3/2	36	3
8	4	45	3	9	3	48	3
12	3	48	2	11	3	36	2
13	3	36	3	14	3	52	1
18	3	42	3	16	3	42	3
20	2	39	2	17	3	55	3
21	3	42	3	22	4	52	3
23	3	39	3	24	3	39	3
26	2	39	3	27	2	36	4
28	3	58	4	29	3	55	3
31	3	45	3	32	3	52	3
34	2	42	3	35	2	51	3
38	2	39	3	39	3/2	36	3
—				—			
Staff 42			Self 44	Staff 44			Self 43

I  
LBDQ

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	49	3	2	2	36	2
3	3/2	39	2	4	3	46	3
6	2	39	2	7	1	49	1
8	3	54	3	9	2	51	2
12	3	41	2	11	1	39	1
13	3	33	2	14	2	40	3
18	2	31	3	16	2	41	3
20	1	46	2	17	2	46	2
21	2	36	3	22	3	55	3
23	3	44	3	24	2	39	2
26	3	51	3	27	3	39	2
28	4	67	3	29	3	36	3
31	4	49	3	32	3	41	2
34	2	44	3	35	2	46	3
38	2	41	3	39	2	56	2
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Staff 39		Self 40		Staff 33		Self 34	

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	52	3	2	2	36	4
3	1	36	3	4	2	41	3
6	3	41	3	7	2	38	4
8	2	36	3	9	2	41	3
12	2	36	1	11	2	43	2
13	2	41	3	14	2	36	3
18	2	26	2	16	3/2	32	4
20	1	36	1	17	2	43	4
21	3	50	3	22	3	55	4
23	2	36	4	24	3	43	3
26	1	33	3	27	3	36	3
28	4	26	4	29	4	43	3
31	2	29	3	32	3	36	4
34	2	38	3	35	2	36	3
38	2	45	2	39	2	36	3
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Staff 30		Self 41		Staff 37		Self 50	



K  
LBDQ

<u>Consideration</u>			<u>Initiating Structure</u>				
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	67	3	2	4	67	3
3	4	50	4	4	3	100	3
6	4	50	3	7	2/0	50	1
8	4/3	50	4	9	2	50	1
12	3/1	50	4	11	4/3	33	2
13	4/3	33	2	14	3	67	3
18	4	50	3	16	4	50	3
20	3	83	2	17	4	83	2
21	4	67	3	22	4/3/2	33	3
23	4/3	50	4	24	3	50	3
26	4/3	50	4	27	4	50	4
28	4	100	4	29	4	67	3
31	4	67	4	32	4	83	4
34	3	67	3	35	3	67	2
38	3	67	2	39	3	67	3
	—		—		—		—
	54		48		51		42

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	52	3	2	3	41	2
3	2	66	2	4	3	55	3
6	3	41	2	7	1	38	1
8	4	45	3	9	3	41	2
12	2	41	3	11	3/2	28	2
13	3	41	2	14	3	52	2
18	3/2	31	3	16	3	31	2
20	3/2	31	2	17	2	35	2
21	3	48	3	22	3	48	1
23	3	35	3	24	3	48	2
26	3	55	3	27	3	45	3
28	4	59	3	29	4	45	2
31	4/3	38	3	32	3	45	2
34	3	48	3	35	3	41	2
38	2	35	3	39	3	48	2

Staff 44

Self 41

Staff 43

Self 30

<u>Consideration</u>			<u>Initiating Structure</u>				
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	3	53	3	2	4	68	3
3	3	47	3	4	3	53	4
6	4	53	3	7	2	47	2
8	4	63	4	9	2/1	37	3
12	3	42	4	11	2/1	32	2
13	4	58	4	14	3	68	3
18	3	53	3	16	3/2	42	2
20	3	42	2	17	4	63	3
21	4	68	4	22	3	53	3
23	4	42	4	24	3	42	1
26	3	53	3	27	4	79	3
28	3	47	3	29	4/3	42	3
31	4	53	3	32	4	74	3
34	3	90	3	35	4	53	3
38	3	58	3	39	4/3	42	3
<hr/>			<hr/>				
	51		49		49		41

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	49	3	2	3	38	3
3	3	43	2	4	3	38	2
6	4/3	41	3	7	1	54	1
8	3	62	4	9	1	39	1
12	2	32	2	11	1	32	1
13	3	46	3	14	3	47	3
18	4	54	3	16	3	58	3
20	3	41	2	17	3	46	2
21	3	46	3	22	3	46	4
23	3	46	3	24	3	43	4
26	3	49	4	27	2	35	3
28	4	57	3	29	4	49	3
31	4	51	4	32	2	35	3
34	3	54	3	35	3	43	2
38	3	41	3	39	3	38	3
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Staff 47		Self 42		Staff 38		Self 38	

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	3	73	2	2	4	47	4
3	4/3	40	3	4	3	53	4
6	4/3	47	3	7	2	40	3
8	4	73	3	9	2	47	4
12	4/3	40	2	11	2	40	3
13	4	67	3	14	3	73	3
18	4	53	4	16	3	40	3
20	3	47	1	17	4	53	4
21	4/3	47	3	22	3	33	3
23	3	53	3	24	2	40	2
26	4/3	40	3	27	4	60	4
28	4	80	4	29	4	53	3
31	4	80	3	32	4	67	4
34	3	73	3	35	4/2	33	4
38	4/2	33	3	39	3	53	3
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Staff 56			Self 41	Staff 47			Self 51

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	2	35	2	2	4	77	3
3	3	48	2	4	3	52	3
6	4	67	1	7	1	33	2
8	4	76	3	9	2	44	2
12	3	44	3	11	2	35	3
13	3	44	2	14	3	57	3
18	4	78	3	16	3	50	3
20	3	41	1	17	4	44	3
21	4/3	46	3	22	3	50	3
23	4	50	3	24	3	39	3
26	4	50	3	27	4	54	3
28	4	91	2	29	4	50	4
31	4	76	3	32	4	61	3
34	3	61	3	35	3	54	3
38	3	57	2	39	3	61	3
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Staff 52		Self 36		Staff 46		Self 44	

<u>Consideration</u>				<u>Initiating Structure</u>			
Item No.	Score	%	Self Score	Item No.	Score	%	Self Score
1	3	42	3	2	3	51	4
3	3	59	4	4	3	59	4
6	3	68	4	7	2	39	0
8	4/3	42	4	9	2	56	3
12	3	49	4	11	1	37	0
13	3	44	4	14	3	51	3
18	4	44	4	16	3	44	3
20	3	44	3	17	3	49	3
21	4/3	42	3	22	2	46	2
23	3	51	4	24	3	39	2
26	4	56	3	27	3	49	4
28	4	71	4	29	2	37	3
31	4	66	4	32	4/3	44	4
34	3	63	3	35	3	51	3
38	3	56	4	39	3	46	3
—				—			
Staff 51			Self 55	Staff 40			Self 41

FOOTNOTES



Footnotes      Chapter One:

1 Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, "A Leadership Theory For Educational Administrators," Education, April-May, 1970, p.1.

2 Andrew Halpin, Leader Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

3 Lee Peters, Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, Situational Management Simulator, (non-published game based on the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, University of Mass., 1970).

4 Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership," Training and Development Journal, XXIII, 5, May, 1969, p.27.

5 Ibid., p.28.

Footnotes      Chapter II

1 This format resulted from discussions with Dr. Jack Spiess, University of Toledo, 1970.

2 Sigmund Freud, Group Psychology And the Analysis of the Ego (New York: Bantam Books, 1960) Translated by James Strachey. p.143.

3 Fritz Redl, "Group Emotion and Leadership." Psychiatry, Volume 4, No. 4, 1942, p.576.

4 Editors, Webster's Seventh Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Mass: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1963), p.140.

5 Jack Spiess, "Leadership for Team Leaders." (working paper written for National Team Leader Development Committee, Spring, 1971), p.57.

6 Ibid., p.58.

7 Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961), p.60.

8 Spiess, p.58.

9. Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (Eds.), Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 3rd Edition (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p.302.

10 Alex Bravelas, "Leadership: Man and Function," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 4, March 1960, p.491.

11 Cartwright and Zander, p.3.

12. Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of The Literature," in C.G. Browne and Thomas Cohn (Eds.), The Study of Leadership (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958), pp.50-61.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid., p.58.

15 Cecil A. Gibb, "Leadership," in Gardner Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison Wesley Pub. Co., Inc., 1954), p.74.

16 Eugene E. Jennings, "The Anatomy of Leadership," Management of Personnel Quarterly, Vol. I, No. 1, Autumn, 1961. p.93.

- 17 John K. Hemphill, Situational Factors in Leadership, Monograph No. 32 (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, The Ohio State University, 1949), pp.24-26.
- 18 Hersey and Blanchard, p.61.
- 19 Spiess, p.61.
- 20 Edgar Schein, Organizational Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp.104-106.
- 21 Raymond B. Cattell, "New Concepts for Measuring Leadership in Terms of Group Syntality," Human Relations, Vol. 4, 1951, p.183.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 David Krech and Richard S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948), pp.417-422.
- 24 Hemphill, p.103.
- 25 Hersey and Blanchard, p.61.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p.102.
- 28 Frederick W. Taylor, Scientific Management (New York: Harper and Bros., 1947), p.63.
- 29 Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management (London: Sir Issac Pitman and Sons, 1949), p.108.
- 30 Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1960), p.46.
- 31 ASCD, Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1967), pp.12-17.
- 32 Elton Mayo, The Human Problems of An Industrial Civilization (Boston: Harvard Business School, 1933), p.95.
- 33 McGregor, p.78.
- 34 Much like the author's description of a school organization he recently consulted in, where leadership was not localized, all were presumed equal, concerned with human feelings and emotions to the point of overlooking the obligation to common needs organizationally.

35 Harold J. Leavitt, "Unhuman Organizations," Harvard Business Review, 40:90, July-August, 1962, p.36.

36 Ibid.

37 ASCD, p.14

38 Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership," Training and Development Journal, XXIII, 5, May, 1969, p.27.

39 See the following: Robert F. Bales, "Task Roles and Social Roles in Problem Solving Groups," Readings in Social Psychology (Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1958), Chester Bainand, Functions of The Executive (Harvard University Press, 1938), Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Research and Theory: Group Dynamics (Row Peterson Co., 1960), D. Katz, N. Macoby and Nancy Morse, Productivity, Supervision and Morale In An Office Situation (Durel Press, Inc., 1950).

40 Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin Coons, Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Research Monograph No. 88 (Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957), p.4.

41 Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959), p.4.

42 Hersey and Blanchard, Training and Development Journal, p.2.

43 Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid (Gulf Publishing Co., 1964), p.104.

44 Ibid.

45 Robert R. Blake et al., "Breakthrough in Organizational Development," Harvard Business Review, Nov.-Dec., 1964, p.136.

46 Andrew Halpin, in Hersey and Blanchard, Training and Development Journal, p.3.

47 Blake and Mouton, p.119.

48 Hersey and Blanchard, Training and Development Journal, p.3.

49 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, p.71.

50 A.K. Korman, "Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria - A Review," Personnel Psychology: A Journal of Applied Research, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Winter, 1966), pp.349-361.

51 See, Fred Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness McGraw-Hill, 1967), Cecil Gibb, "Leadership," A.P. Hare, Handbook of Small Group Research (Wiley, 1965), D.C. Pelz, "Leadership Within a Hierarchical Organization," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 7, 1961, pp.49-55.

52 Paul Hersey, Management Concepts and Behavior: Programmed Instruction for Managers (Little Rock, Arkansas: Marvern Publishing Co., 1967), p. 15.

53 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, pp. 101-102.

54 Ibid.

55 Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 135.

56 Bernard Bass, Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior (New York: Harper and Bros., 1960), p. 271.

57 Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972) p. 106 (Revised edition not yet published.)

58 Ibid.

59 Edgar Schein, pp.104-106.

60 Rensis Likert, The Human Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), pp. 20-29.

61 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, p. 109.

62 Ibid.

63 Douglas McGregor, The Professional Manager (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 137.

64 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, pp.115-117.

65 Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

66 W.G. Bennis, "Toward A Truly Scientific Management: The Concept of Organizational Health," General Systems Yearbook, 1962, Vol.7 pp.269-282.

67 Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: Wiley, 1964), p. 78.

68 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, p. 94

69 Filmore H. Stanford, Authoritarianism and Leadership (Philadelphia: Institute for Human Relations, 1950), p. 94.

70 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, pp. 97-102.

71 Ibid., p.93.

72 Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, "A Leadership Theory For Educational Administrators," Education, April-May, 1970, p.1.

73 Ibid.

74 Ibid., p.3.

75 Andrew Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957, p.61.

76 David C. McClelland, J.W. Atkinson, R.A. Clark, and E.C. Lowell, The Achievement Motive (New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1953), p.176.

77 David J. Duccharme, "The Relationship Between Maturity Level and Leader Behavior Preference Among Urban Elementary School Teachers," (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1970), p.7.

78 D.H. Heath, Explorations In Maturity: Studies of Mature and Immature College Men (New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1965), p.8.

79 Duccharme, p.8.

80 Ibid., p.9.

81 Hersey and Blanchard, Education, p.3.

82 Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Bros., 1954), p.143.

83 Frederick Herzberg, B. Snauser, and B. Syndemann, The Motivation to Work (New York: Wiley, 1959), pp.123-124.

84 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, p.48.

85 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, Revision, p.205.

86 Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1957, pp.6-7.

87 Hersey and Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior, p.43.

88 Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Research Monograph No. 88 (Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957), p.61.

89 Andrew W. Halpin and B. James Winer, "A Factorial Study of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," pp.39-52 in Stogdill and Coons.

90 Ibid., p.43.

91 Ibid., p.51.

92 Halpin, p.35.

93 Ralph L. Spener. "The Leadership Behavior of Elementary School Principals," (an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1964) in Kenneth Blanchard, "The Favorableness of the Group Situation In a Board of Trustees to Its Principal Designated Leader-The College President and The Board Chairman," (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell, 1967, p.58.)

94 "Cyclision," developed by the author, later edited and refined by Hersey and Blanchard and renamed Situational Management Simulator.





