



8-1-1986

School Climate and Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Uses of Power Strategies

Ann Windsor Schroeder Porter

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Porter, Ann Windsor Schroeder, "School Climate and Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Uses of Power Strategies" (1986). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2735.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/2735>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact zeineb.yousif@library.und.edu.

SCHOOL CLIMATE AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF
PRINCIPALS' USES OF POWER STRATEGIES

by
Ann Windsor Schroeder Porter

Bachelor of Science, University of Kansas, 1967
Master of Education, University of North Dakota, 1982

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August
1986

This Dissertation submitted by Ann Windsor Schroeder Porter in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done, and is hereby approved.

Donald K. Lemon
(Chairperson)

Richard T. Hill

Richard J. Landus

Myrna R. Olson

Donald E. Porter

This Dissertation meets the standards for appearance and conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

A. William Johnson 7/18/86
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

School Climate and Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Uses of
Title Power Strategies

Department Center for Teaching and Learning-Educational Administration

Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature

Ann W. Parter

Date

July 7, 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES vi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS viii

ABSTRACT x

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION 1

 Need for the Study

 Purpose of the Study

 Delimitations

 Assumptions

 Definitions

 Research Questions

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 12

 Introduction

 Effective Schools Research

 Organizational Climate and Leadership

 Power and Leadership

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY 48

 Population Studied

 Instruments

 Procedure

CHAPTER IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS 61

 Introduction

 Results

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 83

 Summary

 Conclusions

 Limitations

 Discussion

 Recommendations

APPENDICES 108

APPENDIX A.	LETTER TO PRINCIPALS	109
APPENDIX B.	SCHOOL PARTICIPATION FORM	111
APPENDIX C.	LETTER OF PERMISSION	113
APPENDIX D.	PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL POWER TACTICS SURVEY	115
APPENDIX E.	PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL POWER TACTICS SURVEY (ITEMS IDENTIFIED)	120
APPENDIX F.	LETTER TO TEACHERS	125
APPENDIX G.	OPENNESS SCORES AND SCHOOLS CLIMATE PROFILES AMONG FIFTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN NORTH DAKOTA AND MINNESOTA	127
REFERENCES		129

LIST OF TABLES

1. Reliability of Tactic Scores	60
2. <u>t</u> -Test for Testing the Hypothesis of No Difference between the Means of Seven Scales of the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey	62
3. Frequency of Organizational Climate Profiles among North Dakota and Northwestern Minnesota Elementary Schools	64
4. Analysis of Variance of Elementary Principals' Use of Rationality in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	66
5. Mean Scores and Significant Differences of Elementary Principals on the Rationality Tactic of the PPPTS in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	66
6. Analysis of Variance of Elementary Principals' Use of Ingratiation in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	67
7. Mean Scores and Significant Differences of Elementary Principals on the Ingratiation Tactic of the PPPTS in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	67
8. Analysis of Variance of Elementary Principals' Use of Upward Appeal in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	68
9. Mean Scores of Elementary Principals on the Upward Appeal Tactic of the PPPTS in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	68
10. Analysis of Variance of Elementary Principals' Use of Coalitions in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	70
11. Mean Scores of Elementary Principals on the Coalitions Tactic of the PPPTS in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	70
12. Analysis of Variance of Elementary Principals' Use of Exchange in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	71

13.	Mean Scores of Elementary Principals on the Exchange Tactic of the PPPTS in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	71
14.	Analysis of Variance of Elementary Principals' Use of Assertiveness in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	72
15.	Mean Scores and Significant Differences of Elementary Principals on the Assertiveness Tactic of the PPPTS in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	72
16.	Analysis of Variance of Elementary Principals' Use of Sanctions in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	74
17.	Mean Scores and Significant Differences of Elementary Principals on the Sanctions Tactic of the PPPTS in Relationship to Schools' Climate Profiles	74
18.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of Elementary Schools' Openness Scores in Relationship to Principals' Use of Power Tactics As Perceived by Teachers	75
19.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of Characteristics of the Faculty As a Group Measured by the OCDQ in Relationship to the Principals' Use of Power Tactics As Perceived by Teachers	77
20.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of Characteristics of the Principal As a Leader Measured by the OCDQ in Relationship to Principals' Use of Power Tactics As Perceived by Teachers	79

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As four years of doctoral study come to an end with the completion of this dissertation, I am struck by the paradoxes it presents. The end signifies the beginning of new opportunities and new goals. The new knowledge portends the recognition of how much more there is to know.

I have been blessed to be surrounded by caring and thoughtful professionals and friends during my academic pursuits. My advisor, Dr. Donald Lemon, has been an inspirational teacher. His creative energies have challenged my attitudes, beliefs, and skills. I have grown personally and professionally under his tutelage.

I have been fortunate to have had a supportive and enthusiastic doctoral committee. Dr. Richard Landry has provided valued assistance with the computer program and statistical analysis for this study. Dr. Richard Hill has been generous with his wise counsel and feedback. Dr. Myrna Olson and Dr. Donald Porter have contributed their own perspectives that have brought about new insights.

Special thanks is expressed to Sharon Fields for her expert editing and typing and to Addie Burgard for her helpfulness and sense of humor. Both of these women have made the daily tasks more enjoyable.

There are some very special people who have kept me going through the good times and the bad times. My friend, Beth Randklev, has taken time to walk with me and talk with me. Our conversations

have helped to keep me centered on my goals. Two other friends, Joan Brown and Darlene Peterson, have always been available to listen no matter what I needed to say. There are many other graduate students who I cherish as friends and as professionals. I also appreciate the contribution of the Educational Administration faculty to my learning and development as an educator and a potential administrator. There are other faculty in the Center who have also contributed much to my growth as an educator. To all these people I give my heartfelt thanks.

Special appreciation is expressed to Project IDEAL for providing the financial assistance to make two years of full-time graduate work affordable. The University of North Dakota Graduate School has also made graduate study more financially feasible through their awards of a Summer Doctoral Fellowship and a Graduate Student Research Grant. The support helped to create both an obligation and a motivation to do my best.

Mike, Mary, and Julie have sustained me through the years. Their willingness to fend for themselves has provided the time for me to complete this endeavor. It is my belief that we have all grown together and a legacy of lifelong learning will be passed on. For their love and support I am most thankful.

To my parents, Sydney and Margaret Loomis Schroeder, who laid the groundwork for a life of learning and service to others I want to express my love and admiration.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify the power strategies used by elementary principals in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota. It also examined the relationships between the power strategies used by those principals and the organizational climates of their schools. Schools' climates and principals' power strategies were measured based on teachers' perceptions.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was used to measure the schools' climate profiles, openness scores, and mean scores of the eight dimensions of school climate. The Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey was used to measure teachers' perceptions of principals' uses of power strategies.

Three hundred one teachers in fifty schools participated in the study. Teachers who participated had taught in their schools for two or more years under the supervision of the same full-time principal. The data were analyzed using analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlations, and t-tests.

The principals were perceived to use a combination of power strategies, but were not perceived to use all power strategies equally. Rationality was the most frequently used power strategy followed by Ingratiation, Upward Appeal, Coalitions, Exchange, Assertiveness, and Sanctions.

There were significant differences between principals' use of Rationality, Ingratiation, Assertiveness, and Sanctions and the school

climate profiles. The pattern with which principals used these power strategies appeared to affect teachers' perceptions of the schools' climates.

The more open teachers perceived schools' organizational climates the more teachers perceived principals to use Rationality, Ingratiation, Coalitions, and Exchange. The more closed teachers perceived the schools' climates the more often teachers perceived principals to use Assertiveness and Sanctions.

Principals' use of Rationality was related to the teacher behaviors Disengagement and Esprit. Principals' use of Assertiveness and Sanctions was related to teachers' Hindrance behaviors. Principals' use of Exchange was related to the Intimacy felt among teachers.

Teachers' perceptions of principals' behaviors were apparently based on perceptions of the principals' attempts at influencing teachers. Principals' Thrust and Consideration behaviors were related to perceptions of principals' use of Rationality, Ingratiation, Coalitions, Exchange, Assertiveness, and Sanctions. Principals' Aloofness and Production Emphasis behaviors were related to their use of Upward Appeal, Assertiveness, and Sanctions.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

. . . [C]hange is in the air. No single event galvanizes us into school reform as did the launching of Sputnik in 1957. But the conditions are similarly ripe. We are reconsidering the role of schools in advancing high technology, improving the economy, and helping us understand the rapidly changing global circumstances of which the United States is an interdependent part. (John Goodlad in Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin 1983, p. ix)

John Goodlad described the atmosphere surrounding education in the 1980s just before the "galvanizing event" for the present interest in school reform occurred. In the spring of 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in Education released its report, A Nation at Risk. One conclusion that the Commission arrived at, ". . . the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" (p. 5), has apparently stirred more discussion, more debate, more controversy, and more literature than has any statement or event in any previous era of educational reform. "So voluminous has been the production of information about education and how to improve it that many people interested in the subject have been unable to keep up with the reading or unable to discern common themes among the recommendations" (Education Commission of the States 1983, p. 1).

Efforts were made to improve curriculum and instruction during the 1950s, the 1960s, and the 1970s. While widely advocated as

important advances for improving education, innovations were not implemented extensively across the United States (Wood, Johnson, and Paden 1984). Radical reformers, the government, and universities were the forces of change during those decades (Lieberman and Shiman 1973). Programs and practices were implemented based on a number of different theories. They also used a variety of strategies to promote improvement in education. However, the amount and pace of change fell far short of expectations. One reason for the lack of success of these innovations was that federal and state agencies were designing and implementing programs without considering the resistance to change at the service delivery level (Mann 1976). Goodlad (1984) noted, "Principals and teachers who do not want what others seek to impose upon them often are extraordinarily adept at nullifying or defusing practices perceived to be in conflict with prevailing ways of doing things" (p. 16). Thus, many reforms of the past such as the new math and the open classroom were "painstakingly adopted and painlessly discarded" (Tanner 1984, p. 5).

Efforts at change focused on schools had failed according to Sarason (1982) because:

The school culture, like any other major social institution, is political in the narrow and general sense of that word, i.e., the behavior of people (students, teachers, administrators, parents) and the stability and transformations in classroom, school, and school system structures have to be seen in terms of the seeking, allocation, and uses of power. Introducing, sustaining, and assessing an educational change are political processes because they inevitably alter or threaten to alter existing power relationships, especially if that process implies, as it almost always does, a reallocation of resources. Few myths have been as resistant to change as that which assumes that the culture of the school is a nonpolitical one, and few myths have contributed as much to failure of the change effort. (pp. 70-71)

Goodlad (1983) urged that those interested in improving schools look more closely at the schools themselves in their efforts at reform.

. . . [S]ome seemingly endemic problems of schooling have remained impervious to change. Committed to the factory model without feeling a need to validate it, our reflex response to school problems as citizens and educators is to increase pressure through mandates, testing requirements, new standards for college entrance, and the like. We rarely look at what lies between the input value and the output spigot. . . . The interactions of individuals and other elements in and around schools are far more complicated. . . . Strategies for school improvement that ignore these interactions and the rationales governing them are unlikely to have more than minimal impact on the culture of schools. (p. 466)

Research conducted since the late 1960s determined that one difference between successful and unsuccessful schools was the climate for teaching and learning that was created by the school's staff. Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, and Ouston's (1979) longitudinal study of twelve secondary schools demonstrated that children's experiences in school made a difference in students' behavior and attainments. In addition, the study showed that these differences could be attributed to the particular set of values, attitudes, and behaviors which were characteristic of the school as a whole. Goodlad's (1984) research using thirty-eight schools in thirteen communities throughout the United States also substantiated the importance of the school climate in distinguishing between effective schools and ineffective schools. Thus, school change that positively affected school climate would be likely to positively affect learning outcomes for students.

In the literature on school effectiveness, the school principal has been identified as the major link to which all factors related to school climate were connected.

The most commonly studied principal behaviors have been leadership style and decision making, and the most commonly examined school attributes have been teacher morale, organizational climate, and school innovativeness. These studies consistently show a significant positive relationship between certain patterns of principal behavior and certain school attributes. For example, two dimensions of leadership style familiar to graduate students of educational administration--task orientation and human relations orientation--were consistently related to positive school organizational climate, teacher morale, and school innovativeness. These data provide research support for the practitioner's intuition, "The principal makes the difference." (Cross 1981, p. 21)

Research has confirmed that real improvement in quality education was essentially a school-by-school process and that a bond of trust and mutual support between the principal and the teachers appeared to be basic to such a process (Goodlad 1984). Consequently, this implied that the link of trust and support between the principal and the teachers in establishing a productive and satisfying school climate becomes even more significant.

In the past twenty-five years, however, many outside forces have inhibited the power of the school principal to influence others in the pursuit of the school's goals (Boyd and Crowson 1981; Redfern 1979). Communities have been demanding more participation in school decision making. Teacher power has been increasing through the collective bargaining process. Legislatures have been mandating more accountability in personnel decisions and student achievement. Courts have been dictating procedures in providing services for all children. Tye (1973) asserted that though the role of the elementary principal was changing, the principal could be a key agent for change in schools when he or she acted as a leader rather than as an administrator.

Sarason (1974) believed that those who wanted to change the schools through decentralization and community control had hoped that

by changing structures and forces of power they would better the system. Sarason suggested that what was missing in such proposals for change was any recognition that the principal was the crucial implementer of change.

Any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal. One can realign forces of power, change administrative structures, and increase budgets for materials and new personnel, but the intended effects of all these changes will be drastically diluted by principals whose past experiences and training, interacting with certain personality factors, ill prepares them for the role of educational and intellectual leader. In fact, and this point has tended to be overlooked, many of the intended outcomes of the proposed changes could have been achieved by the principal before these proposals ever were made or became matters of official policy. . . . I have too often witnessed when the new policies are stated and then implemented: The more things change the more they remain the same. (p. 53)

At present it seems that the most popular way to bring about reform is to legislate and mandate change at the state level. Kirst (1984) pointed out the danger of increased state control of education as a strategy for school improvement. He noted that statutes and regulations aimed at what should be taught, how it should be taught, and who should teach it have a standardizing effect. Kirst concluded that the balance between developing statewide standards to provide effective schools and creating the kind of school climate that requires professionals to be involved will be a continuing part of the education reform debate.

Need for the Study

School principals are identified among those in a significant position to make a difference in America's efforts for quality education. However, since they are hampered in their efforts by current

social trends, it is necessary that they be informed of strategies that have the greatest potential for influencing others in order to bring about commitment and cooperation of all groups interested in the education of America's youth.

Two general types of power available to organizational leaders have been identified as "position power" and "personal power" (Hersey and Blanchard 1977; Yukl 1981). When an individual occupied a formal position in an organization with the authority to exert influence over others, he or she was said to have "position power." The right to issue rewards and punishments, to make legitimate requests, to control aspects of the work situation, and to have control over vital information have been identified as ways to influence others through one's position (Yukl 1981). When an individual's influence was derived from his or her personality, he or she was said to have "personal power." Personal power comes from subordinates' willingness to follow their leader (Hersey and Blanchard 1977). The use of rational persuasion, personal identification, and inspirational appeals have been reported as sources of influence related to personal power (Yukl 1981). Research has suggested that leaders depend more on personal power than position power. It has also been recognized that position power has been an important element in accomplishing goals, since power in organizations has been based to a large extent on the right of a leader to make decisions and initiate actions (McCall 1979; Stogdill 1974).

Principals, who have occupied positions to exert the most influence to change and to improve schools, must also have used their personal power in such a way that a positive educational climate for

teachers to work and students to learn was accomplished. In order for principals to use both position and personal power in the most effective way they must also be aware of their subordinates' perceptions of their use of power strategies. Gioia and Sims (1983) noted:

. . . The study of perceived power is important for a number of reasons. First, organization members do not typically respond to objective power; rather, they respond to their own subjective perceptions that power exists and will be exercised. Secondly, the locus of power in an organization is not always (or even often) obvious. Thus, people must rely on behavioral, informational, and situational cues in order to make the inference that organizational or interpersonal power is present (and, therefore, should be taken into account in any contemplated action). Thirdly, by managing the impression of the possession of power, people who other wise would not be seen as powerful (from an "objective" analysis of power standpoint) can influence the behavior of others. (pp. 7-8)

In summary, past reform efforts have often been unsuccessful in creating effective schools. One might postulate some of the efforts were focused on new programs and practices instead of improved school climates. In part, the power strategies for their implementation most likely did not take into consideration the resistance to change at the building level. Current social trends have limited the power strategies available to school principals who have been recognized as the key individuals to influence the creation of positive school climates in which teachers and students were productive and satisfied. Since subordinates respond to their leader's behavior based upon their subjective views, school principals need to be informed of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's use of power strategies and school climate if changes in schools are to be successfully introduced and sustained.

Purpose of the Study

This study will seek to identify the power strategies of elementary principals as perceived by the teachers in the schools which they serve. It will also examine the relationships between these teacher perceptions of principals' power strategies and the eight dimensions of schools' organizational climates as well as schools' climate profiles and openness scores as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ).

Delimitations

The study was delimited to:

1. Public elementary schools in northwestern Minnesota and North Dakota which were served by principals who met the following criteria:
 - a) They had been at the school for the past two years as principal.
 - b) They were full-time elementary principals and had served only one building for the past two years.
2. Elementary teachers in the sample schools who met the following criteria:
 - a) They were full-time elementary teachers at the time of the study.
 - b) They had been teaching in their present school for the past two years.
3. The perceptions of teachers in the sample schools of their principals' use of power strategies.

4. The perceptions of teachers in the sample schools of the organizational climates of their schools.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in designing this study:

1. Full-time elementary principals who served a school for a period of two or more years have had time to use power strategies to influence the school's organizational climate.

2. The perceptions teachers have of principals' attempts to use power affect the working and the learning climate in a school unit.

3. Teachers respond to principals' attempts to use power based upon their perceptions of such attempts.

4. Full-time elementary teachers who have worked in the same building with the same principal for a period of two or more years have knowledge of the school's organizational climate as well as the principal's leadership behaviors.

5. Teachers' responses to the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey were open and honest.

6. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire reliably and validly measured teachers' perceptions of the organizational climates of their schools.

7. The Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey validly and reliably measured teachers' perceptions of their principals' uses of power strategies.

Definitions

For this study, the following terms and their definitions are pertinent:

Power. The possession of the means (power strategies/tactics) for one person to influence the behavior and/or attitudes of another person or group.

Power strategies. Means by which a person attempts to influence the behavior and/or attitudes of another person or group. Also defined as power tactics.

Organizational climate. The "personality" of an organization that impresses others and distinguishes one organization from another. Climate in this study was limited to the social interactions among teachers and between the teachers and the principal since the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire measured these aspects of school climate.

School profile. The pattern of teacher and principal behaviors identified by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire subscales that most closely resembles one of the six prototypic climates arrayed along a continuum from open to closed.

Full-time teachers. Education professionals who work full-time in the direct instruction of students in only one school.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be investigated in the study.

1. What types of power strategies do elementary teachers perceive their principals to use in the administration of schools?

2. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the school climate profiles as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)?

3. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the openness of the schools' climates as measured by the OCDQ?

4. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the teacher behavior dimensions measured by the OCDQ?

5. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the principal dimensions measured by the OCDQ?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In 1966, the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare released Equality of Educational Opportunity popularly known as "The Coleman Report." Within this detailed report one statement in particular caught the attention of educators and the public:

Taking all these results together, one implication stands out above all: That schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context; and that this very lack of an independent effect means that the inequalities imposed on children by their home, neighborhood, and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of school. (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, and York 1966, p. 325)

For a decade federal dollars had been poured into education. The 1957 launch of Sputnik prompted the enactment of the National Defense Education Act for the development of new science, math, and foreign language curriculum. President Johnson's visions of the "Great Society" prompted the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Act in 1965 for educational materials and programs for the poor. Educators and the public were therefore stunned that per pupil expenditures, teacher qualifications, number of books in the library, and other traditional measures of quality education had not improved student

achievement. Some educators were relieved; it got them "off the hook." Others were appalled that their efforts in the schools were judged to be of so little value.

Intuitively, educators knew that schools made a difference in students' lives. Thus, during the 1970s researchers began conducting what is now known as the "effective schools" research. Numerous studies examined schools to discover what the differences were between schools in which students were achieving and schools in which students were just marking time.

Then in 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education submitted its report, A Nation at Risk, to the United States Department of Education and the nation. In it, several statements caught the attention of the public and educators:

Our Nation is at risk. . . . [T]he educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. . . . If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. (p. 5)

In response to these accusations, the educational community began to study the research that had been conducted during the less turbulent seventies in education.

Effective Schools Research

One of the first studies to seek out effective schools and examine the school factors that made a difference in students' achievement was done by Weber (1971). He studied four inner-city elementary schools which had been identified as making a difference in the reading achievement of their students. Two schools were in

Manhattan, one in Kansas City, and one in Los Angeles. The factors that were common to these schools in making a difference were strong leadership, an orderly school climate, high expectations for all students, an emphasis on reading, and assessment of student progress. Factors often thought to be related to achievement that were not present in the four schools included small class sizes, homogeneous ability grouping, outstanding teachers, ethnic background of teachers similar to students, preschool education, and optimal physical facilities.

The Office of Education for Performance Review for the State of New York (State of New York 1974) studied two inner-city schools that had been matched for pupil inputs. One was identified as a high-performing school and one as a low-performing school. Factors that influenced reading achievement were found to be within the control of the school. The positive interactions between the principal and the staff as well as the community, the attitude of the professionals that they could make a difference, and a schoolwide plan for dealing with reading problems were factors associated with the high-achieving school.

Brookover and Lezotte (1979) did an in-depth study of six Michigan schools that were improving in their students' math and reading achievement and two schools that were declining in student achievement. The leadership of the principal and the attitudes of teachers and the principal toward student achievement were two of the differences between the improving and declining schools. Improving schools emphasized basic reading and math objectives. The staffs in the improving schools believed that all students could master the basic objectives, were committed to teaching the skills identified in the

objectives, and spent more time teaching those skills. The principal in the improving schools was more likely to be an instructional leader, assertive in his instructional leadership role, a disciplinarian, and took responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of objectives.

Rutter et al. (1979) conducted a study that was extremely influential in the effective schools movement. They studied twelve inner-city secondary schools in London from 1974 to 1977 to discover if the time students spent in different schools had a significant impact on those children's development. The study investigated differences between schools in their overall style, approach, aims, and ethos to see what implications these had on students' achievement, behavior, attendance, and delinquency. Their study also sought to eliminate the influence of the characteristics of the students when they entered these schools so that the differences in outcomes would be related to what was happening in the school.

The findings showed that there were differences in schools in all output factors even when input variables and ecological influences were taken into consideration and that these differences were stable over time. The writers concluded that "to an appreciable extent children's behaviour and attitudes are shaped and influenced by their experiences at school and, in particular, by the qualities of the school as a social institution" (Rutter et al. 1979, p. 179).

Teachers were also influenced by the schools' ethos:

A cooperative and productive atmosphere in the classroom is clearly a crucial starting point for effective teaching and learning. . . . (p. 119)

Our observations suggested that it was very much easier to be a good teacher in some schools than it was in others. The overall ethos of the school seemed to provide support and a context which facilitated good teaching. (p. 139)

The main differences between schools in teacher effectiveness related to experienced teachers. In all schools inexperienced teachers were rather unsuccessful in class management. It seems that most people find a lot of difficulty in class management to begin with. However, the extent to which teachers can improve their skills appears to be dependent, in part, on the school they are working in. (p. 140)

Edmonds (1979) reviewed five studies that comprised a portion of the effective schools research. He summarized the characteristics of effective schools that were reflected in those studies:

(a) They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together; (b) Schools that are instructionally effective for poor children have a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement; (c) The school's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand; (d) Effective schools get that way partly by making it clear that pupil acquisition of basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities; (e) When necessary, school energy and resources can be diverted from other business in furtherance of the fundamental objectives; and (f) There must be some means by which pupil progress can be frequently monitored. (p. 22)

Eight case studies, a review of fifty-nine other case studies, a review of forty research and evaluation studies, and the judgments from eleven experts were included in a report published by Phi Delta Kappa (1980). In all aspects of this report the leadership of the principal was an important factor in effective schools. "Every case study singled out the principal as a critical incident that contributed to progress in student achievement" (p. 132). In twenty-one of the fifty-nine case studies reviewed, leadership was identified as an important variable in determining school success. The principal's leadership style and attitudes were the variables most frequently related to school outcomes. The forty research and evaluation studies indicated school climate was influenced by the principal's leadership.

The experts concluded that "Leaders are important because they influence the behavior of subordinates and other school participants" (p. 203).

From their review of ten effective schools studies, Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) concluded that schools and especially principals make a difference in the achievement of students. These authors suggested four themes related to effective schools that were derived from their review. Effective schools have "1) assertive, achievement-oriented leadership; 2) orderly, purposeful and peaceful school climate; 3) high expectations for staff and pupils; and 4) well-designed instructional objectives and evaluation system" (p. 180).

Four urban elementary schools were studied by Schneider (1985). Information on student achievement, family, peer group, teacher and school characteristics were analyzed. Classroom observations and teacher interviews were conducted over a two-year period. In two schools with high-achieving students, teachers expected most students to be at grade level, parents were actively involved in the school, the total student enrollment was lower, teachers had fewer years of experience, and teachers spent more time on instruction. "This study reaffirms the position that there are systematic differentials among schools that affect the academic progress of students even when controlling for background effects" (p. 355).

Six types of studies that represented the research on effective schools were examined by Squires, Huitt, and Segars (1984). The review included:

. . . (1) studies that concentrate on quantifiable input-output relationships, (2) studies that look at the correlation of safe schools, (3) studies that compare

high- and low-achieving schools, (4) a longitudinal study of urban schools succeeding above expectations, (5) studies of successfully desegregated schools, and (6) descriptions by journalists of schools with reputations for effectiveness. (p. 47)

The authors concluded:

Student success is clearly related to school climate, which is in turn, related to leadership. (p. 6)

Three areas appear important in creating a positive school climate: an academic emphasis, an orderly environment, and expectations for success. Three leadership processes that build and maintain this climate are modeling, consensus building, and feedback. (p. 46)

In summary, after a decade of spending tremendous amounts of money to develop new school facilities and instructional materials to improve the nation's math, science, and foreign language curriculums and to provide equal educational opportunities for the poor, Coleman et al. (1966) announced that the school inputs receiving the nation's attention and resources did not make a difference. Family background and socioeconomic status were what made the difference in how well students did in school. They were supported in their findings by Jencks (1972) and Hauser, Sewell, and Alwin (1976). Thus during the 1970s, researchers set out to find schools that did make a difference for students and to identify the elements of those effective schools. In 1980, Madaus, Airasian, and Kellaghan responded to Coleman's conclusions after reviewing the findings of the school effectiveness studies:

Perhaps the most striking finding of school-effectiveness studies to date is that variation in such traditional inputs as expenditure, facilities, and teacher qualifications have not been found consistently to explain much of the variance between schools in scholastic achievement as measured by students' performance on standardized tests. (p. 108)

In addition, the evidence caused them to conclude that Coleman's generalizations about schools went far beyond the findings of his study. They stated that their evidence

. . . cast serious doubt on such a pessimistic conclusion about school's effectiveness; rather, we were led to the conclusion that schools differentially affect student achievement and, further, that differences between schools in achievement can be explained by factors related to school and classroom characteristics. . . .

. . . Some schools and/or classes simply do a better job than others in helping pupils learn the syllabus material, or in preparing pupils to take the tests, or both. Further, a substantial part of these differences can be explained by differences in the academic press of the school or classroom rather than by home-background factors. Schools or classes that have strong press for academic excellence, value discipline, provide structure, emphasize homework and study, and where pupils expect--and are expected--to do well achieve at higher levels than pupils in classes that do not subscribe to these "traditional" values of teaching and learning. (Madaus, Airasian, and Kellaghan 1980, p. 174)

The school effectiveness studies, however, did not have any real impact until after 1983 when national reports began to appear criticizing schools. Those who synthesized the effective schools research found that two factors consistently differentiated effective and ineffective schools: the organizational climate of the school and the leadership of the principal.

Organizational Climate and Leadership

Writers in the area of organizational behavior began to recognize the importance of climate in the 1950s. Argyris (1958) suggested that the climate of an organization was a "living complexity" (p. 502) and that conceptualizing the complex, multilevel, mutually interacting variables was a problem in the study of organizations. Litwin's (1968) research was based on the assumptions that all organizational climates were

. . . (1) composed of elements representing many levels of analysis, (2) whose origin can be traced to simple beginnings, (3) whose predisposition is toward stability rather than change, and (4) whose pattern of variables is assumed to be the "best" or "natural" one for that particular organization under the conditions in which it exists. (p. 520)

Tagiuri (1968) suggested that in order to understand the behavior of individuals in organizations, it was important to consider the concept of climate. He reviewed definitions of organizational climate. From these he proposed the following definition:

Organizational climate is a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization. (p. 27)

The importance of the perceptions of members of the organization was emphasized by Joyce and Slocum (1979) in their definition:

"[C]limate can be defined as a summary perception of the organizational environment. These perceptions are, theoretically, non-evaluative and multidimensional" (p. 318).

Litwin (1968) described a study designed to examine the relationship of leadership style to organizational climate, the effects of organizational climate on individual motivation, and to identify the effects of organizational climate on satisfaction and performance. Three business organizations were experimentally created that included fifteen members and a president who was to maintain a particular leadership style (power-related, affiliative, or achieving). All other factors were controlled such as location, tasks, and technology. Group members were also matched with respect to age, sex, background, motive patterns, and personality characteristics. The experiment took place over a two-week period of eight six-hour working days. The

climate dimensions of structure, responsibility, reward and punishment, warmth and support, cooperation and conflict, and risk and involvement were measured for each of the three groups each week. Participants wrote several paragraphs on the second, fifth, and seventh days of the experiment. These were scored to measure the motivations of achievement, affiliation, and power. Satisfaction was measured three times during the experimental period. Group performance was also evaluated. Conclusions derived from the findings of this study have relevance to leaders as they strive to develop appropriate climates in their organizations:

- (1) A major conclusion of this experimental study is that distinct organizational climates can be created by varying leadership style. Such climates can be created in a short period of time, and their characteristics are quite stable.
- (2) Once created, these climates seem to have significant, often dramatic, effects on motivation, and correspondingly on performance and job satisfaction. Each of the three experimentally induced climates aroused a different motivational pattern.
- (3) Organizational climates may effect changes in seemingly stable personality traits. This conclusion is somewhat tentative. Motive strength, as measured by a standardized thematic apperceptive instrument, was not significantly affected, but certain personality dispositions, measured through a standardized empirically validated personality test, were affected by the climate.
- (4) These findings suggest that organizational climate is an important variable in the study of human organizations. The climate concept should aid, first, in understanding the impact of organizations on the person and the personality. If significant changes in relatively stable personality factors can be created in less than two weeks, then we can imagine how living in a given climate for a period of years could dramatically affect many aspects of personal functioning, capacity for productive effort, commitment to long-term relationships (such as friendships and marriage), etc. An understanding of climate will aid in the study of the management process, particularly with regard to the effects different styles of management have on people, on organizational performance, and on organizational health. (Litwin 1968, pp. 189-90)

Meyer (1968) was interested in learning how climate as it was influenced by the manager's leadership style affected the motivation of employees.

It is natural to think of motivation as a quality of the individual. People have different needs, seek different goals; some are ambitious, others lazy. Yet we know that individual differences do not account for all the variance in motivation. Situational or environmental variables also have an important influence on the motivation of individuals. Few managers are fully aware of the effects that their own actions and leadership "style" have on the general working atmosphere and on the motivation of members of the organization. (p. 151)

He collected descriptive material from twenty-five General Electric employees. These descriptions were analyzed and sorted into categories based on dimensions from theory and research on organizational climate. A fifty-item questionnaire was administered to 350 employees in two General Electric plants which had similar operations. The dimensions of climate that were measured included constraining conformity; responsibility; standards; reward; organizational clarity; and friendly, team spirit. One plant had a "Theory Y" manager, one who was supportive and facilitating since people were assumed to be basically self-motivated (McGregor 1960). The other had a manager who was more a "Theory X" manager, one who was directive, controlling, and supervised employees closely since people were assumed to be unreliable, irresponsible, and immature (McGregor 1960). It was concluded that differences in the climates of the two plants could be attributed to the way the manager operated.

. . . [B]y far the most important influence on climate which has been uncovered to date is the manager's style. . . . The manager administers the reward system, assigns responsibility, sets goals, provides structure. He can do these things in such a way as to stimulate an achievement or success orientation, or he can just as easily, and perhaps unknowingly,

cultivate a fear of failure orientation in the members of the organization, with its accompanying conservatism, avoidance of responsibility, and generally inhibited performance. (Meyer 1968, pp. 162-63)

Deal and Kennedy (1982) argued that culture had a powerful influence throughout an organization whether the culture was weak or strong.

. . . It affects practically everything--from who gets promoted and what decisions are made, to how employees dress and what sports they play. . . . Culture ties people together and gives meaning and purpose to their day-to-day lives. (pp. 4-5)

Elements that created a strong culture included the business environment in which the organization operated, the system of values that was shared by those within the organization, people within the organization that provided visible role models, systematic routines that showed employees the kinds of behavior that were expected of them, and the informal communication network within the organization. They believed that managers had to analyze the culture of their organizations, then work to develop a strong culture. They noted that ". . . the most successful managers we know are precisely those who strive to make a mark through creating a guiding vision, shaping shared values, and otherwise providing leadership for the people with whom they work" (p. 18).

In the early sixties, Halpin and Croft (1963) conducted research to identify the elements of school climate that accounted for the differences between schools. Their objective was to develop an instrument that would assist those interested in improving schools by identifying the important aspects of the school climate. School climate was defined as the organizational personality of the school. These researchers recognized that many factors such as the socioeconomic

background of students, the school's physical plant, the educational policies of the school district as well as others could account for differences in the climate of schools. However, they considered the social interactions among teachers and between teachers and the principal to be most important. Thus, they limited their study to these interactions assuming the other factors would be measured indirectly since they determined to some extent the interactions between the teachers and the principal.

Halpin and Croft (1963) analyzed responses of teachers and principals from seventy-one elementary schools describing the climate of their school. They identified eight dimensions that characterized the different schools. Four were related to characteristics of the faculty as a group and four were related to the characteristics of the principal as a leader. Faculty behaviors included Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, and Intimacy. The principal behaviors included Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

Using the eight dimensions, Halpin and Croft (1963) constructed a profile for each of the seventy-one schools. They found that the schools could be arrayed along a continuum from open to closed and that the schools could be categorized into six prototypic climate profiles. The prototypic profiles from most open to most closed included Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal, and Closed. The six profiles described the organizational climate of the schools.

Halpin and Croft (1963) had set out to objectively describe schools. They had not intended to evaluate the quality of the various climates. "Yet the more we worked with the findings, the more did judgments about the climates force themselves upon our attention.

The difference in the quality of different Climates became too vivid and too compelling to be ignored" (p. 6). In their attempts to describe the climates, it became clear to them that the most desirable was the Open Climate.

The profile for the Open Climate scores high on the subtests of Esprit and Thrust and low on Disengagement. These scores describe an energetic, lively organization which is moving toward its goals, but which is also providing satisfaction for the individuals' social needs. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately as they are required. The group is not preoccupied exclusively with either task-achievement or social-needs satisfaction; satisfaction on both counts seems to be obtained easily and almost effortlessly. Contrariwise, the Closed Climate is marked by low scores on Esprit and Thrust, and by a high score on Disengagement. There seems to be "nothing going on" in this organization. Although some attempts are being made to move the organization, they are met with apathy; they are not taken seriously by the group members. In short, "morale" is low, and the organization seems to be stagnant. (Halpin and Croft 1963, p. 74)

A number of studies have been conducted using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) to determine relationships between the organizational climates of schools, school characteristics, and demographic and behavioral characteristics of the principal and/or the teachers. Teachers tended to perceive the climates of schools to be more closed than principals (Brewer 1980; Petasis 1974; Sisson 1979; Tirpak 1970). Elementary schools with relatively open climates were found to be more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than elementary schools with relatively closed climates (Appleberry and Hoy 1969). The climate of elementary schools was not related to either staff size (Petasis 1974) or the size of the school (Brewer 1980; Lake 1977; Powell 1976). School characteristics of student membership (Lake 1977; Sisson 1979) and average daily attendance (Lake 1977; Powell 1976; Sisson 1979) also had no relationship to a school's organizational climate.

Researchers have generally found that many characteristics of the school principal were not related to the school's climate. Age of the school principal (Franklin 1968; Lake 1977; Manning 1973; Petasis 1974; Powell 1976; Tirpak 1970), number of years experience in present school (Franklin 1968; Manning 1973; Powell 1976), number of years in administration (Franklin 1968; Manning 1973; Petasis 1974; Sisson 1979), number of years in education (Manning 1973; Sisson 1979), and number of years of formal education (Lake 1977; Manning 1973; Powell 1976; Tirpak 1970) were not related to the organizational climate of schools. Both Franklin (1968) and Kobayashi (1974) found no differences between the organizational climates of schools with male principals and those with female principals. However, Kobayashi (1974) did find differences between female and male principals on the leader behavior dimensions of Thrust, Production Emphasis, and Aloofness on the OCDQ. Females principals were found to be more task oriented than male principals. Tirpak (1970) found that the school principal's intelligence and personality traits were related to the school's organizational climate.

Halpin and Croft (1963) in their development of the OCDQ recognized the importance of the behavior of the school principal on the school climate.

In interpreting the prototypic profiles, we have emphasized the impact of the behavior of the principal upon the climate which obtains in his school. There is no gainsaying the fact that such influence does operate and that it must be taken into account when we seek to understand the Organizational Climate of a particular school. (p. 86)

Researchers using the OCDQ have found aspects of the principal's leadership behavior related to the organizational climate of the school. Principals of schools with a more open climate were perceived by teachers to be more considerate and higher in initiating structure (Craig 1979), more satisfactory communicators (Dugan 1967), and exhibited more congruence between their verbal and nonverbal behavior (Woodward 1974) than principals in more closed climates. Brewer (1980) found a significant relationship between principals' "real" behavior on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the school climate as perceived by teachers, principals, and superintendents.

Parker (1974) and Craig (1979) found that teachers in schools with Open climates, as measured by the OCDQ, were more satisfied with their jobs than teachers in schools with Closed climates. Teaching experience (Lake 1977; Powell 1976; Sisson 1979), teachers' length of tenure in present school (Powell 1976; Sisson 1979), and number of years at present grade level (Powell 1976; Sisson 1979) were not related to the school's organizational climate. Powell (1976) found that there was no relationship between teachers' sex and school climate. Further, Petasis (1974), Lake (1977), and Powell (1976) found no relationship between the teachers' age and the organizational climate of the school. In contrast, Manning (1973) found that teachers with more years of experience taught in schools with a more open climate. In addition, Parker (1974) and Craig (1979) found that older teachers taught in schools with more open climates.

Wilson (1980) found that the subtests of Esprit and Intimacy measured on the OCDQ had a positive effect on the principal's perception of the teachers' effectiveness. Wilson also found that

principals who were perceived to be aloof by their teachers perceived their teachers to be less effective.

Fox, Boies, Brainard, Fletcher, Huges, Martin, Maynard, Monasmith, Olivero, Schmuck, Shaheen, and Stegeman (1974) suggested the schools created by the reforms of the 1960s were not the ones educators had envisioned. The problems schools continued to experience were believed to be symptoms of inadequate attention to developing satisfying and productive school climates. Factors which were suggested to comprise a school's climate and determine its quality resulted from an interaction of the school's programs, processes, and physical conditions. These factors included:

1. Respect. Students should see themselves as persons of worth, believing that they have ideas, and that those ideas are listened to and make a difference. Teachers and administrators should feel the same way. School should be a place where there are self-respecting individuals. Respect is also due to others. In a positive climate there are not put-downs.
2. Trust. Trust is reflected in one's confidence that others can be counted on to behave in a way that is honest. They will do what they say they will do. There is also an element of believing others will not let you down.
3. High Morale. People with high morale feel good about what is happening.
4. Opportunities for Input. Not all persons can be involved in making the important decisions. Not always can each person be as influential as he might like to be on the many aspects of the school's programs and processes that affect him. But every person cherishes the opportunity to contribute his or her ideas, and know they have been considered. A feeling of a lack of voice is counter-productive to self-esteem and deprives the school of that person's resources.
5. Continuous Academic and Social Growth. Each student needs to develop additional academic, social, and physical skills, knowledge, and attitudes. . . .
6. Cohesiveness. This quality is measured by the person's feeling toward the school. Members should feel a part of the school. They want to stay with it and have a chance to exert their influence on it in collaboration with others.
7. School Renewal. The school as an institution should develop improvement projects. It should be self-renewing in

that it is growing, developing, and changing rather than following routines, repeating previously accepted procedures, and striving for conformity. If there is renewal, difference is seen as interesting, to be cherished. Diversity and pluralism are valued. New conditions are faced with poise. Adjustments are worked out as needed. The "new" is not seen as threatening, but as something to be examined, weighed, and its value or relevance determined. The school should be able to organize improvement projects rapidly and efficiently, with an absence of stress and conflict.

8. Caring. Every individual in the school should feel that some other person or persons are concerned about him as a human being. Each knows it will make a difference to someone else if he is happy or sad, healthy or ill. (Fox et al. 1974, pp. 7-9)

Fox et al. (1974) believed that the school principal was "first and foremost a climate leader and his key function is improvement of the school's climate or learning environment" (pp. 23-24). The CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile (Charles F. Kettering Limited, a Denver-based philanthropic foundation) was presented by this group of authors to assess a school's climate.

A modified version of the CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile was used by Sellars (1984) to measure school climate and the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description-Self (LEAD-Self) and LEAD-Other to measure leadership style in a study designed to examine the relationship between school climate and the leadership style of school principals in one district in Oklahoma. Sellars found that principals and teachers perceived the principal's leadership and school climate differently. Principals perceived both their own leadership and the school's climate more positively than did the teachers in those schools. He found that the more adaptable a principal was in his or her leadership style the more positive the school climate.

Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979) examined the relationships between social system variables and school

outcomes in public elementary schools in Michigan. The researchers studied the impact of the school climate, the school social organization, the student body composition, and the teachers' characteristics on student achievement, student self-concept of ability, and student self-reliance. They concluded that the school climate variables explained more of the differences between schools in student achievement, academic self-concept, and self-reliance than either student body composition or school social organization variables. In addition, teacher inputs such as salary and experience contributed little or nothing to the differences between schools.

In Brookover et al.'s (1979) study, school climate was defined "as the composite of norms, expectations, and beliefs which characterize the school social system as perceived by members of the social system" (p. 19). These authors maintained that "Favorable climate is, we believe, a necessary condition for high achievement" (p. 80).

Coleman (1983) conducted research comparing the school climate as perceived by parents and teachers. This researcher used Brookover et al.'s (1979) definition in a two-year project to improve the climate of nine elementary schools in British Columbia. Four principles that emerged from the effective schools research were used in the project:

1. Schools should be responsive to their clients' preferences;
2. Precise descriptions of complex realities like schools require multiple measures using a process of convergent validation;
3. Principal leadership is a critical factor in effective schools; and
4. Efforts to change schools need to be school-based and school specific. (Coleman 1983, p. 1)

The study found that parents and teachers have different preferences for the school's climate. The study found that the factors

of the tenure of the principal in the school, school size, philosophical differences between staff members, community reaction to shifts in policy, and the influences of school history were related to the school's climate. Based on factor analysis of the parent survey the role of the principal related to activities and style accounted for 60 percent of the variance in the school's climate. The teacher survey revealed that 40 percent of the variance in school climate was accounted for by the role of the principal related to teacher-principal collegiality. Coleman (1983) concluded: ". . . [T]he principal is critical to school quality, for both parents and teachers" (p. 4).

Keefe, Kelley, and Miller (1985) emphasized the importance of climate in making schools effective:

The environment of a school or classroom has a profound effect on the satisfaction and achievement of students. Schools with positive climates are places where people respect, trust, and help one another; and where the school projects a "feeling" that fosters both caring and learning. In the best of these schools, people exhibit a strong sense of pride, ownership, and personal productivity that comes from helping to make the school a better place. (p. 70)

These writers suggested that assessing a school's environment is essential for school improvement. They presented a model that would assist school personnel in evaluating a school's climate. Climate was defined as "the relatively enduring pattern of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members" (p. 74). In their model, school climate was influenced by goals and objectives of the school, the organizational characteristics of the school, and the characteristics of the groups and individuals in the building. These, in turn, were influenced by the school district and community environment as well as the societal environment. The two outcome

variables in the model were the degree of student satisfaction with environment and the degree of productivity in achieving intended and unintended cognitive, affective, and psychomotor goals.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (1984) included school climate and leadership as important factors in quality schools. School climate was defined "as those qualities of a school that affect the attitudes, behavior, and achievement of the people involved in its operation--students, staff, parents, and members of the community" (p. 18). Indicators of a quality school climate included caring, respect, trust, morale, social development, and academic development. The Association stressed that "The principal is the one individual who is directly involved in every aspect of the school's operation, and therefore is the primary figure in determining the school's quality and character" (p. 7). Principals in quality elementary schools were described as persons who inspired others; conveyed high expectations; placed high priority on instructional leadership; promoted professional development; were good organizers; and encouraged leadership among teachers, staff, students, and parents.

In summary, the research and literature indicated that organizational climate was an important concept in determining the effectiveness of schools. The climate of an organization had a significant effect on the satisfaction and behavior of those in the organization. In addition, the climate was primarily influenced by the behavior of the leader. Eicholtz (1984) commented:

School climate is the key to excellence and effectiveness in our schools, regardless of the socioeconomic or ethnic composition of the student bodies. Education research emphasizes the prime importance of the school climate, and those groups charged with the responsibility of identifying

the characteristics of effective schools generally place it at the top of their lists.

. . . Research confirms that, through management style and management skills, the principal serves as the instructional leader, the motivator, and the molder of school climate. (p. 22)

Power and Leadership

Power has been recognized as an important aspect of leadership. The use of power has been considered crucial (Herlihy and Herlihy 1985) and necessary (Cuming 1981) to the exercise of leadership. Cartwright (1959) asserted that leadership could not "be adequately understood without the concept of power" (p. 3) and Cunningham (1985) defined leadership as "the exercise of influence" (p. 17). After reviewing the literature on leadership Rost (1982) concluded:

1. Leadership is a form of power. . . .
2. Leadership involves using influence to achieve goals. . . .
3. Leadership means having goals, purposes, and values as well as the motivation to mobilize resources to get them. . . .
4. Leadership demands that the motives and purposes of both the leader and the followers be realized. . . .
5. Leadership involves some competition and conflict over who is going to lead and what will be done once the leader is established. . . . (pp. 22-23)

Though power and leadership have been acknowledged to be inseparable concepts, power has received little attention in the research and literature on organizational theory (Allen, Madison, Porter, Renwick, and Mayes 1979) and particularly in the research and literature related to school administration (Bridges 1982). The absence of power from the literature can be attributed in part to the negative connotations associated with the use of power (McClelland 1971; Pfeffer 1981). In general, Americans have been very uncomfortable with power. Those who have sought power have been distrusted and

thought to be manipulative. Those who have used power often have felt guilty (Kotter 1977).

McClelland (1971) believed there were two faces of power: the negative authoritarian power that Americans feared and a positive, caring power that assisted groups in accomplishing goals. The positive face of power was characterized by a concern for finding what goals would move a group, for helping the group to formulate their goals, for taking some initiative in providing members of the group with the means of achieving such goals, and for giving group members the feeling of strength and competence they needed to work hard for their goals (p. 148). It was this kind of positive power that Maccoby (1983) attributed to the six leaders he described. He characterized the leaders of the 1980s as persons who shared power with subordinates and in return created more power for themselves. He stated, "People only trust leaders who articulate a moral code, who care about people and are competent in the exercise of power" (p. 223).

The absence of the concept of power from the literature and research has also been attributed to the difficulty in defining the term. Power has been said to be a complex, confusing, often elusive concept. Dahl (1957) commented:

. . . we are not likely to produce--certainly not for some considerable time to come--anything like a single, consistent, coherent "Theory of Power." We are much more likely to produce a variety of theories of limited scope, each of which employs some definition of power that is useful in the context of the particular piece of research or theory but different in important respects from the definitions of other studies. Thus we may never get through the swamp. But it looks as if we might someday get around it. (p. 202)

Definitions of power have focused on power as potential action or actual action, as one person having an effect on another or a reciprocal process between individuals or groups, and in terms of an individual's or group's role in an organization.

A number of writers have focused on the potential of power. Wrong (1979) defined power as "the capacity of some persons to produce intended and foreseen effects on others" (p. 21). Kanter (1983) defined power as "the capacity to mobilize people and resources to get things done" (p. 213). McCall (1979) defined power as "the ability to get things done the way one wants them to be done, the ability of individuals or units to influence other individuals or units, or the ability to affect processes such as resource allocation or decision making" (p. 204).

Hall (1982) disagreed with those who defined power as potential. He pointed out that power is a relational concept and was meaningless if not exercised (p. 131). Zander, Cohen, and Stotland (1959) carried their definition of power one step further. Not only was power a relational concept, the relationship was a reciprocal one:

. . . the ability of P to influence O or to determine O's fate indirectly, as P perceives the situation. Person P may also feel that O has some power over him. Thus the resultant amount of power that P attributes to himself in relations with O is the degree to which he believes he can successfully influence O, less the amount he believes O can influence him. (p. 17)

Kadushin (1968) suggested that perhaps there can be no single definition because of the dispositional nature of power (p. 697).

Understanding the concept of power has also been confused by the number of terms that either have been used interchangeably for power or have been defined separately. Such terms included influence,

authority, and control.

Simon (1948) defined authority as "the rightful use of power to create the means of coordination of action" (p. 6). Grant (1981) used this definition to explain three aspects of authority that shaped the character of schools. These aspects of authority were thought of as three concentric circles. The inner circle included the adults who gave commands and had responsibility for the school's functioning. The second circle included the ethnic and social-class mix of students. The outer circle included external policies or constraints that established the context within which schools functioned (pp. 138-39).

Muth (1984) made a distinction among power, control, authority, and influence. Power was defined "as the ability of an actor to affect the behavior of another actor" (p. 27). Control was the result of an act of power. Thus, power was potential and control was the actual use of power. Muth visualized power as a continuum from coercion to authority to influence. Coercion was the "ability of an actor to affect another's behavior, regardless of the other's wishes" (p. 29). This situation was described as asymmetrical since the wielder of power would have greater resources and be able to enforce his or her demands. Authority was the "legitimation of an actor's ability to affect another's behavior" (p. 31). This situation was described as a mutually acceptable relationship between the two actors. Influence was "the ability of an actor, without recourse to force or legitimation, to affect another's behavior" (p. 31). In this situation the actor would be dependent on the other's ability or desire to comply with the actor's wishes. Kadushin's (1968) notion of influence parallels Muth's definition of influence. He believed that influence

implied informality and that the power wielder took into account the wishes of the other person. Pfeffer's (1981) differentiation between power and politics was very similar to Muth's differentiation between power and control. Pfeffer explained, "Power is a property of the system at rest; politics is the study of power in action" (p. 7).

A number of writers have attempted to identify the conditions that must be present before power was used. Pfeffer (1981) suggested that there were five conditions necessary for the use of power. The presence of the first three conditions--interdependence, inconsistent goals and/or beliefs about technology, and scarcity of resources--would produce conflict. Then the importance of the decision and the dispersion of power would determine the use of power.

Given conflicting and heterogeneous preferences and goals and beliefs about the relationship between actions and consequences, interdependence among the actors who possess conflicting preferences and beliefs, and a condition of scarcity so that not all participants can get their way, power is virtually the only way (except, perhaps, to use chance) to resolve the decision. There is no rational way to determine whose preferences are to prevail, or whose beliefs about technology should guide the decision. There may be norms, social customs, or traditions which dictate the choice, but these may be all efforts to legitimate the use of power to make its appearance less obtrusive. In situations of conflict, power is the mechanism, the currency by which the conflict gets resolved. Social power almost inevitably accompanies conditions of conflict, for power is the way by which such conflicts become resolved. (p. 70)

Kadushin (1968) proposed that power could only be defined through the use of reduction sentences that specified the conditions under which power was used. He identified six elements of power. The first three had to do with the act of power and the second set of three dealt with the social setting in which power was used.

1. Who is said to have power--individual persons, roles, or statuses, or collectivities.
 2. What is being manipulated--the acts of particular people . . . the utilities of people . . . or the general course of events . . .
 3. To whom does power have consequences--the self, other people, or other roles, or other collectivities . . .
 4. When or whether power is an ability or potential ability to have an effect or represents an actual effect.
 5. Where--the sectors, arenas and institutional areas for which particular units can have or do have certain consequences . . .
 6. Under what conditions--the institutional, organizational and moral constraints on the use of power. . . .
- (pp. 686-87)

Kadushin suggested that the study of power was best served through the study of social circles--their structure, function, and development. Thus, decisions were not made based upon the pressure of one individual but the pressure brought to bear by an entire social circle.

For Dahl (1957) power was an actual act as well as a relation between people: "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something he would not otherwise do" (pp. 202-03). Properties of this power relation included a time lag between the actions of the power wielder and the responses of the power receiver, a connection between the actor and the receiver, and a successful attempt to get the receiver to do what the actor desired.

McCall (1979) suggested that power was "a function of being in the right place, at the right time, with the right resources, and doing the right thing" (p. 189). Thus power involved both possession and the ability to use what was possessed (p. 186). Elements of the power situation included the consideration of people or units who

1. are in a position to deal with important problems facing the organization;
2. have control over significant resources valued by others;
3. are lucky or skilled enough to bring problems and resources together at the same time;

4. are centrally connected in the work flow of the organization;
 5. are not easily replaced or substituted for; and
 6. have successfully used their power in the past.
- (p. 194)

Two sources of power available to those who have attempted to alter behavior or attitudes of others in organizations were the power derived from one's position or from one's person. The importance of position power in an organization was argued by Cartwright (1959) when he stated that "the power of one person to influence another depends upon the role he occupies" (p. 5). Cartwright also pointed out the reciprocal aspect of position power--"The authority of a position must be sanctioned by others if it is to possess power" (p. 5). One's position in an organization was identified as critical because it contributed to the kinds of problems one was confronted with as well as control over resources, high visibility, prestige and status (McCall 1979). Yukl (1982) suggested that school principals could use their position power to "accrue obligations and support by dispensing rewards and assistance to subordinates--particularly when these benefits exceed the amount normally received by teachers" (p. 3). In contrast, Yukl (1982) suggested principals could increase their personal power over teachers by "supporting them in conflicts with parents and administrators, looking out for their welfare, and being considerate and helpful. Power research in schools indicates that influence based on personal power is associated with greater loyalty, satisfaction, and commitment on the part of teachers" (p. 3).

Hagberg (1984) provided a model of personal power in organizations. She described personal power as a continuum from very little personal power to a great deal of personal power. Along this

continuum were six stages and people developed and matured through these stages. Hagberg believed that leaders at each stage provided direction for their organizations in different ways. Furthermore, people at the different stages within the organization needed to be motivated and managed in different ways.

"Stage One persons are powerless. They manipulate. They are secure and dependent, low in self-esteem, uninformed and helpless . . ." (p. 251). The security felt by Stage One persons was related to their comfort within the rules and regulations of the organization. Hagberg asserted that Stage One leaders lead by domination and force (p. 168). Stage One employees needed structure and limits, concrete rewards, and encouragement and support (pp. 182-83).

"Stage Two persons see power by association. They emulate their superiors, believing them to have some kind of magic. While learning the ropes in their organization, they are dependent on their supervisor . . ." (p. 251). Stage Two leaders were reported to lead by seduction and making deals (p. 168). Employees at Stage Two needed to be given information and experience, be allowed to learn from their mistakes, be encouraged to take responsibility for their work and to model others (pp. 182-83).

"Stage Three persons interpret symbols as signs of power. They strive for control. They are egocentric, realistic and competitive, expert, ambitious, and often charismatic . . ." (p. 251). Leaders in Stage Three used personal persuasion to inspire a winning attitude in followers (p. 168). Employees at Stage Three needed to be taught the culture and norms of the organization, given feedback, rewarded and challenged in their thinking (p. 184).

"Stage Four persons come to understand power through intense self-reflection. They have genuine influence. They are competent, strong, comfortable with their personal style, skilled at mentoring, and they show true leadership . . ." (p. 251). Stage Four leaders modeled integrity and trust (p. 168). Stage Four employees needed encouragement to be self-directing, to expand their views and interests, and to be educated in mentoring and counseling (pp. 184-86).

"Stage Five persons experience power because they are confident of a life purpose beyond themselves. They have vision. They are self-accepting, calm, humble, and generous in empowering others . . ." (p. 251). Empowering others and service to others were ways in which Stage Five leaders envisioned their role (p. 168). Employees at Stage Five needed to be protected from others in the organization, be consulted on major issues, and allowed to operate freely (p. 187).

"Stage Six persons see the whole picture. They are wise. They are comfortable with paradox, unafraid of death, quiet in service, ethical, and powerless. They see and feel things on the universal plane . . ." (p. 251). A Stage Six person was exemplified by Mohandas Gandhi who among other things did not view himself as powerful within the universe. Hagberg (1984) suggested that there were very few Stage Six leaders since people in Stage Six did not aspire to leadership of any kind. The way these people lead would be through their wisdom and insight into issues of mankind. These leaders have tended to lead through their art, writing, music, or visions (p. 166). It was recommended that employees at Stage Six should not be managed at all but managers should try to keep them in their organization if at all possible (p. 188).

French and Raven (1959) suggested the goal of power was to change either the behaviors, attitudes, goals, needs, or values of subordinates. Power also depended on the perceptions of subordinates that the leader had the potential to carry out an act of power. These writers classified five sources of power that have been used extensively in the research on power. Reward power referred to a leader's ability to issue rewards for desired changes in others. Coercive power was derived from a leader's ability to issue punishments for failure to change to the expectations of the leader. Legitimate power was based on the internalized values of subordinates that the leader had the right to make certain requests. Reward power, coercive power, and legitimate power were associated with one's position in the organization. Referent power was based on the identification of followers with their leader and how well liked the leader was by followers. Expert power was established when followers believed their leader to be knowledgeable and competent. Referent power and expert power were related to one's personal power.

Sashkin and Morris (1984) believed that the ultimate source of power was derived from the use of sanctions (rewards and punishments). The three primary forms of power were legitimate or position power, referent or personal power, and expert or proficiency power. The power of one's position came from the power to reward or punish others in the organization for complying with requests. The rewards for compliance that were based on referent power had to do with the fulfillment of psychological needs. Providing or withholding expert assistance were viewed as the rewards and punishments related to proficiency power.

Power is the ability to influence people to do as we want them to. People are influenced to behave as we wish for many reasons but these all come down to one primary factor: sanctions--rewards and punishments. In discussing the various sanctions managers use in organizations, we should keep in mind the fact that there are a great many different rewards and punishments, but few are terribly important--in that category would be pay raises, promotions, or dismissal. There are many small rewards and punishments, such as a word of public praise, a special job assignment, hearing a bit of inside news early, having to work overtime or being assigned a job one does not like. Too many managers operate in a "power-improvished" manner, not realizing the many small rewards and punishments that are available in any organization. (Sashkin and Morris 1984, p. 298)

Gioia and Sims (1983) used French and Raven's power bases to explore how managers' positive reward, punitive, and goal-setting behaviors as well as their performance reputation for effectiveness influenced the perceptions of subordinates. It was found that both the behavior and the reputation of the manager influenced subordinates' perceptions of the manager's power. Managers' reward and punitive behavior were related to perceptions of reward and coercive power. In addition, increased use of punitive behavior was perceived by subordinates to indicate more legitimate power and less referent power. Increased task-oriented behaviors by managers were related to increased perceptions of coercive power and referent power. Goal-setting behavior did not convey a power message to subordinates. The reputation of the manager was related to perceptions of legitimate, expert, and referent power. The authors suggested that a basic implication of their study was that

A manager might hold actual power (by virtue of control of resources, for example), or he might simply be perceived as holding power (when in fact he does not). In the latter case, when one organization member attributes power to another, it creates power in a defacto sense. The overt effects of actual vs. perceived power are indistinguishable. Influence can occur so long as power is perceived by others. (p. 22)

Using French and Raven's five power bases Warren (1968) conducted research to determine the kind of conformity (behavioral or attitudinal) each power base was effective in producing. The research also investigated whether the power base was effective in bringing about conformity under conditions of high or low visibility. Data were collected from 534 teachers and the principals in eighteen elementary schools. The findings supported the researcher's hypotheses that Coercive and Reward power required high visibility and brought about behavioral conformity. Referent power was most effective in bringing about attitudinal conformity and was associated with low visibility. Expert and Legitimate power were also significantly correlated with attitudinal conformity. Expert power was frequently found under conditions of low visibility, and Legitimate power was found about equally under low and high visibility conditions. In addition, there was a general increase in conformity with the number of power bases used by the principal.

In a study conducted by Guditus and Zirkel (1979-80), 683 teachers ranked French and Raven's power bases according to the reasons they would comply with their principals' requests. Legitimate power was the most influential followed by Expert, Referent, Reward, and Coercive. Expert and Referent power were associated with teachers' satisfaction with their principals' role performance while Coercive and Reward power were associated with teacher dissatisfaction with the principals' performance. Guditus and Zirkel concluded that "The influence of principals depends to a considerable degree on their possession of special knowledge and skills which enable them to help teachers achieve their goals" (p. 3).

Herlihy and Herlihy (1985) suggested that principals maximize their use of expert and referent power in order to be effective leaders. They pointed out that teachers also possessed the same power bases and that power struggles would result if principals did not share power with teachers.

Though French and Raven's power base typology has been used most frequently in the research on power, other researchers have investigated other classifications of uses of power. Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) sought to identify the power tactics used by people at work. Participants were asked to describe an incident in which they were successful at getting someone else to do something they wanted and what they did to influence that person. Eight power tactics were identified: Ingratiation, Rationality, Assertiveness, Sanctions, Exchange, Upward Appeal, Blocking, and Coalitions. All were found to be dimensions of influence in attempts to influence subordinates, co-workers, and superiors except for Blocking. Blocking emerged as an influence tactic only when directed toward superiors. Goals that were sought by one person from another included assistance with one's own job, getting others to do their own jobs, obtaining personal benefits from others, initiating change in the organization, and improving others' job performance. The influence tactics used were found to vary with the goal sought from the target person, with the status of the target person, and the amount of resistance from the target person.

Allen et al. (1979) asked managers in thirty organizations in the electronics industry the political tactics used in their organizations. Organizational politics was defined as "intentional acts of influence to enhance or protect the self-interest of

individuals or groups" (p. 77). The eight tactics mentioned most frequently were attacking and blaming others, use of information, image building, building a base of support, ingratiation, coalitions, associating with the influential, and reciprocity. The authors believed that politics was an important social influence process that had the potential of being functional or dysfunctional to organizations and individuals.

Fairholm and Fairholm (1984) asked sixty secondary principals, assistant principals, and supervisors how frequently they used sixteen power tactics: ritualism, organizational structure, manipulation of resources, use of rewards, legitimatization, use of language and symbols, use of ambiguity, control over agenda preparation, use of objective criteria, use of outside experts, formation of coalitions, cooptation of opposition, personality, public relations, proactivity, and brinkmanship. The most often used power tactics were personality (respect others have for one's character), public relations (building a favorable image among colleagues), and agenda preparation (determining the issues for group decision making). Women were found to use organizational structure (place those amenable to one's views in strategic positions or isolate potential opponents) most often. Males found personality to be the most effective power tactic while women found cooptation effective. The authors concluded that "administrators do not always use those tactics that they recognize as being most effective" (p. 75).

In summary, writers and researchers have recognized the existence of power in organizations. However, there has been little agreement about how power should be defined. The difficulty in

defining power combined with the negative connotations associated with power have resulted in little research related to power and more intuitive speculation about power, its uses, and consequences.

Wiggington (1986) provided the following perspective about the ways principals use power from a "teacher's-eye" view:

Some know how to apply it positively. Some manipulate us with it and make us like it. Some manipulate us with it and make us hate it. Some destroy our confidence with it. Others never actively use it at all, hiding in their offices all day doing who knows what. (p. 31)

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify the power strategies used by elementary principals in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota and to examine the relationships between the power strategies and the organizational climate of the schools in which they worked. Both school climate and principals' power strategies were measured from the perspective of teachers in the schools. In the review of the literature, it was found that the teaching and learning climate was an important factor in effective schools. In addition, the principal was identified as the key individual in developing a school's climate. However, current social trends have restricted the power of principals to influence a school's program and practices.

Population Studied

Elementary schools in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota were invited to participate in the study. The teachers in these schools who had direct instructional contact with students on a full-time basis were assumed to have knowledge of the learning climate within their schools. In addition, if the teacher had worked in the school with the same principal for two or more years, he or she was assumed to have knowledge of that principal's use of power strategies in attempting to influence teachers. Thus, elementary teachers who had

experience in the same school with the same principal for a period of two years or more were chosen for participation in the study.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction provided a list of 140 full-time principals who had served in the same school district for two or more years prior to the 1985-86 school year. Those principals who served high schools, junior high schools, or middle schools were eliminated from the list. In addition, elementary principals who served in more than one school during the 1984-85 school year, who were in a different school during 1984-85 than in 1983-84, or who were known to have retired at the end of the 1984-85 school year were eliminated from the list. The final list yielded fifty-two elementary principals in North Dakota who had served full-time in the same school for two or more years previous to 1985-86.

The Minnesota Department of Education provided a list of 132 full-time elementary principals in Economic Development Regions Numbers 1, 2, 4, and 5. These regions, established by the state of Minnesota, occupy the northwestern part of the state. Principals who served more than one school, who were in a different school during the 1984-85 school year than during the 1983-84 school year, or who were known not to be serving the school during the 1985-86 school year were eliminated. Principals who served schools with less than 120 students were also eliminated from the list. This was done in order to insure there were enough teachers in the school to qualify for participation in the study. The final list yielded sixty-three elementary principals in northwestern Minnesota who served full-time in the same school for two or more years previous to the 1985-86 academic year.

A letter (see appendix A), a school participation form (see appendix B), and a return envelope were sent to a proportional random sample of twenty-seven principals in North Dakota and thirty-three principals in northwestern Minnesota. This was done to further eliminate schools served by principals who did not serve in a school on a full-time basis or who had not served a school for two years or more, as well as to identify teachers who had taught in the building supervised by the same principal for two or more years previous to the 1985-86 academic year. The letter explained the purpose of the study, asked for permission for teachers to participate, and explained the delimitations for the participants. The participation form requested the names of teachers who met the criterion, i.e., who had taught for two years or more in the school with the principal.

When a principal responded that his or her school did not meet the criteria for participation in the study, a replacement from the original list was randomly selected. A total of thirty-eight elementary principals from North Dakota and fifty elementary principals from Minnesota were asked to participate in the study. There were twenty-three schools in North Dakota and twenty-nine schools in Minnesota for a total of fifty-two schools in the final sample.

Instruments

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)

The OCDQ was used to gather information about the organizational climate of schools in the study. The OCDQ was developed in the early 1960s by Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft at the Midwest Administration

Center of the University of Chicago under a grant from the United States Office of Education. A monograph, The Organizational Climate of Schools, describing the development of the OCDQ, was published in 1963. Subsequently, the instrument was published in Theory and Research in Administration by Andrew W. Halpin (1966). Permission (see appendix C) was granted by Macmillan Publishing Company for use of the instrument in this study.

Halpin's and Croft's primary purpose in developing the OCDQ was "to map the domain of organizational climate, to identify and describe its dimensions, and to measure them in a dependable way" (Halpin 1966, p. 132). These authors analyzed the climates of seventy-one elementary schools in six different parts of the United States. Descriptions from 1,151 teachers and principals were used to develop the questionnaire items. Lake, Miles, and Earle (1973) discussed the development of the OCDQ:

An effort was made to locate items bearing on 1) task and socio-emotional orientation; 2) social control and social need-satisfaction, by both leader and group; and 3) leader behavior, group behavior, procedural regulation, and personality orientation. (p. 210)

The final instrument contained sixty-four Likert-type questions with eight subscales. Four of these related to teachers' behaviors: Disengagement, Hindrance, Intimacy, and Esprit.

Disengagement refers to the teachers' tendency to be "not with it." This dimension describes a group which is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand.

Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary "busywork." The teachers perceive that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work.

Esprit refers to morale. The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.

Intimacy refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other. This dimension describes a social-needs satisfaction which is not necessarily associated with task-accomplishment. (Halpin 1966, pp. 150-51)

Four of the subscales related to the principal's behavior: Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal with the teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation. His behavior, in brief, is universalistic rather than particularistic; nomothetic rather than idiosyncratic. To maintain this style, he keeps himself--at least, "emotionally"--at a distance from his staff.

Production Emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive and plays the role of a "straw boss." His communication tends to go in only one direction, and he is not sensitive to feedback from the staff.

Thrust refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization." Thrust behavior is marked not by close supervision, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets. Apparently, because he does not ask the teachers to give of themselves any more than he willingly gives of himself, his behavior, though starkly task-oriented, is nonetheless viewed favorably by the teachers.

Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers "humanly," to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms. (Halpin 1966, p. 151)

From the scores of the eight subscales, six climate profiles along the "authenticity" continuum were determined from openness to closedness: Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal, and Closed.

Open climate. Describes a school profile in which the teachers work well together, feel good about each other, and have a sense of accomplishment. Principals set an example of hard work and treat teachers in a humane way. Low Disengagement, high Esprit, and high Thrust are characteristic of this climate as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Halpin 1966, pp. 174-75).

Autonomous climate. Describes a school profile in which teachers are given almost complete freedom to accomplish the organization's goals and morale is high. The principal sets an example of hard work; however, his behavior towards teachers is formal and impersonal. The school profile as measured by the OCDQ is characterized by high Esprit among teachers, high Aloofness and low Production Emphasis exhibited by the principal (Halpin 1966, pp. 175-76).

Controlled climate. Describes a school profile in which task accomplishment is a priority. Job satisfaction is a result of getting the job done rather than social interaction with others. The principal supervises the staff closely and is highly directive. High Hindrance, low Intimacy, and high Production Emphasis are characteristic of this climate on the OCDQ (Halpin 1966, pp. 177-78).

Familiar climate. Describes a school profile in which the staff is extremely friendly and exhibits little task-oriented behavior. There is a high degree of Disengagement and Intimacy on the part of teachers and the principal shows the lowest score on Production Emphasis and the highest score on Consideration measured by the OCDQ (Halpin 1966, pp. 178-79).

Paternal climate. Describes a school profile in which the teachers do not work well together and receive little satisfaction from task accomplishment. The principal in a Paternal climate is constantly directing and checking on his staff. As measured by the OCDQ, there is low Esprit and high Disengagement on the part of teachers while the principal exhibits behaviors that are high in Production Emphasis and high in Consideration (Halpin 1966, pp. 179-80).

Closed climate. Describes the most ineffective school climate profile measured by the OCDQ. Faculty receive little satisfaction from task accomplishment or their activities with each other. This climate is characterized by high Disengagement, high Hindrance, high Aloofness, and high Production Emphasis, while Consideration is low (Halpin 1966, pp. 180-81).

The OCDQ has been widely used in research related to school climate. Lake, Miles, and Earle (1973) commented,

The instrument is thoughtfully developed, and represents a good blend of underlying conceptualization and empirical winnowing of items. It should not be used to make predictions about individuals, but seems quite workable for examining the proposed dimensions of climate at the level of the school building. (p. 212)

In their critique of the OCDQ, these reviewers reported, "Subtest split-half reliabilities range from .26 to .84, with median at .64. Odd versus even respondent subtest correlations range from .49 to .76, median .63" (p. 210).

Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey

After reviewing the literature, the writer found few instruments that would measure the subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors' use of power strategies. Few of the instruments that

were found in the literature had been submitted to reliability and validity studies. Several instruments had unsatisfactory reliability and/or validity for research purposes.

This writer developed the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey (see appendix D) to determine principals' use of power strategies. Items developed by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) were used in the construction of the instrument. These researchers examined the tactics of influence used by people when attempting to change the behavior of their subordinates, superiors, or co-workers at work.

In the first study reported by these researchers, the range of tactics that people used at work was identified. An incident in which they had succeeded in getting their way with a superior, a subordinate, or a co-worker was described by 165 respondents. A total of 370 influence tactics were identified and sorted into fourteen categories.

In a follow-up study reported in the same article, the dimensions of influence underlying the tactics that had been discovered in the first study were identified. Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) developed fifty-eight items that were included in a questionnaire administered to 754 employed respondents. The respondents were asked to describe how frequently, on a five-point scale, they had used the tactic in the past six months to influence someone at work. Each participant responded to three forms--one for subordinates, one for co-workers, and one for superiors. The respondents were also asked the reason for exercising influence. The fifty-eight items were factor analyzed for the entire sample and separately for each of the three target levels. Six interpretable factors from the entire sample were

identified.

Factor 1 is identified by highest loadings on the influence tactics, including demanding, ordering, and setting deadlines. This factor is labeled Assertiveness.

Factor 2 is described by the highest loadings on weak and nonobtrusive influence tactics. Included here were such tactics as "acting humble" and "making the other person feel important." This factor is labeled Ingratiation.

Factor 3 is characterized by loadings on the use of rationality influence tactics and is labeled Rationality. It includes such tactics as "writing a detailed plan" and "explaining the reasons for my request."

Factor 4 involved the use of administrative sanctions to induce compliance. Tactics with high loadings included "prevented salary increases" and "threatened job security." This factor is labeled Sanctions.

Factor 5 loaded on tactics involving the exchange of positive benefits. Included here were such tactics as "offering an exchange" and "offering to make personal sacrifices." This factor is labeled Exchange of Benefits.

Factor 6 is described by loadings on tactics that bring additional pressure for conformity on the target by invoking the influence of higher levels in the organization. Included here were such tactics as "making a formal appeal to higher levels" and "obtaining the informal support of higher-ups." This factor is labeled Upward Appeal. (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980, p. 447)

These factors accounted for 38 percent of the total item variance.

Two other factors emerged in the overall factor analysis that were found in the subanalyses. The authors decided to retain these factors for heuristic purposes: Blocking and Coalitions.

Factor 7 emerged in the factor analysis of influence directed toward superiors. Items that loaded on this factor included "engaging in a work slowdown and threatening to stop working with the target person." Essentially, these tactics are attempts to stop the target person from carrying out some action by various kinds of blocking tactics. This factor is labeled Blocking.

Factor 8 emerged from the factor analysis of tactics directed toward subordinates. Items in this factor were part of the previously described factor Rationality. However, this subset of items described the use of steady pressure for compliance by "obtaining the support of co-workers" and by "obtaining the support of subordinates." This is labeled Coalitions. (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980, pp. 447-48)

For all dimensions except Blocking, the Alpha Coefficient for the reliability of the tactic scores ranged from .61 to .71 when the target person was a subordinate. From the fifty-eight items, this writer eliminated items categorized as Blocking since those items emerged only when directed toward superiors. Items that loaded under .40 on a given factor from the factor analysis data reported by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) were also eliminated. Forty-one items were then reworded so that participants could respond on a five-point scale about how frequently their principal used the tactic to influence teachers. Nine statements in the instrument were related to the power strategy Assertiveness, nine to Ingratiation, six to Rationality, five statements each to Sanctions and Exchange, four statements to Upward Appeal, and three statements to the power strategy Coalitions. The statements and the power tactics each was related to appear in appendix E.

Five elementary teachers were asked to sort the forty-one statements into categories defined by the seven power strategies in order to determine the statements' content validity. There was 100 percent agreement among the raters and with the categories defined by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) for thirty-three items. These items were retained as rewritten in the final instrument. For one item there was 100 percent agreement among raters, but the teachers' assignment to a category did not agree with the category assignment of Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson. This item was retained in the final instrument but scored with items in the factor labeled Exchange rather than Rationality. There was 80 percent agreement among raters and with Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson on two items. These items were retained

in the final instrument. There was less than 80 percent agreement among teachers on five items. These items were rewritten, then resubmitted to the raters. There was 100 percent agreement on four of the items and 80 percent agreement on one item among the raters after the revisions; thus, these items were included in the final instrument.

Procedure

Seven teachers in each of the sample schools received a copy of the OCDQ, Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey, and a letter (see appendix F) requesting participation in the study. The teachers were originally asked to return the OCDQ and the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey by 2 October 1985. By 12 November 1985, 301 teachers had returned both questionnaires. Four Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey instruments and five Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire instruments were not usable. The scores from the OCDQ and the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey were averaged to determine the school climates and the principals' power tactics. The school was the unit of analysis. In sixteen schools seven teachers returned usable OCDQ instruments, in fifteen schools six teachers returned usable OCDQ instruments, in twelve schools five teachers returned usable instruments, and in seven schools four teachers returned usable instruments. In fifteen schools seven teachers returned usable Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey instruments, in eighteen schools six teachers returned usable instruments, in twenty schools five teachers returned usable instruments, and in seven schools four teachers returned usable Perception of Principal Power Tactics

Survey instruments. There were two schools in the sample that did not have four or more usable OCDQs and/or Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey instruments. These schools were not used in the statistical analysis for this study.

The OCDQ was scored for each of the eight subtests as described by Halpin and Croft (1963, p. 37). The school-mean scores for each of the eight subtests were obtained. Raw scores were converted into standard scores in order to compare the various subtests and determine the school's climate profile. A similarity score was found for each of the six climate profiles. The lowest similarity score determined the climate of the school. An openness score was found by adding the Esprit subtest score and the Thrust subtest score then subtracting the Disengagement subtest score ($[\text{Esprit} + \text{Thrust}] - \text{Disengagement} = \text{Openness Score}$). The higher the score the more open the organizational climate was perceived to be. The lower the score the more closed the organizational climate was perceived to be.

The Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey was scored. An item analysis of the individual scales for reliability (internal consistency) on the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey was conducted using the Coefficient Alpha (reliability) program from SPSSX (SPSS Inc. 1983). All items having a correlation less than .20 were eliminated from the test instrument. Item six was eliminated from the category Assertiveness. Item twenty-five was eliminated from the category Ingratiation. Item nine was eliminated from the category Sanctions. Item seventeen was eliminated from the category Exchange. Item twenty-one was eliminated from the category Upward Appeal. Item forty was eliminated from the category Coalitions. These items were

not used in the statistical analysis of the data. Table 1 presents the alpha coefficients for the items retained in each of the scales. A school-mean was found for each of the power strategies that were measured.

TABLE 1
RELIABILITY OF TACTIC SCORES

Tactic	Number of Items	Alpha Coefficient
Assertiveness	8	.8039
Ingratiation	8	.7595
Rationality	5	.6668
Sanctions	4	.7453
Exchange	5	.5957
Upward Appeal	3	.4445
Coalitions	2	.4504

To answer the research questions, t-tests, analysis of variance, and Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated from SPSSX (SPSS Inc. 1983) to determine the relationships between the six climate profiles, the eight subscales, the openness scores, and the seven power strategies. Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test for unequal sample sizes was used to determine which groups had significantly different means (SPSS Inc. 1983). A significance of .05 was chosen as adequate for rejecting the hypothesis of no difference.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter reports and analyzes the data that were collected relative to the research questions presented in chapter 1. The purpose of the study was to identify the power strategies of elementary principals as perceived by the teachers in the schools which they served. It also examined the relationships between these teacher perceptions of principals' use of power strategies and the dimensions of the schools' climates as well as the schools' climate profiles and openness scores as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The data were analyzed using the analysis of variance, the Pearson product-moment correlation, and t-tests.

Results

In order to answer the first research question, "What types of power strategies do elementary teachers perceive their principals to use in the administration of schools?", the t-test for repeated measures was used. The differences between the mean scores for each of the seven power tactics reflected elementary teachers' perceptions of their principals' use of those power tactics that were measured by the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey (PPPTS). The results of the statistical treatment are presented in table 2. The sample means

for each subscale are provided along with the standard deviations and the t value.

TABLE 2

t -TEST FOR TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS OF NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
THE MEANS OF SEVEN SCALES OF THE PERCEPTION OF
PRINCIPAL POWER TACTICS SURVEY (N = 297)

Tactic	Mean	SD	t value
Rationality	3.54	0.704	6.79 ^a
Ingratiation	3.26	0.696	6.08 ^a
Upward Appeal	2.88	0.884	1.45 ^b
Coalitions	2.80	0.925	5.71 ^a
Exchange	2.48	0.651	1.26 ^b
Assertiveness	2.41	0.686	34.04 ^a
Sanctions	1.28	0.512	

^aSignificant at the .001 level with the subsequent mean with $df = 296$

^bNo significant difference with the subsequent mean

An examination of the data presented in table 2 which were treated with the t -test for repeated measures showed that there was statistical differences between the power tactics used by elementary principals. These comparisons indicated that there were five sets of power tactics used by elementary principals as perceived by teachers in their schools: (1) Rationality, (2) Ingratiation, (3) Upward Appeal and Coalitions, (4) Exchange and Assertiveness, and (5) Sanctions. The power tactic most frequently used by elementary principals was Rationality. The power tactic used least frequently was Sanctions.

Statistically significant differences at the .001 level were found between these sets of power tactics.

The PPPTS was scored on a scale from one to five. One was designated as never, two as seldom, three as occasionally, four as frequently, and five as usually. Thus, the mean scores on Rationality (3.54) and Ingratiation (3.26) indicated that these power tactics occurred occasionally to frequently. The mean scores on Upward Appeal (2.88), Coalitions (2.80), Exchange (2.48), and Assertiveness (2.41) indicated that these power tactics occurred seldom to occasionally. The mean score on Sanctions (1.28) indicated that this power tactic occurred never to seldom.

The OCDQ identified six different climate profiles determined by the school-means for each of the eight subscales. The six climates were ranked along the "authenticity" continuum from openness to closedness. The six climate profiles can be grouped into three categories composed of the first two, Open and Autonomous, which are relatively open climates; the second two, Controlled and Familiar, each which stresses either group maintenance or task accomplishment; and the last two, Paternal and Closed, which are relatively closed climates. "Hence, the profile of scores shows how most of the teachers in a school characterize the Organizational Climate of their particular school" (Halpin 1966, p. 167). The six climate profiles were defined in chapter 3. Table 3 presents the organizational climates of the fifty schools that participated in the study.

An examination of the data in table 3 showed that eleven (22%) of the schools were perceived to have an Open organizational climate by the teachers in those schools. Five (10%) schools were perceived to

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE PROFILES AMONG NORTH
DAKOTA AND NORTHWESTERN MINNESOTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Climate Profile	Absolute Frequency	Percent of Total
Open	11	22
Autonomous	5	10
Controlled	7	14
Familiar	3	6
Paternal	7	14
Closed	17	34
TOTAL	50	100

have an Autonomous organizational climate. Seven (14%) schools were perceived to have a Controlled climate. Three (6%) schools were perceived to have a Familiar climate. Seven (14%) schools were perceived to have a Paternal climate. Seventeen (34%) schools were perceived to have a Closed organizational climate by the teachers in those schools.

In order to answer the second research question, "What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by the elementary principals and the school climate profiles as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)?", analysis of variance was used. When significant differences existed, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test was used to determine which groups had significantly different means at the .05 level (SPSS Inc. 1983).

To determine the relationship between principals' use of the power tactic Rationality and school climate profiles, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in tables 4 and 5.

An examination of the data in tables 4 and 5 showed that there was a statistically significant difference at the .01 level on the basis of principals' use of Rationality when compared on the school climate profiles. A visual examination of the data found in table 5 revealed that principals in schools with a Closed climate were perceived to use the power tactic Rationality significantly less often than principals in Open and Controlled climate profile schools.

To determine the relationship between principals' use of the power tactic Ingratiation and the school climate profiles, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in tables 6 and 7.

An examination of the data in tables 6 and 7 showed that there was a statistically significant difference at the .05 level on the basis of principals' use of Ingratiation when compared on the school climate profiles. A visual examination of the data in table 7 revealed that principals in schools with Closed climates were perceived to use the power tactic Ingratiation significantly less often than principals in Open and Paternal climate schools.

To determine the relationship between principals' use of the power tactic Upward Appeal and the school climate profiles, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in tables 8 and 9.

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' USE OF RATIONALITY
IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS' CLIMATE PROFILES

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Rationality	5	3.493	0.699	3.853	0.006
Residual	44	7.978	0.181		
TOTAL	49	11.472	0.234		

TABLE 5

MEAN SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
ON THE RATIONALITY TACTIC OF THE PPPTS IN RELATIONSHIP
TO SCHOOLS' CLIMATE PROFILES

Category	N	\bar{X}	Category					
			Contr	Famil	Open	Pater	Auton	Close
Controlled	7	3.91						
Familiar	3	3.86						
Open	11	3.70						
Paternal	7	3.62						
Autonomous	5	3.51						
Closed	17	3.21	*		*			

*Indicates HSD at .05 level of significance

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' USE OF
INGRATIATION IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS'
CLIMATE PROFILES

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Ingratiation	5	2.689	0.538	3.400	0.011
Residual	44	6.958	0.158		
TOTAL	49	9.647	0.197		

TABLE 7

MEAN SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF ELEMENTARY
PRINCIPALS ON THE INGRATIATION TACTIC OF THE PPPTS
IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS' CLIMATE PROFILES

Category	N	\bar{X}	Category					
			Pater	Famil	Open	Contr	Auton	Close
Paternal	7	3.56						
Familiar	3	3.43						
Open	11	3.43						
Controlled	7	3.40						
Autonomous	5	3.16						
Closed	17	2.97	*		*			

*Indicates HSD at .05 level of significance

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' USE OF
UPWARD APPEAL IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS'
CLIMATE PROFILES

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Upward Appeal	5	1.013	0.203	0.973	0.445
Residual	44	9.161	0.208		
TOTAL	49	10.175	0.208		

TABLE 9

MEAN SCORES OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS ON THE UPWARD APPEAL
TACTIC OF THE PPPTS IN RELATIONSHIP TO
SCHOOLS' CLIMATE PROFILES

Category	N	\bar{X}
Open	11	2.67
Autonomous	5	2.77
Controlled	7	3.07
Familiar	3	3.10
Paternal	7	2.99
Closed	17	2.91

An examination of the data in tables 8 and 9 showed that there was no statistically significant difference at the .05 level on the basis of principals' use of the power tactic Upward Appeal when compared on the school climate profiles. Elementary principals in all climate profiles were perceived to use the power tactic Upward Appeal occasionally.

To determine the relationship between principals' use of the power tactic Coalitions and the school climate profiles, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in tables 10 and 11.

An examination of the data in tables 10 and 11 showed that there was no significant difference at the .05 level on the basis of principals' use of the power tactic Coalitions when compared on the school climate profiles. Principals of schools in all climate profiles were perceived to use the power tactic Coalitions occasionally.

To determine the relationship between principals' use of the power tactic Exchange and the school climate profiles, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in tables 12 and 13.

An examination of the data in tables 12 and 13 showed that there was no statistically significant difference at the .05 level on the basis of the principals' use of the Exchange tactic when compared on the school climate profiles. Principals in all climate profiles were perceived to use the power tactic Exchange seldom to occasionally.

To determine the relationship between principals' use of the power tactic Assertiveness and the school climate profiles, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of the statistical treatment

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' USE OF
COALITIONS IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS'
CLIMATE PROFILES

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Coalitions	5	1.207	0.241	1.218	0.317
Residual	44	8.719	0.198		
TOTAL	49	9.926	0.203		

TABLE 11

MEAN SCORES OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS ON THE COALITIONS
TACTIC OF THE PPPTS IN RELATIONSHIP TO
SCHOOLS' CLIMATE PROFILES

Category	N	\bar{X}
Open	11	2.84
Autonomous	5	2.53
Controlled	7	2.96
Familiar	3	3.04
Paternal	7	3.00
Closed	17	2.69

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' USE OF
EXCHANGE IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS'
CLIMATE PROFILES

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Exchange	5	0.872	0.174	.435	0.225
Residual	44	5.283	0.120		
TOTAL	49	6.156	0.126		

TABLE 13

MEAN SCORES OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS ON THE EXCHANGE
TACTIC OF THE PPPTS IN RELATIONSHIP TO
SCHOOLS' CLIMATE PROFILES

Category	N	\bar{X}
Open	11	2.61
Autonomous	5	2.22
Controlled	7	2.55
Familiar	3	2.56
Paternal	7	2.62
Closed	17	2.38

of the data are presented in tables 14 and 15.

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' USE OF
ASSERTIVENESS IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS'
CLIMATE PROFILES

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Assertiveness	5	3.749	0.750	4.404	0.002
Residual	44	7.492	0.170		
TOTAL	49	11.241	0.229		

TABLE 15

MEAN SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF ELEMENTARY
PRINCIPALS ON THE ASSERTIVENESS TACTIC OF THE
PPPTS IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS'
CLIMATE PROFILES

Category	N	\bar{X}	Category					
			Close	Contr	Famil	Auton	Open	Pater
Closed	17	2.76						
Controlled	7	2.51						
Familiar	3	2.44						
Autonomous	5	2.18						
Open	11	2.17	*					
Paternal	7	2.09	*					

*Indicates HSD at .05 level of significance

An examination of the data in tables 14 and 15 showed that there was a statistically significant difference at the .01 level on

the basis of principals' use of the power tactic Assertiveness when compared on the school climate profiles. A visual examination of the data found in table 15 revealed that principals in schools with a Closed climate were perceived to use the power tactic Assertiveness more often than principals in Paternal and Open climate schools.

To determine the relationship between principals' use of the power tactic Sanctions and the school climate profiles, an analysis of variance was performed. The results are presented in tables 16 and 17.

An examination of the data in tables 16 and 17 showed that there was a statistically significant difference at the .05 level on the basis of the principals' use of the power tactic Sanctions when compared on the school climate profiles. A visual examination of the data found in table 17 revealed that principals in schools with Closed climates were perceived to use the power tactic Sanctions significantly more often than principals in Open climate schools.

In order to answer the third research question, "What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the openness of the schools' climates as measured by the OCDQ?", a Pearson product-moment correlation was used. From the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire an openness score for each school was calculated by adding the Esprit subtest score and the Thrust subtest score then subtracting the Disengagement subtest score. The higher the score the more open was the school's climate. Conversely, the lower the score the more closed the school's climate. The openness scores for the schools in the study ranged from twelve to seventy-six. The mean score was forty-nine. The openness scores and the climate profiles for each of the fifty

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' USE OF
SANCTIONS IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS'
CLIMATE PROFILES

Source of Variance	df	SS	MS	F	p
Sanctions	5	1.125	0.225	3.118	0.017
Residual	44	3.176	0.075		
TOTAL	49	4.301	0.088		

TABLE 17

MEAN SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF ELEMENTARY
PRINCIPALS ON THE SANCTIONS TACTIC OF THE PPPTS
IN RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOLS' CLIMATE PROFILES

Category	N	\bar{X}	Category					
			Close	Contr	Famil	Open	Pater	Auton
Closed	17	1.47						
Controlled	7	1.40						
Familiar	3	1.20						
Open	11	1.17	*					
Paternal	7	1.14						
Autonomous	5	1.11						

*Indicates HSD at .05 level of significance

sample schools are listed in appendix G.

To determine the relationship between elementary schools' openness scores and the principals' use of the power tactics measured by the PPPTS, a Pearson product-moment correlation was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in table 18.

TABLE 18

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS'
OPENNESS SCORES IN RELATIONSHIP TO PRINCIPALS' USE
OF POWER TACTICS AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Correlation Coefficients/Number of Schools = 50

Power Tactic	Openness Score
Rationality	.5825 ^a
Ingratiation	.4284 ^a
Upward Appeal	-.0054
Coalitions	.2461 ^c
Exchange	.2510 ^c
Assertiveness	-.2964 ^b
Sanctions	-.3543 ^b

^a_p ≤ .001

^b_p ≤ .01

^c_p ≤ .05

An examination of the data in table 18 showed that there were statistically significant relationships between the openness of schools' organizational climates and the use of power tactics by principals. Statistically significant positive relationships at the

.001 level were found between principals' use of the power tactics Rationality and Ingratiation and the openness of the schools' organizational climates. The more the principal was perceived to use Rationality and Ingratiation the more open the school's climate was perceived by teachers.

Statistically significant negative relationships at the .01 level were found between principals' use of the power tactics Assertiveness and Sanctions and the openness of the schools' organizational climates. The more the principal was perceived to use Assertiveness and Sanctions by teachers the less open the school's climate was perceived by teachers.

Statistically significant positive relationships at the .05 level were found between principals' use of the power tactics Coalitions and Exchange and the openness of the schools' organizational climates. The principals whose teachers perceived them to use Coalitions and Exchange most often administered schools in which teachers perceived the organizational climates to be more open.

There was no statistically significant relationship between the principals' use of the power tactic Upward Appeal and the schools' organizational climates. Teachers perceived principals in all schools used the power tactic Upward Appeal approximately to the same degree.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire contained eight subscales. Four of the subscales were related to the characteristics of the school faculty as a group: Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, and Intimacy. These behaviors were discussed in chapter 3. In order to answer the fourth research question, "What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are

used by elementary principals and the teacher behavior dimensions measured by the OCDQ?", a Pearson product-moment correlation was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in table 19.

TABLE 19

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FACULTY AS A GROUP MEASURED BY THE OCDQ IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE PRINCIPALS' USE OF POWER TACTICS AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Correlation Coefficients/Number of Schools = 50				
Power Strategies	Disengagement	Hindrance	Esprit	Intimacy
Rationality	-.3051 ^a	-.2212	.3335 ^a	-.0736
Ingratiation	-.1654	-.1328	.2008	-.1564
Upward Appeal	-.0034	.0237	-.0174	-.1013
Coalitions	-.0420	.1002	.1665	-.0086
Exchange	-.0611	-.0604	.0822	-.2349 ^b
Assertiveness	.1838	.3771 ^a	-.1786	.1048
Sanctions	.1409	.3534 ^a	-.1930	-.0441

^a_p ≤ .01

^b_p ≤ .05

An examination of the data in table 19 showed that there were five statistically significant relationships between teacher behaviors and principals' use of power tactics. A statistically significant negative relationship at the .01 level was found between the teacher behavior Disengagement and principals' use of Rationality. The more frequently a principal was perceived to use the power tactic

Rationality the less disengaged the teachers perceived their own behavior.

A statistically significant positive relationship at the .01 level was found between the teacher behavior Esprit and principals' use of Rationality. The more frequently a principal was perceived to use the power tactic Rationality the more teachers felt a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment in their job.

A statistically significant negative relationship at the .05 level was found between principals' use of the power tactic Exchange and the teacher behavior Intimacy. The more frequently a principal was perceived to use the power tactic Exchange the less enjoyment teachers felt in their social relations on the job.

Statistically significant positive relationships at the .01 level were found between the teacher behavior Hindrance and principals' use of the power tactics Assertiveness and Sanctions. The more frequently a principal was perceived to use Assertiveness and Sanctions the more teachers felt their principal burdened them with routine busywork.

Four of the eight subscales of the OCDQ related to characteristics of the principal as a leader: Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration. These principal behaviors were defined in chapter 3. In order to answer the fifth research question, "What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the principal behavior dimensions measured by the OCDQ?", a Pearson product-moment correlation was performed. The results of the statistical treatment of the data are presented in table 20.

TABLE 20

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
PRINCIPAL AS A LEADER MEASURED BY THE OCDQ IN
RELATIONSHIP TO PRINCIPALS' USE OF POWER
TACTICS AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Correlation Coefficients/Number of Schools = 50				
Power Tactics	Aloofness	Production Emphasis	Thrust	Consideration
Rationality	-.0566	-.0648	.7650 ^a	.4163 ^a
Ingratiation	-.1557	-.1248	.6157 ^a	.5391 ^a
Upward Appeal	.2608 ^c	.4173 ^a	.0140	.0365
Coalitions	.0737	.0569	.3685 ^b	.2936 ^c
Exchange	.0081	.1100	.4153 ^a	.4299 ^a
Assertiveness	.4743 ^a	.4118 ^a	-.3374 ^b	-.2466 ^c
Sanctions	.2614 ^c	.3583 ^c	-.4905 ^a	-.4292 ^a

^a
p ≤ .001

^b
p ≤ .01

^c
p ≤ .05

An examination of the data in table 20 showed that there were eighteen statistically significant relationships between the power tactics used by elementary principals and the characteristics of principals as leaders. Statistically significant positive relationships at the .001 level were found between principals' use of the power tactic Rationality and principals' Thrust and Consideration behaviors. The more often teachers perceived the principal used the power tactic Rationality the more teachers perceived the principal to be modeling task-oriented behaviors and the more considerate the principal was

perceived by teachers.

Statistically significant positive relationships at the .001 level were found between principals' use of the power tactic Ingratiation and principals' Thrust and Consideration behaviors. The more often teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Ingratiation the more teachers perceived principals to be modeling task-oriented behaviors and the more considerate principals were perceived by teachers.

A statistically significant positive relationship at the .001 level was found between the power tactic Upward Appeal and principals' Production Emphasis behaviors. The more often principals were perceived to use the power tactic Upward Appeal the more principals were perceived by teachers to be directive without being sensitive to feedback.

A statistically significant positive relationship at the .05 level was found between principals' use of the power tactic Upward Appeal and the Aloofness of principals. The more often teachers perceived the principal to use the power tactic Upward Appeal the more formal and impersonal the principal was perceived by teachers.

A statistically significant positive relationship at the .01 level was found between principals' use of the power tactic Coalitions and Thrust behaviors of principals. The more often the principal was perceived to use Coalitions the more task oriented the principal was perceived by teachers.

A statistically significant positive relationship at the .05 level was found between principals' use of the power tactic Coalitions and the Consideration behaviors of principals. The more often the principal was perceived to use the power tactic Coalitions the more

considerate the principal was perceived by teachers.

Statistically significant positive relationships at the .001 level were found between the power tactic Exchange and principals' Thrust and Consideration behaviors. The more often the principal was perceived to use the power strategy Exchange the more teachers perceived the principal to model task-oriented behaviors and the more considerate the principal was perceived by teachers.

Statistically significant positive relationships at the .001 level were found between principals' use of the power tactic Assertiveness and their Aloofness and Production Emphasis behaviors. The more assertive the principal was perceived the more aloof, directive, and insensitive to feedback the principal was perceived by teachers.

A statistically significant negative relationship at the .01 level was found between principals' use of the power tactic Assertiveness and principals' Thrust behaviors. The more Assertiveness teachers perceived the principal to use the less effort teachers perceived the principal to be making in moving the organization forward.

A statistically significant negative relationship at the .05 level was found between principals' use of the power tactic Assertiveness and principals' Consideration behaviors. The more often the principal was perceived to use the power tactic Assertiveness the less considerate the principal was perceived by teachers.

Statistically significant negative relationships at the .001 level were found between principals' use of the power tactic Sanctions and principals' Thrust and Consideration behaviors. The more often teachers perceived the principal to use the power tactic Sanctions the

the less the teachers perceived the principal to be task oriented or considerate.

Statistically significant negative relationships at the .05 level were found between the use of the power tactic Sanctions and principals' behaviors of Aloofness and Production Emphasis. The more often teachers perceived the principal to use the power tactic Sanctions the more the teachers perceived the principal to be formal and impersonal as well as directive and insensitive to feedback.

Chapter 5 presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for this study. These are based upon an analysis and discussion of the data presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify the power strategies used by elementary principals in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota. It also examined the relationships between the power strategies used by those principals and the organizational climates of the schools in which they worked. Schools' climates and principals' power strategies were measured from the perspective of teachers in the schools.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) was used to measure school climate. School climate included the schools' climate profiles, the openness scores, and the mean scores of the eight dimensions of school climate for each school. The OCDQ was developed by Halpin and Croft (1963) to identify and describe the factors that comprised elementary schools' organizational climates as well as to measure the climates of elementary schools. The instrument included sixty-four Likert-type questions related to eight subscales. Four subscales were associated with the teachers' behaviors as a group: Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, and Intimacy. Four subscales described the principal as a leader: Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration. Six climate profiles were defined according

to the pattern formed by the eight subscales: Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal, and Closed. These climates were ranked along a continuum from openness to closedness. The more open climates were marked by their flexibility while the more closed climates were marked by their rigidity.

The Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey (PPPTS) was used to determine teachers' perceptions of their principals' use of power strategies. The PPPTS was developed by this writer based upon the research of Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980). Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson examined power tactics that were used by people at work to change the behavior of subordinates, superiors, or co-workers. Items for the PPPTS were extracted from a list of fifty-eight items developed by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson and designed to elicit how frequently the power tactic was used to influence the target person. These items were reworded for use in schools to measure the perceptions of teachers of their principals' use of power tactics. Content and face validity tests as well as reliability tests were conducted. The final instrument included forty-one items that related to seven power tactics used by superiors to influence subordinates. These included Assertiveness, Ingratiation, Rationality, Sanctions, Exchange, Upward Appeal, and Coalitions. Once the instrument was received and scored, an item analysis for reliability was conducted. All items having a correlation less than .20 were eliminated in the statistical analysis of the data.

The sample included twenty-three schools in North Dakota and twenty-nine schools in Minnesota. Schools that participated had principals who had served full-time in the school for two or more years prior to the 1985-86 school year. Teachers who were selected to

participate had taught full-time in the school for two or more years prior to the 1985-86 school year. There were 301 teachers who returned the two instruments. Two schools were eliminated from the statistical analysis since an insufficient number of instruments were returned.

The data gathered for this study revealed that eleven (22%) schools had Open climates, five (10%) schools had Autonomous climates, seven (14%) schools had Controlled climates, three (6%) schools had Familiar climates, seven (14%) had Paternal climates, and seventeen (34%) had Closed climates. Openness scores ranged from twelve to seventy-six. The higher the openness score the more likely was the organizational climate to be open.

The data related to the research questions were treated for significant differences with the analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlation, and t-tests. Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test for unequal size means was also administered to determine significance between variables on the analysis of variance when appropriate. A significance of .05 was chosen as adequate for rejecting the hypothesis of no difference.

Teachers perceived principals to use Rationality significantly more often than all other power tactics. An examination of the data related to the principals' use of the power tactic Rationality indicated that there were significant differences between the use of the power tactic Rationality and school climate. Principals of schools with Closed climates were perceived to use Rationality significantly less often than principals in Open and Controlled climate schools. The data indicated that the more open the organizational climate the more often teachers perceived the power tactic Rationality was used by the

schools' principals. Teacher behaviors that were significantly related to principals' use of the power tactic Rationality were Disengagement and Esprit. The more often teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Rationality the less disengaged the teachers' behavior. The more often teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Rationality the more good feelings teachers had about their jobs. Principal behaviors that were significantly related to principals' use of the power tactic Rationality included Thrust and Consideration. The more often teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Rationality the more teachers perceived principals to be making efforts to move their organizations forward and to be considerate of teachers.

Teachers perceived Ingratiation to be used significantly more often than all other power tactics except Rationality by elementary principals in this study. An examination of the data related to principals' use of the power tactic Ingratiation indicated that there were significant differences between the use of Ingratiation by elementary principals and school climate as perceived by teachers. Principals whose teachers perceived the climate of the school to be Closed were perceived to use Ingratiation significantly less often than principals in Open and Paternal climate schools. The more often the teachers perceived their principals to use the power tactic Ingratiation the more open were the schools' climates as perceived by teachers. Principal behaviors that were significantly related to principals' use of the power tactic Ingratiation included Thrust and Consideration. The more often principals were perceived by teachers to use the power tactic Ingratiation the more teachers perceived principals to be making efforts to move their organizations forward and to be

considerate of teachers.

Teachers perceived that Upward Appeal was used significantly more often by elementary principals than the power tactics Exchange, Assertiveness, and Sanctions and less than Rationality and Ingratiation. Principals in all climate profile categories used Upward Appeal occasionally. An examination of the data related to principals' use of the power tactic Upward Appeal indicated that there were significant differences between the use of Upward Appeal by elementary principals and the principal behavior dimensions of the OCDQ as perceived by teachers. Principal behaviors that were significantly related to principals' use of the power tactic Upward Appeal were Aloofness and Production Emphasis. The more often teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Upward Appeal the more teachers perceived principals to be formal and impersonal as well as directive without being sensitive to feedback.

Teachers perceived that principals used the power tactic Coalitions significantly more often than the power tactics Exchange, Assertiveness, and Sanctions but significantly less often than Rationality and Ingratiation. An examination of the data related to principals' use of the power tactic Coalitions indicated that there were significant differences between the use of Coalitions by elementary principals and school climate. Principals in all climate profile categories used Coalitions occasionally. However, the more often principals were perceived to use Coalitions the more open were the schools' climates as perceived by teachers. Principal behaviors that were related to teachers' perceptions of principals' use of the power tactic Coalitions were Thrust and Consideration. The more often

teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Coalitions the more task oriented and considerate principals were perceived by teachers.

Teachers perceived that principals used the power tactic Exchange significantly less often than the power tactics Rationality, Ingratiation, Upward Appeal, and Coalitions and significantly more often than Sanctions. An examination of the data related to principals' use of the power tactic Exchange indicated that there were significant differences between the use of Exchange by elementary principals and school climate. Principals in all climate profile categories used Exchange seldom to occasionally. However, the more often principals were perceived to use Exchange the more open were the schools' climates as perceived by teachers. The teacher behavior Intimacy was significantly related to principals' use of the power tactic Exchange. The more often principals were perceived to use the power tactic Exchange the less enjoyment teachers felt in their social relations with other teachers at school. Principal behaviors that were related to teachers' perceptions of the principals' use of the power tactic Exchange were Thrust and Consideration. The more often teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Exchange the more task oriented and considerate principals were perceived by teachers.

Teachers perceived that principals used the power tactic Assertiveness significantly less often than the power tactics Rationality, Ingratiation, Upward Appeal, and Coalitions and significantly more often than Sanctions. An examination of the data related to principals' use of the power tactic Assertiveness indicated that there were significant differences between the use of Assertiveness

by the elementary principals and school climate. Principals whose teachers perceived the organizational climates of their schools to be Closed were perceived to use the power tactic Assertiveness more often than principals in Open and Paternal climate schools. The more often the teachers perceived the principals to use the power tactic Assertiveness the more closed were the schools' climates as perceived by teachers. The teacher behavior Hindrance was significantly related to the use of Assertiveness by elementary principals. The more often principals were perceived to use the power tactic Assertiveness the more teachers perceived principals to burden them with unnecessary committee meetings and routine tasks. Principal behaviors that were significantly related to principals' use of Assertiveness included Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration. The more often teachers perceived principals to use Assertiveness the more aloof, directive, and insensitive to feedback principals were perceived by teachers. The more often teachers perceived their principals to use Assertiveness the less the teachers perceived principals to be considerate and the less the teachers perceived principals to be making an effort in moving their organizations forward.

Teachers perceived their principals to use Sanctions significantly less often than all other power tactics. An examination of the data related to principals' use of the power tactic Sanctions indicated that there were significant differences between the use of Sanctions by elementary principals and school climate. Principals of schools whose teachers perceived the organizational climate of the school to be Closed were perceived to use the power tactic Sanctions more often than principals in Open climate schools. The more often

teachers perceived principals to use Sanctions the more closed the climates were perceived by those teachers. The teacher behavior Hindrance was significantly related to principals' use of the power tactic Sanctions. The more often principals were perceived to use Sanctions the more the teachers felt their principals burdened them with routine busywork. The principal behaviors Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration were significantly related to principals' use of the power tactic Sanctions. The more often teachers perceived principals to use Sanctions the more aloof, directive, and insensitive to feedback principals were perceived by teachers. The more often teachers perceived principals to use the power tactic Sanctions the less considerate and less task oriented principals were perceived by teachers.

Conclusions

The conclusions were based on the results and analyses of the statistical treatment of the data for this study. They apply only to this study. The conclusions were organized in the sequence of the research questions.

Research question 1. What types of power strategies do elementary teachers perceive their principals to use in the administration of schools?

Power strategies for this study were defined as the means by which a person attempted to influence the behavior and/or attitudes of another person or group. Strategies were also defined as power tactics. The results of the study indicated that elementary teachers in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota perceived their principals to use a combination of the power tactics measured by the PPPTS. However, they

did not perceive their principals to use all power tactics with equal frequency. Statistically significant differences were found between the use of power tactics by principals. Rationality (e.g., explaining the reasons for a request) was the strategy teachers perceived their principals to use most frequently. Teachers identified Ingratiation (e.g., making teachers feel good) as the second most often used tactic by principals. The use of these two tactics by principals was probably a reflection of their cultural values and educational training. It was possible that principals were more comfortable with the use of Rationality and Ingratiation in their attempts to influence teachers and that these power strategies worked best in getting teachers to comply with their requests.

Further analysis of the findings indicated that Upward Appeal (e.g., the support of superiors) and Coalitions (e.g., gaining the support of a peer or subordinate group) were the power tactics teachers perceived principals used seldom to occasionally. Possibly principals were insecure and/or not sufficiently skilled to use these tactics more often. Upward Appeal implied the need to ask for assistance from one's superiors which might be thought to reflect negatively on the principal. Coalitions required skill in identifying others who would support requests and cause others to comply. It was possible these were not tactics principals preferred to use or had limited opportunity to choose these tactics in their attempts to influence teachers.

Teachers perceived that principals seldom used the power tactics Exchange (e.g., reciprocating benefits) and Assertiveness (e.g., ordering teachers to comply). Perhaps principals did not view their role in such a way that they felt they could exchange favors

with teachers. Exchange perhaps was not a way that principals chose to influence teachers. The possibility existed that principals did do favors for teachers but did not expect teachers to reciprocate by complying with the principals' requests. Teachers' perceptions of principals' use of Assertiveness was probably a reflection of principals' uneasiness with demanding or ordering teachers to carry out a task. Perhaps principals preferred a collegial approach rather than an assertive one.

Sanctions (e.g., administrative rewards and punishments) was the tactic teachers perceived principals to use never to seldom. The most logical conclusion for this finding was that principals have little or no discretionary authority over teachers' salaries or fringe benefits. In addition, current legislation and union contracts have made it difficult for principals to release a teacher. It could be that principals deliberately avoided the use of Sanctions. Rewards, another form of Sanctions, were not tested by the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey. Perhaps principals do reward teachers in nonmonetary ways.

Research question 2. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the school climate profiles as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)?

Organizational climate for this study was defined as the "personality" of an organization that impressed others and distinguished one organization from another. The OCDQ measured the social interactions among teachers and between teachers and the principal. These interactions were thought to be the most important

factors in the creation of a school's climate and other factors would be measured indirectly since any other factor would have some impact on those social interactions.

Each of the six climate profiles measured by the OCDQ was determined by the pattern of behaviors among teachers and between teachers and the principal. The Open climate was characterized by the authenticity of its group members while the Closed climate was characterized by its stagnation and inflexibility. In the Autonomous climate there was high morale but little direction by the principal. In contrast, teachers in the Paternal climate had low morale and the principal was highly directive. In the Controlled climate there was a preoccupation with task accomplishment while in the Familiar climate the atmosphere was highly personal but focused little on task accomplishment.

The results indicated that there were no significant differences between teachers' perceptions of their principals' use of the power tactics Exchange, Coalitions, and Upward Appeal and the schools' climate profiles. Apparently, principals' use of Exchange, Coalitions, and Upward Appeal had the least affect on teachers' perceptions of the overall school climate.

Further analysis of the results showed that there were significant differences between teachers' perceptions of the principals' use of the power tactics Rationality, Ingratiation, Assertiveness, and Sanctions and the school climate profiles. Evidently, the pattern of the frequencies with which principals used these power tactics affected teachers' perceptions of the schools' climates.

Principals whose teachers perceived the climate of their schools to be Open were perceived to use Rationality and Ingratiation significantly more often than principals in Closed climate schools. Teachers perceived that principals in Open climate schools used Assertiveness and Sanctions significantly less often than principals in Closed climate schools. This appeared to indicate that it was the particular combination of power tactics Rationality, Ingratiation, Assertiveness, and Sanctions which teachers perceived their principals to use that created climates in those schools that teachers perceived were Open.

Principals in Controlled climate schools were perceived to use Rationality significantly more often than principals in Closed climate schools. Task accomplishment was a priority in Controlled climate schools. It could be concluded, then, that the principals in the Controlled climate schools used more Rationality in their attempts to get teachers to focus on their jobs. Thus, principals created a climate profile that was more open than the Closed climate profile.

Principals whose teachers perceived the climates of their schools to be Paternal used Ingratiation significantly more often and Assertiveness significantly less often than principals in Closed climate schools. It appeared that principals who used Assertiveness less frequently than average and Ingratiation more frequently than average created school climates that teachers perceived to be Paternal. Evidently, the use of Ingratiation by the principals in the Paternal climate was viewed by teachers as insincere since the Paternal climate profile was on the closed end of the authenticity continuum of climate profiles.

Teachers who perceived the climate of their schools to be Closed perceived their principals to use the power tactics Assertiveness and Sanctions significantly more often and the power tactics Rationality and Ingratiation significantly less often than principals in Open climate schools. Principals in Closed climate schools were also perceived to use Assertiveness more often and Ingratiation less often than principals in Paternal climate schools. In addition, principals in Controlled climate schools were perceived to use Rationality significantly more often than principals in Closed climate schools. A reasonable conclusion for these findings was that principals who used a combination of more Assertiveness and more Sanctions as well as less Rationality and Ingratiation to influence teachers created school climates that teachers perceived were Closed. This particular combination obviously made teachers feel uncomfortable with their principal's efforts to influence them.

Research question 3. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the openness of the schools' climates as measured by the OCDQ?

The openness score as measured by the OCDQ reflected the authenticity of the behaviors of the teachers and principals in schools. The findings, related to the third research question, indicated that there were statistically significant relationships between teachers' perceptions of the openness of their schools' climates and the power strategies used by principals. The more open the schools' climates were perceived by teachers the more frequently teachers perceived their principals to use Rationality, Ingratiation, Coalitions, and Exchange. In addition, the more open were schools'

climates as perceived by teachers the less Assertiveness and Sanctions teachers perceived their principals to use. It is worthy to note that teachers' perceptions of their principals' use of Upward Appeal did not affect teachers' perceptions of the openness of their schools' climates.

These findings appeared to indicate that the more Rationality and Ingratiation teachers perceived their principals to use, the more authentic the behaviors of the principal and staff were perceived by those teachers. These findings would also seem to indicate that principals who could use various groups (Coalitions) to influence teachers were able to create more open climate schools. Apparently, teachers perceived principals who found it possible to do favors for teachers and were willing to call in those favors (Exchange) in such a way that created more open climate schools. In comparison, principals who were perceived to use more Assertiveness and Sanctions created environments in which the behaviors of the principals and the staffs were less genuine thus creating more closed climates.

Research question 4. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the teacher behavior dimensions measured by the OCDQ?

The four teacher behavior dimensions measured by the OCDQ were Hindrance, Disengagement, Esprit, and Intimacy. The findings related to the fourth research question revealed that there were significant relationships between teacher behaviors and the power strategies used by principals as perceived by teachers. The more teachers perceived their principals to use the power tactic Rationality, the less Disengagement and the more Esprit among teachers. When teachers

perceived their principals to use Assertiveness and Sanctions more often, teachers exhibited higher Hindrance scores. The more often teachers perceived their principals to use the power tactic Exchange, the less Intimacy was felt among teachers. Teachers' perceptions of their principals' use of Ingratiation, Upward Appeal, and Coalitions did not affect their perceptions of the teachers' behaviors as a group.

Apparently, principals used Assertiveness and Sanctions in relation to the routine tasks of the school since teachers perceived they were burdened with routine assignments (high Hindrance) by principals who used those tactics most often. Teachers appeared to respond to the use of Rationality by being more engaged in their jobs (low Disengagement) and having high morale (high Esprit). Since perceptions of the increased use of the power tactic Exchange appeared to result in less friendly relations among teachers (low Intimacy), it seemed possible that this power tactic was used on an individual basis. Perhaps, when a principal was perceived to exchange benefits with an individual teacher others were resentful and less likely to interact with one another. Another possibility was that when teachers did not experience friendly relations on the job, the principal counteracted by attempting to gain compliance by exchanging benefits with individual teachers.

Research question 5. What relationships exist between the power strategies teachers perceive are used by elementary principals and the principal dimensions measured by the OCDQ?

The four principal behavior dimensions measured by the OCDQ were Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration. The data revealed that there were significant relationships between

teachers' perceptions of these principal behaviors and the principals' use of power tactics. The perceptions of principals' Thrust and Consideration behaviors were affected by teachers' perceptions of principals' use of Rationality, Ingratiation, Coalitions, Exchange, Assertiveness, and Sanctions. The more teachers perceived principals to use Rationality, Ingratiation, Coalitions, and Exchange the more considerate and task oriented principals were perceived by teachers. The more teachers perceived principals to use Assertiveness and Sanctions the less considerate and task oriented principals were perceived by teachers. Further analysis of the findings indicated that teachers' perceptions of their principals' Aloofness and Production Emphasis behaviors were related to their perceptions of the principals' use of Upward Appeal, Assertiveness, and Sanctions. The more teachers perceived principals to use Upward Appeal, Assertiveness, and Sanctions the more aloof and preoccupied with tasks the principal was perceived by teachers.

It appeared that teachers' perceptions of their principals' behaviors were based on their perceptions of the ways in which the principal attempted to influence teachers. Principals who were attempting to influence teachers through the tactics Rationality, Ingratiation, Coalitions, and Exchange were viewed by teachers to be moving their organizations forward and at the same time being considerate of teachers. In contrast, principals who were attempting to influence teachers through the use of Assertiveness, Upward Appeal, and Sanctions were viewed by teachers to be more distant and to be managing rather than leading their organizations.

Limitations

Following are limitations which may have affected the results of the study.

1. The statistical procedures utilized to treat the data imposed some limitations on the research design. These limitations were associated with the statistic and its attendant assumptions.
2. The administration of the PPPTS and OCDQ was not conducted in a controlled environment. Participants may have expended varying amounts of time and effort in completing the instruments. Varying interpretations of instructions and questionnaire items may have caused some participants to respond to the same item in different ways.
3. The PPPTS did not provide the opportunity for teachers to think about their principals' use of positive Sanctions (rewards). Perhaps the inclusion of items about rewards would have resulted in different findings regarding this power tactic category.
4. The PPPTS included only three items related to the power tactic Upward Appeal and only two items related to the power tactic Coalitions that were used in the statistical treatment of the data. So few items may not have provided sufficient opportunity for teachers to respond to these categories.
5. The sample was not sufficiently large enough to identify more than a few cases in the following climate profiles: Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, and Paternal. Caution should be used in interpreting the findings related to these climate profile categories.

Discussion

Teachers' perceptions of principals' use of the power tactics Exchange, Coalitions, Rationality, and Ingratiation were significantly related to higher Thrust and Consideration behaviors by the principal. Conversely, teachers' perceptions of principals' use of the power tactics Sanctions and Assertiveness were significantly related to lower Thrust and Consideration behaviors. Furthermore, principals who were perceived to use Sanctions and Assertiveness were also perceived to be higher in the dimensions of Aloofness and Production Emphasis. Teachers' perceptions of their principals' behavior appeared to be influenced by the way principals attempted to get teachers to do what the principal wanted. It would seem apparent that elementary principals who are interested in creating more open climates should increase their use of the power tactics Exchange, Coalitions, Rationality, and Ingratiation as well as reduce their use of Sanctions and Assertiveness. In order for principals to implement this strategy they would need to examine their own behaviors and check teacher perceptions of their behavior. Then they would need to make conscious choices about actions that would be viewed positively by teachers while achieving the goals of the school.

Though teachers perceived principals to use Sanctions very seldom and Assertiveness seldom, these two power tactics seemed to have a notable impact on teachers' negative perceptions of the schools' climates. This was the case among all measures of school climate: climate profiles, openness scores, teacher behaviors as well as principal behaviors. Principals probably should use these power tactics with great caution if they hope to create open climates in

their schools.

The greater number of Closed climate schools (17 or 34%) was a disappointing yet not surprising finding. The public has been pressuring schools to change. However, change can upset established ways of doing things. Staffs in the schools of the 1980s are older, more experienced, and less transient than staffs of earlier decades (National Education Association 1983). The kind of leadership that was appropriate in the schools of the 1950s and 1960s with younger and more mobile staffs would not necessarily be appropriate in the 1980s. Perhaps, principals have been leading schools in a way that was suitable twenty years ago when many of them received their training and began their administrative careers but unsuitable for today's schools. Being uncomfortable with the need to change and perceiving the need for change to be initiated from outside the schools may have caused principals to behave in ways that created Closed climate schools. In turn, teachers responded to principals' leadership in ways that contributed to the creation of Closed climates.

Coalitions and Exchange were two power tactics associated with more open climates as well as teachers' perceptions of principals' Thrust and Consideration behaviors. However, teachers perceived principals used these tactics only seldom to occasionally. Principals should experiment with the use of these tactics for influencing teachers since they appear to have a positive effect on schools' climates. One possibility would be to form a core group that is supportive of the principal's position. Another group might be composed of supportive teachers in addition to a teacher who the principal wants to influence. Principals could consciously look for

ways to do favors for teachers. For example, the principal could take over a teacher's class while the teacher observes another professional.

A number of significant findings converged upon the Closed climate schools. Principals in Closed climate schools were perceived to use more Assertiveness and Sanctions along with less Rationality and Ingratiation. The use of Sanctions and Assertiveness was significantly related to the teacher behavior Hindrance. Hindrance referred to teachers feeling burdened by unnecessary "busywork." Thus, it would seem that the use of Sanctions and Assertiveness was associated with routine tasks by teachers. By relieving teachers of burdensome duties and committee assignments, principals in the Closed climate schools might move their schools toward more open climates. Furthermore, it would become unnecessary to influence teachers for those purposes if, in fact, teachers no longer performed them. Another possibility would be for principals to increase their use of Rationality and Ingratiation to get teachers to perform the burdensome but necessary tasks of the school. Principals who were perceived to use more Rationality were in schools in which teachers were more engaged in their jobs, there was higher morale, and the climates were more open.

Principals in schools that teachers perceived to have Paternal climates were perceived to use significantly more Ingratiation but significantly less Assertiveness than principals in Closed climate schools. These principals seemed to be particularly reluctant to confront teachers and their ingratiating behavior apparently was not viewed as authentic by teachers. This may have been related to their personalities as much as to their conscious use of power. This finding seems to imply that combining the use of a tactic (Ingratiation) that

generally had a positive result with one (Assertiveness) that generally had a negative result did not produce an open climate school.

One contradiction between the findings of this study and the findings from the literature was notable to the writer. The effective schools research identified principals who were assertive instructional leaders, were disciplinarians, supervised their teachers, and rewarded outstanding performance to lead the more effective schools. This study did not adequately deal with the aspect of rewards as a part of the power tactic Sanctions. However, Assertiveness was seldom used by principals in the study. Perhaps the literature had a different connotation for the term assertiveness. Another reasonable rationale for this disagreement was that principals in the study were not assertive when dealing with those aspects that were important in creating effective schools such as setting goals. When principals were assertive it was related to the routine tasks of the school. Perhaps principals needed to identify their goals when using power tactics then use those that would get the job done. If teachers felt the goals were important, then they might perceive the use of Sanctions and Assertiveness to be acceptable ways to influence teachers.

The literature did suggest that expert and referent power were related to more satisfied teachers. In this study, the power tactics Rationality and Ingratiation were the closest correlates to these power bases. Principals in the study were perceived to use Rationality and Ingratiation more often than other power tactics. Principals in the more open climate schools were also perceived to use more Rationality and Ingratiation. In this case these data from the study and the literature appeared to agree.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the data from this study as well as insights from the literature. They are suggested for further research and implementation in the areas of school climate and use of power by elementary principals.

1. Principals should study the concept of power as well as its uses and the predictable patterns of responses that their use will generate among followers.

2. Elementary principals should develop a repertoire of skills for influencing teachers in order to develop productive and satisfying school climates.

3. Elementary principals should first use Rationality when attempting to influence teachers. This power tactic had the most positive effect on teachers' perceptions of the schools' climates.

4. Elementary principals should use Sanctions as "punishment" and Assertiveness only when it has been deemed absolutely necessary. Though these power tactics were seldom used by principals, when they were used they had a negative effect on teachers' perceptions of the schools' climates.

5. Elementary principals should use Ingratiation only when it is sincere. When teachers perceived principals' ingratiating behavior was less than sincere, the schools' climates were perceived to be more closed.

6. Elementary principals must recognize their unique position in the educational community to influence school climate. In turn, principals must take responsibility for the climates in their schools.

7. Elementary principals need to examine the perceptions of various groups (students, teachers, parents) of the organizational climate of their schools. Instruments such as the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Halpin and Croft 1963) or CFK Ltd. (Fox et al. 1974) are instruments that could assist in such an assessment. The information gained from this assessment should be used to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the school's climate and assist in setting high but obtainable goals.

8. Elementary principals need to identify ways to make their teachers feel more empowered. Teachers who feel powerless are likely to hinder the efforts of principals in creating positive school climates.

9. This study should be replicated using a larger sample. More sample schools in the profile categories Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, and Paternal are needed to determine the pattern of power strategies used by principals in those schools.

10. Further study of the ways in which principals attempt to influence teachers should be conducted. A research method used by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) could be used to determine ways principals attempt to influence teachers and what goals principals are attempting to achieve through the use of those strategies.

11. Further study of the uses of power and its effects on different faculty compositions such as age, sex, experience, and ethnicity should be conducted.

12. Further study related to leadership styles and the uses of power should be conducted. The study should attempt to identify the power tactics related to a particular leadership style and their

effectiveness in developing positive school climates.

13. Elementary principals, individually and through their professional organizations, need to examine ways in which principals can influence their school climates so that they are productive and satisfying places to be for students, staff, and community. The State and National Association of Elementary School Principals should develop seminars and provide training that would assist principals in this endeavor.

14. Elementary principals should study Standards for Quality Elementary Schools (National Association of Elementary School Principals 1984) and Proficiencies for Principals (National Association of Elementary School Principals 1986). These two publications would assist principals in assessing the quality of their schools' climates, their own leadership, and other standards and their related proficiencies.

15. Elementary principals need to assist their staffs in identifying goals and objectives for their schools. These goals and objectives should be guides for the curriculum and instruction as well as all other activities on which the school chooses to focus. Identifying goals and objectives is essential to creation of satisfying and productive school climates.

16. School districts should identify the attitudes, beliefs, and values as well as the administrative skills needed to develop productive and satisfying school climates, then employ principals who have these attitudes, beliefs, values, and skills.

17. School districts should also employ teachers who have the attitudes, values, and beliefs needed to develop productive and

satisfying school climates. Shared attitudes, values, and beliefs are important in developing strong school climates.

18. Institutions that train elementary school principals need to include in their curriculum skills related to diagnosing and building positive school climates as well as the skills most effective for influencing teachers and simultaneously developing positive climates. Principals must also be trained to clearly articulate their attitudes, beliefs, and values to their staffs and communities.

19. Elementary principals must examine their leadership carefully. Through self-assessment they should identify how they can serve their students, teachers, and communities in keeping with shared values.

APPENDIX A
LETTER TO PRINCIPALS



September 3, 1985

Dear

I am a doctoral student at the University of North Dakota and am conducting research for a dissertation concerned with principals' use of power strategies and its relationship to the schools' climate. The study will consist of asking a sample of full-time teachers in fifty North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota schools to complete two instruments that take approximately twenty minutes.

This study will be restricted to schools in which the principal has served full-time in only one school two or more years and to full-time teachers in that school who have taught two or more years under that principal's supervision. Full-time teachers for this study are defined as professional staff who have direct contact with students on a full-time basis. This includes classroom teachers, special education teachers, etc., but not counselors or teachers who teach only part-time. If you have served in your present position for the past two years, I need the participation of your school and your teachers.

You have my assurance that the information the teachers provide will be treated with strict confidentiality. Neither you nor your school will be identified. The information from this study will be useful to you as a principal, since an understanding of how principals influence the climate of their schools and, in turn, provide quality education for students is an important issue. Next spring I will provide a summary of the findings to all principals whose schools have participated in the study.

If you have served in your present position for the past two years, please complete and return the enclosed form. Please inform your teachers that they may be receiving a letter requesting their participation and the questionnaires. Also, please inform them that you have given your permission for their participation.

My goal is to have the questionnaires mailed to teachers by September 18. I would appreciate your response no later than September 11 so that there will be time to complete the necessary preparations for mailing.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. I am looking forward to hearing from you by September 11. If you have any questions regarding this study, please call me at the University of North Dakota (701) 777-3245.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ann W. Porter".

Ann W. Porter
Ed.D. Student

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Donald K. Lemon".

Approved by Advisor
Donald K. Lemon

APPENDIX B
SCHOOL PARTICIPATION FORM

SCHOOL PARTICIPATION FORM

Principal's Name _____

Years of Experience in present school _____

Total Years Experience as an administrator _____

School _____

_____ Yes, my teachers may participate in this study

_____ No, I have not served in my school two or more years

_____ No, I served as principal in more than one school in the past two years

Names of full-time teachers who have taught two or more years in this school under my supervision:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

6. _____

7. _____

8. _____

9. _____

10. _____

11. _____

12. _____

13. _____

14. _____

15. _____

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF PERMISSION

MACMILLAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
A DIVISION OF MACMILLAN, INC.
866 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022

July 10, 1985

Ms. Ann W. Porter
The University of North Dakota
Center for Teaching and Learning
Box 8158, University Station
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58202

Dear Ms. Porter:

You have our permission to use the "Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire" from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew W. Halpin, subject to the following limitations:

Permission is granted for usage of the instrument in the manner and for the purpose as specified in your letter of June 19, 1985, and in all copies to meet degree requirements including University Microfilms edition. New permission is required if the dissertation is later accepted for commercial publication;

Full credit must be given on every copy reproduced as follows:

Reprinted with permission of Macmillan Publishing Company from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew W. Halpin. © Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1966.

Permission is granted for a fee of \$35.00. This fee is payable upon signing this letter of agreement.

If you are in agreement, kindly sign and return one copy of this letter with your remittance; the second copy is for your records.

Thank you and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Agnes Fisher
(Mrs.) Agnes Fisher
Permissions Manager

AGREED TO AND ACCEPTED:

Ann W. Porter
Ann W. Porter

APPENDIX D

PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL POWER TACTICS SURVEY

PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL POWER TACTICS SURVEY

This questionnaire is a way of obtaining information about how your principal goes about changing teachers' minds so that they agree with him. Below are described various ways of doing this. Describe the degree of frequency your principal uses each item to influence a teacher or teachers by circling one of the five numbers to show the answers you have selected.

5 = usually uses this tactic to influence teachers

4 = frequently uses this tactic to influence teachers

3 = occasionally uses this tactic to influence teachers

2 = seldom uses this tactic to influence teachers

1 = never uses this tactic to influence teachers

How frequently does your principal use this tactic to influence teachers?

	usually	frequently	occasionally	seldom	never
1. My principal sympathizes with teachers about the added problems that his/her request has caused.	5	4	3	2	1
2. My principal threatens to give teachers an unsatisfactory performance evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1
3. My principal offers to help if teachers would do what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
4. My principal acts humbly to teachers while making a request.	5	4	3	2	1
5. My principal shows his/her appreciation of teachers' help.	5	4	3	2	1
6. My principal sets a time deadline for teachers to do what is asked.	5	4	3	2	1
7. My principal obtains the support of other principals to back up his/her requests.	5	4	3	2	1
8. My principal uses logic to convince teachers.	5	4	3	2	1

(continued on back)

	usually	frequently	occasionally	seldom	never
9. My principal promises (or gives) incentives (e.g. permission to attend a special conference).	5	4	3	2	1
10. My principal acts in a friendly manner prior to asking for what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
11. My principal demands that teachers do what is requested.	5	4	3	2	1
12. My principal tells teachers that the work must be done as ordered or teachers should propose a better way.	5	4	3	2	1
13. My principal obtains the informal support of higher-ups.	5	4	3	2	1
14. My principal explains in a memo what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
15. My principal files a report about teachers with higher-ups (e.g., the superintendent).	5	4	3	2	1
16. My principal threatens teachers' job security (e.g., hints of getting a teacher terminated).	5	4	3	2	1
17. My principal reminds teachers of past favors that he/she did for them and now would like a favor in return.	5	4	3	2	1
18. My principal makes teachers feel good about him/her before making a request.	5	4	3	2	1
19. My principal explains the reasons for his/her request.	5	4	3	2	1
20. My principal obtains the support of other teachers to back up his/her request.	5	4	3	2	1
21. My principal sends teachers to the superintendent.	5	4	3	2	1
22. My principal threatens to withdraw an incentive (e.g., to deny a requested re-assignment).	5	4	3	2	1

	usually	frequently	occasionally	seldom	never
23. My principal offers an exchange (e.g., if you do this for me, I will do something for you).	5	4	3	2	1
24. My principal praises teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
25. My principal inflates the importance of what he/she wants teachers to do.	5	4	3	2	1
26. My principal presents teachers with information in support of his/her point of view.	5	4	3	2	1
27. My principal bawls teachers out.	5	4	3	2	1
28. My principal writes a detailed plan that justifies his/her ideas.	5	4	3	2	1
29. My principal offers to compromise over the issue (he/she gives in a little).	5	4	3	2	1
30. My principal repeatedly reminds teachers about what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
31. My principal waits until teachers appear in a receptive mood before asking.	5	4	3	2	1
32. My principal simply orders teachers to do what is asked.	5	4	3	2	1
33. My principal makes teachers feel important ("only you have the brains, talent to do this").	5	4	3	2	1
34. My principal prevents a teacher from getting an incentive (e.g., a merit salary increase or a teacher aide).	5	4	3	2	1
35. My principal offers to make a personal sacrifice if a teacher will do what he/she wants (e.g., take over a teacher's class, do his/her share of the work, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
36. My principal checks up on teachers to see that his/her requests are carried out.	5	4	3	2	1

(continued on back)

	usually	frequently	occasionally	seldom	never
37. My principal becomes a nuisance (e.g., keeps bugging a teacher until he/she does what he/she wants).	5	4	3	2	1
38. My principal expresses anger verbally.	5	4	3	2	1
39. My principal does personal favors for teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
40. My principal makes a request of a teacher at a faculty meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
41. My principal makes a formal appeal to higher levels to back up his/her request.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX E

PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL POWER TACTICS SURVEY

(ITEMS IDENTIFIED)

**PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL POWER TACTIC SURVEY
(POWER TACTICS IDENTIFIED)**

This questionnaire is a way of obtaining information about how your principal goes about changing teachers' minds so that they agree with him. Below are described various ways of doing this. Describe the degree of frequency your principal uses each item below to influence a teacher or teachers.

5 = usually uses this tactic to influence teachers

4 = frequently uses this tactic to influence teachers

3 = occasionally uses this tactic to influence teachers

2 = seldom uses this tactic to influence teachers

1 = never uses this tactic to influence teachers

(Power Strategies - Number of items)

Assertiveness	9
Ingratiation	9
Rationality	5
Sanctions	5
Exchange	6
Upward Appeal	4
Coalition	3

How frequently does
your principal use
this tactic to influence
teachers?

1.	My principal sympathizes with teachers about the added problems that his/her request has caused.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
2.	My principal threatens to give teachers an unsatisfactory performance evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1
	Sanctions					
3.	My principal offers to help if teachers would do what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
	Exchange					
4.	My principal acts humbly to teachers while making a request.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
5.	My principal shows his/her need for teachers' help.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					

6.	My principal sets a time deadline for teachers to do what is asked.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
7.	My principal obtains the support of other principals to back up his/her requests.	5	4	3	2	1
	Coalition					
8.	My principal uses logic to convince teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
	Rationality					
9.	My principal promises (or gives) incentives (e.g. permission to attend a conference).	5	4	3	2	1
	Sanctions					
10.	My principal acts in a friendly manner prior to asking for what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
11.	My principal demands that teachers do what is requested.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
12.	My principal tells teachers that the work must be done as ordered or teachers should propose a better way.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
13.	My principal obtains the informal support of higher-ups.	5	4	3	2	1
	Upward Appeal					
14.	My principal writes a memo that describes what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
	Rationality					
15.	My principal files a report about teachers with higher-ups (e.g. the superintendent).	5	4	3	2	1
	Upward Appeal					
16.	My principal threatens teachers' job security (e.g. hints of getting a teacher terminated).	5	4	3	2	1
	Sanctions					
17.	My principal reminds teachers of past favors that he/she did for them.	5	4	3	2	1
	Exchange					

18.	My principal makes teachers feel good about him/her before making a request.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
19.	My principal explains the reasons for his/her request.	5	4	3	2	1
	Rationality					
20.	My principal obtains the support of other teachers to back up his/her request.	5	4	3	2	
	Coalition					
21.	My principal sends teachers to the superintendent.	5	4	3	2	1
	Upward Appeal					
22.	My principal threatens to withdraw an incentive (e.g. to deny a requested reassignment).	5	4	3	2	1
	Sanctions					
23.	My principal offers an exchange (e.g. if you do this for me, I will do something for you).	5	4	3	2	1
	Exchange					
24.	My principal praises teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
25.	My principal inflates the importance of what he/she wants teachers to do.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
26.	My principal presents teachers with information in support of his/her point of view.	5	4	3	2	1
	Rationality					
27.	My principal bawls teachers out.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
28.	My principal writes a detailed plan that justifies his/her ideas.	5	4	3	2	1
	Rationality					
29.	My principal offers to compromise over the issue (he/she gives in a little).	5	4	3	2	1
	Exchange					
30.	My principal repeatedly reminds teachers about what he/she wants.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					

31.	My principal waits until teachers appear in a receptive mood before asking.	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
32.	My principal simply orders teachers to do what is asked.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
33.	My principal makes teachers feel important ("only you have the brains, talent to do this").	5	4	3	2	1
	Ingratiation					
34.	My principal prevents a teacher from getting an incentive (e.g. a merit salary increase or a teacher aide).	5	4	3	2	1
	Sanctions					
35.	My principal offers to make a personal sacrifice if a teacher will do what he/she wants (e.g. take over teacher's class, do his/her share of the work, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
	Exchange					
36.	My principal keeps checking up on teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
37.	My principal becomes a nuisance (keeps bugging a teacher until he/she does what he/she wants).	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
38.	My principal expresses anger verbally.	5	4	3	2	1
	Assertiveness					
39.	My principal does personal favors for teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
	Exchange					
40.	My principal has a teacher come to a formal conference at which he/she makes the request.	5	4	3	2	1
	Coalitions					
41.	My principal makes a formal appeal to higher levels to back up his/her request.	5	4	3	2	1
	Upward Appeal					

APPENDIX F
LETTER TO TEACHERS



September 18, 1985

Dear

I am a doctoral student at the University of North Dakota and am conducting research for a dissertation concerned with principals' use of power strategies and its relationship to the schools' climate. I am asking seven full-time teachers in each of fifty schools located in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota to complete two instruments: the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Perception of Principal Power Tactics Survey. It should take about twenty minutes to complete the two questionnaires.

has given permission for you and other teachers at Elementary School to participate. As a full-time teacher under her supervision for the past two years, you will have knowledge of your school's teaching and learning climate as well as your principal's leadership behavior. For those reasons I need your participation in this study.

You have my assurance that the information you provide will be treated with strict confidentiality. Neither you, your principal, nor your school will be identified. The information from this study will, however, assist principals to understand how their behaviors influence the climate of a school and, in turn, support teacher efforts to provide quality education for students.

The questionnaires each have a set of directions. Please read the directions carefully and then respond to ALL the items. Return the questionnaires in the enclosed stamped-self-addressed envelope. My goal is to have all the questionnaires returned by October 2, 1985.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to call me at the University of North Dakota (701) 777-3245. Thank you very much for your cooperation and participation!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Ann Porter'.

Ann Porter,
Graduate Student

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Donald K. Lemon'.

Approved by Advisor,
Donald K. Lemon

APPENDIX G
OPENNESS SCORES AND SCHOOLS CLIMATE PROFILES
AMONG FIFTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN
NORTH DAKOTA AND MINNESOTA

OPENNESS SCORES AND SCHOOL CLIMATE PROFILES AMONG FIFTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
IN NORTH DAKOTA AND NORTHWESTERN MINNESOTA

<u>School ID</u>	<u>Openness Score</u>	<u>Climate Profile</u>
25	76	Open
26	76	Open
30	70	Open
49	70	Controlled
4	68	Open
13	66	Open
22	65	Open
47	64	Open
44	64	Open
15	63	Familiar
31	61	Open
16	61	Controlled
48	60	Controlled
38	60	Controlled
6	60	Autonomous
39	58	Familiar
1	58	Autonomous
45	55	Controlled
28	55	Familiar
24	55	Open
9	55	Paternal
32	54	Autonomous
14	54	Closed
18	54	Controlled
20	54	Autonomous
52	53	Open
19	53	Controlled
11	52	Paternal
7	51	Paternal
34	50	Paternal
40	48	Autonomous
50	45	Closed
23	44	Closed
43	43	Paternal
46	41	Closed
27	41	Paternal
35	39	Closed
5	38	Closed
12	38	Closed
37	37	Closed
33	37	Closed
21	36	Closed
3	34	Closed
2	33	Closed
42	31	Paternal
8	29	Closed
17	20	Closed
29	16	Closed
51	15	Closed
10	12	Closed

REFERENCES

- Allen, Robert W.; Madison, Dan L.; Porter, Lyman W.; Renwick, Patricia A.; and Mayes, Bronston T. "Organizational Politics: Tactics and Characteristics." California Management Review 22 (Fall 1979): 77-83.
- Appleberry, James B., and Hoy, Wayne K. "The Pupil Control Ideology of Professional Personnel in 'Open' and 'Closed' Elementary Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly 5 (Autumn 1969): 74-85.
- Argyris, Chris. "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank." Administrative Science Quarterly 24 (March 1958): 501-20.
- Boyd, William Lowe, and Crowson, Robert L. "The Changing Conception and Practice of Public School Administration." In Review of Research in Education, pp. 311-73. Edited by David C. Berliner. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, 1981.
- Brewer, F. Gary. "Secondary School Principals' Leadership Behavior and the Atmosphere of the School as Perceived by Teachers, Principals, and Superintendents." Ed.D. dissertation, Northwestern State University of Louisiana, 1980.
- Bridges, Edwin M. "Research on the School Administrator." Educational Administration Quarterly 18 (Summer 1982): 12-33.
- Brookover, Wilbur; Beady, Charles; Flood, Patricia; Schweitzer, John; and Wisenbaker, Joe. School Social Systems and School Achievement. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1979.
- Brookover, Wilbur B., and Lezotte, Lawrence W. Changes in School Characteristics Coincident With Changes in Student Achievement. East Lansing, MI: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 181 005, 1979. (Occasional Paper No. 17.)
- Cartwright, Dorwin. "Power: A Neglected Variable In Social Psychology." In Studies in Social Power, pp. 1-14. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, 1959.

- Coleman, James S.; Campbell, Ernest O.; Hobson, Carol J.; McPartland, James; Mood, Alexander M.; Weinfeld, Frederic D.; and York, Robert L. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Coleman, Peter. "Towards More Effective Schools: Improving Elementary Schools: Improving Elementary School Climate." Administrator's Notebook 31 (1983): 4 pages.
- Craig, Larry Vernon. "The Effects of Organizational Climate and Leadership Behavior on Teacher Job Satisfaction in Selected Schools." Ph.D. dissertation, North Texas State University, 1979.
- Cross, Ray. "What Makes an Effective Principal?" Principal 60 (March 1981): 19-22.
- Cuming, Pamela. The Power Handbook: A Strategic Guide to Organizational and Personal Effectiveness. Boston: CBI Publishing Company, Inc., 1981.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. "Leaders and Leadership: 1985 and Beyond." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (September 1985): 17-20.
- Dahl, Robert A. "The Concept of Power." Behavioral Science 2 (July 1957): 201-18.
- Deal, Terrence E., and Kennedy, Allen A. Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1982.
- Dugan, Peter Jerome. "The Relationship Between The Communication Behavior of Elementary School Principals and the Organizational Climates of Their Schools." Ed.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1967.
- Edmonds, Ronald. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37 (October 1979): 15-24.
- Education Commission of the States. A Summary of the Major Reports of Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1983.
- Eicholtz, Robert L. "School Climate: Key to Excellence." American Education 20 (January-February 1984): 22-26.
- Fairholm, Gil, and Fairholm, Barbara C. "Sixteen Power Tactics Principals Can Use to Improve Management Effectiveness." NASSP Bulletin 68 (May 1984): 68-75.

- Fox, Robert S.; Boies, Herbert E.; Brainard, Edward; Fletcher, Edward; Huge, James S.; Martin, Cecelia L.; Maynard, William; Monasmith, James; Olivero, James; Schmuck, Richard; Shaheen, Thomas A.; and Stegeman, William H. School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974.
- Franklin, Arthur Jewel. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Selected Characteristics of Principals and Organizational Climate of Junior High Schools in the State of Louisiana." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1968.
- French, John R. P., and Raven, Bertram. "The Bases of Social Power." In Studies in Social Power, pp. 150-67. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, 1959.
- Gioia, Dennis A., and Sims, Henry P., Jr. "Perceptions of Managerial Power as a Consequence of Managerial Behavior and Reputation." Journal of Management 9 (Spring-Summer 1983): 7-26.
- Goodlad, John I. "A Study of Schooling: Some Findings and Hypotheses." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (March 1983): 465-70.
- _____. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984.
- Grant, Gerald. "The Character of Education and the Education of Character." Daedalus 110 (Summer 1981): 135-49.
- Guditus, Charles W., and Zirkel, Perry A. "Bases of Supervisory Power Among Public School Principals." Administrator's Notebook 28 (1979-80): 4 pages.
- Hagberg, Janet O. Real Power: The Stages of Personal Power on Organizations. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, Inc., 1984.
- Hagensee, Theodore E. "A Comparison of the Leadership Styles of Principals and Factors of Organizational Climates of Selected Open Space Suburban Elementary Schools." Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1980.
- Hall, Richard H. Organizations: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Halpin, Andrew W., and Croft, Don B. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1963.

- Hauser, Robert M.; Sewell, William H.; and Alwin, Duane F. "High School Effects on Achievement." In Schooling and Achievement in American Society, pp. 309-41. Edited by William H. Sewell, Robert M. Hauser, and David L. Featherman. New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- Herlihy, Barbara, and Herlihy, Dennis. "Improving Principal-Teacher Relationships by Understanding the Concepts of Power." NASSP Bulletin 69 (December 1985): 95-102.
- Hersey, Paul, and Blanchard, Kenneth H. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Jencks, Christopher S. "The Coleman Report and The Conventional Wisdom." In On Equality of Educational Opportunity, pp. 69-115. Edited by Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan. New York: Random House, Inc., 1972.
- Joyce, Bruce R.; Hersh, Richard H.; and McKibbin, Michael. The Structure of School Improvement. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Joyce, William F., and Slocum, John W. "Climates in Organizations." In Organizational Behavior, pp. 317-33. Edited by Steven Kerr. Columbus, OH: Grid Publishing Co., 1979.
- Kadushin, Charles. "Power, Influence and Social Circles: A New Methodology for Studying Opinion Makers." American Sociological Review 33 (October 1968): 685-99.
- Kanell, Karen L. "A Comparison of Principals' Preference for 'Change Via Credibility' and Its Relation to Organizational Climate, Principals' Leader Behavior, and Teachers' Attitudes Toward Change." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1980.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. The Change Masters. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1983.
- Keefe, James W.; Kelley, Edgar A.; and Miller, Stephen K. "School Climate: Clear Definitions and a Model for a Larger Setting." NASSP Bulletin 69 (November 1985): 70-77.
- Kipnis, David; Schmidt, Stuart M.; and Wilkinson, Ian. "Introrganizational Influence Tactics: Explorations in Getting One's Way." Journal of Applied Psychology 65 (August 1980): 440-52.
- Kirst, Michale W. "The Changing Balance in State and Local Power to Control Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 189-91.
- Kobayashi, K. Jessie. "A Comparison of Organizational Climate of Schools Administered by Female and Male Elementary School Principals." Ed.D. dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1974.

- Kotter, John P. "Power, Dependence, and Effective Management." Harvard Business Review 55 (July-August 1977): 125-36.
- Lake, Dale G.; Miles, Matthew B.; and Earle, Ralph B., Jr., eds. Measuring Human Behavior. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.
- Lake, Jevoner Frankie. "An Investigation of Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers, and Schools With Two Dimensions of Organizational Climate in the Public Schools of Caroline County, Maryland." Ed.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1977.
- Lieberman, Ann, and Shiman, David A. "The Stages of Change in Elementary School Settings." In The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator, pp. 49-71. Edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Litwin, George H. "Climate and Motivation: An Experimental Study." In Organizational Climate: An Exploration of a Concept, pp. 170-90. Edited by Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin. Boston: Division of Research, School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.
- McCall, Morgan W. "Power, Authority, and Influence." In Organizational Behavior, pp. 185-206. Edited by Steven Kerr. Columbus, OH: Grid Publishing Co., 1979.
- McClelland, David C. "The Dynamics of Power and Affiliation Motivation." In Organizational Psychology: A Book of Readings, pp. 141-61. Edited by David A. Kolb, Irwin M. Rubin, and James M. McIntyre. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Maccoby, Michael. The Leader. New York: Ballantine Books, 1983.
- Madaus, George F.; Airasian, Peter W.; and Kellaghan, Thomas. School Effectiveness: A Reassessment of the Evidence. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980.
- Mann, Dale. "Making Change Happen?" Teachers College Record 77 (February 1976): 313-22.
- Manning, James Edward. "The Differences Between Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers, and Schools Within Two Categories of Organizational Climate." Ed.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1973.

- Meyer, Herbert H. "Achievement Motivation and Industrial Climates." In Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept, pp. 151-66. Edited by Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin. Boston: Division of Research, School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.
- Muth, Rodney. "Toward an Integrative Theory of Power and Educational Organizations." Educational Administration Quarterly 20 (Spring 1984): 25-42.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. Standards for Quality Elementary Schools: Kindergarten through Eighth Grade. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1984.
- _____. Elementary and Middle Schools Proficiencies for Principals: Kindergarten through Eighth Grade. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1986.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education, The. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.
- National Education Association. Nationwide Teacher Opinion Poll, 1983. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1983.
- Parker, Thomas Meredith, Jr. "The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction of Elementary Teachers." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1974.
- Petasis, Aris Poludoros. "The Relationship of Organizational Climate to Selected Variables." Ed.D. dissertation, Drake University, 1974.
- Pfeffer, Jeffery. Power in Organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Inc., 1981.
- Phi Delta Kappa. Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 194 660, 1980.
- Powell, Lek Etta. "The Differences Between Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers and Schools Within Two Dimensions of Organizational Climate in Public Schools of Carroll County, Maryland." Ed.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1976.
- Redfern, George B. "Principal Power: Learning to Live with Less." National Elementary Principal 58 (March 1979): 55-61.

- Rost, Joseph C. "The Politics of Leadership." Paper presented at the 35th annual meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, San Marcos, Texas, 19 August 1982.
- Rutter, Michael; Maughan, Barbara; Mortimore, Peter; and Ouston, Janet. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Sarason, Seymour B. "The Principal and the Power to Change." National Elementary Principal 53 (July/August 1974): 47-53.
- _____. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.
- Sashkin, Marshall, and Morris, William C. Organizational Behavior: Concepts and Experiences. Reston, VA: Reston Publishing Company, Inc., 1984.
- Schneider, Barbara L. "Further Evidence of School Effects." Journal of Educational Research 78 (July/August 1985): 351-56.
- Sellars, Phillip L. "A Comparative Study of School Climate and the Leadership Style of School Principals." Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1984.
- Shoemaker, Joan, and Fraser, Hugh W. "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications From Studies of Effective Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 178-82.
- Simon, Yves. Nature and Functions of Authority. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1948.
- Sisson, Robert Franklin, Jr. "An Investigation of Perceptions and of Relationships Between Selected Characteristics of Principals, Teachers, and Schools Relative to Organizational Climate." Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College of Teachers, 1979.
- SPSS Inc. SPSSX: User's Guide. Chicago: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1983.
- Squires, David A.; Huitt, William G.; and Segars, John K. Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.
- State of New York. Office of Education Performance Review. School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools. March 1974.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press, 1974.

- Tagiuri, Renato. "The Concept of Organizational Climate." In Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept, pp. 11-32. Edited by Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin. Boston: Division of Research, School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.
- Tanner, Daniel. "The American High School at the Crossroads." Educational Leadership 41 (March 1984): 4-13.
- Tirpak, Richard. "Relationships Between Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools and Personal Characteristics of the Schools' Principals." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Akron, 1970.
- Tye, Kenneth A. "The Elementary School Principal: Key to Educational Change." In The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator, pp. 25-33. Edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Warren, Donald I. "Power, Visibility, and Conformity in Formal Organizations." American Sociological Review 33 (December 1968): 951-70.
- Weber, George. Inner-City Children can be taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 1971.
- Wigginton, Eliot. "The Question of Power." National Elementary Principal 65 (May 1986): 30-32.
- Wilson, William Lynn. "Organizational Climate, Teachers' Attitudes, Teachers' Demographic Data, and Perceived Effectiveness of Teachers." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1980.
- Wood, Fred H.; Johnson, Gil; and Paden, Jon. "Will This New Round of Recommendations for High Schools Make a Difference?" Educational Leadership 41 (March 1984): 69-72.
- Woodward, Audie Wayne. "The Relationship Between Perceived Nonverbal Behavior of Principals and Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools." Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1974.
- Wrong, Dennis H. Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979.
- Yukl, Gary. "Managerial Leadership and the Effective Principal." In The Effective Principal: A Research Summary, pp. 1-13. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982.
- Yukl, Gary A. Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Zander, Alvin; Cohen, Arthur R.; and Stotland, Ezra. "Power and the Relations Among Professions." In Studies in Social Power, pp. 15-34. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, 1959.