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ABSTRACT

EFFECTIVE AND LESS EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS; DIFFERENCES IN MORALE
AND LEADER BEHAVIORS AS REVEALED BY SELECTED OBSERVATIONS

by

Jerry Albert Lynn

The purpose of this study was: (a) to determine if a significant difference exists between leadership behavior of principals in effective schools when compared to leadership behavior of principals in less effective schools as perceived by teachers, (b) to determine if a significant difference exists in teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools, and (c) to determine if a significant difference exists in the comparison of the correlations between leadership behaviors of principals and factors contributing to teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools.

A total of 158 teachers returned completed questionnaires. Leadership behavior of principals and teacher morale were measured by 83 teachers in effective schools and 75 teachers in less effective schools using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ) and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (FTO).

A significant difference was found between effective schools and less effective schools in the leader behavior persuasiveness. Significant differences were also found in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and initiation of structure and consideration.

No significant differences were found in the total mean scores of leader behavior, total mean scores of teacher morale, or the correlation between the total mean scores of leader behavior and teacher morale. No significant differences were found in leader behavior dimensions of representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, or superior orientation.

No significant differences were found in teacher morale dimensions of teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, or community pressures. No significant differences were found in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and representation,
demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, superior orientation; rapport among teachers and demand reconciliation, initiation of structure, role assumption, integration; curriculum issues and tolerance of freedom; teacher status and consideration; or school facilities and services and production emphasis. Recommendations based on the findings were given.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

One of the primary contributors to teachers' self-perception is school morale. Evidence indicates that in schools that have superior teacher morale, there is also superior instruction, which contributes to more effective learning. Consequently, researchers need to identify means of improving teacher morale. The school administrator, as the promoter of effective learning within his school, should consider the morale of his faculty as an important determinant of the success of his educational program (Wood, 1968).

As a leader with opportunities to manipulate variables affecting teachers, the school principal plays a key role in nurturing and maintaining positive teacher morale. High morale is a valid indicator that the staff is satisfied with the operation and accomplishments of the school. Teachers who feel satisfied with their work environment tend to strive for fulfillment of higher goals, and their efforts and attitudes ultimately will overflow to the student body, resulting in more productive students (Washington & Watson, 1976).

Thus, specific leadership behaviors of principals in effective schools that have a positive relationship with high teacher morale need to be identified. Such behavior will give school administrators and teachers a foundation from which to establish future goals of creating a high degree of satisfaction among principals, teachers, and students.
The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to determine why some schools are less effective than some other schools with similar student populations.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate morale and leader behaviors as possible explanations for schools being defined as more or less effective. The approach selected ought (a) to determine if teachers perceive a significant difference between leadership behavior of principals in effective schools when compared to those in less effective schools, (b) to determine if there is a significant difference in teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools, and (c) to determine if there is a significant difference in the correlations between leadership behaviors of principals and factors contributing to teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools.

Significance of the Study

Research reports on effective schools label the principal as one of the key elements in the success of a school (Robinson, 1984). The principal has the opportunity to establish an environment that boosts the morale of teachers which leads to more enthusiastic instruction. This, in turn, results in increased learning by students.

If principals are to set the stage for high morale among teachers, specific behaviors need to be identified that are considered important to the job satisfaction of teachers. Data from this study will determine
if relationships existing between leadership behaviors of school principals and the morale of school teachers of effective schools differ from those of less effective schools. Determining the morale factors and leader behaviors that show the highest correlation in effective schools can serve as a basis for principals to build their leadership skills.

**Limitations**

The following limitations were placed on this study.

1. The study was limited to teachers of public school systems within a 50-mile radius of East Tennessee State University.
2. Identification of schools was limited to 1985-86 public school directories of North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee.
3. The data collection was limited to the period May, 1987.
4. The measurement of leader behavior was limited to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII (hereafter referred to as LBDQ).
5. The measurement of teacher morale was limited to the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (hereafter referred to as PTO).

**Assumptions**

1. It was assumed that superintendents selected their most effective schools based on the criteria provided.
2. It was assumed that teachers were honest in their responses to the instruments.
3. It was assumed the instruments were valid for the purposes for which they were used.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were stated in the declarative format:

1. There will be a significant difference in the mean score of leadership behaviors of principals in effective schools when compared to the mean score of leadership behaviors of principals in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

2. There will be a significant difference in the mean score of teacher morale of teachers in effective schools when compared to the mean score of teacher morale of teachers in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

3. There will be a significant difference in the correlation between the mean score of leadership behaviors of principals and the mean score of teacher morale in effective schools when compared to the correlation between the mean score of leadership behaviors of principals and the mean score of teacher morale in less effective schools.

4. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in representation in effective schools when compared to the mean score in representation in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

5. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in demand reconciliation in effective schools when compared to the mean score in demand reconciliation in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

6. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in effective schools when compared to the mean
score in *tolerance of uncertainty* in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

7. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in *persuasiveness* in effective schools when compared to the mean score in *persuasiveness* in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

8. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in *initiation of structure* in effective schools when compared to the mean score in *initiation of structure* in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

9. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in *tolerance of freedom* in effective schools when compared to the mean score in *tolerance of freedom* in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

10. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in *role assumption* in effective schools when compared to the mean score in *role assumption* in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

11. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in *consideration* in effective schools when compared to the mean score in *consideration* in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

12. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in *production emphasis* in effective schools when compared to the mean score in *production emphasis* in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.
13. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in predictive accuracy in effective schools when compared to the mean score in predictive accuracy in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

14. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in integration in effective schools when compared to the mean score in integration in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

15. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in superior orientation in effective schools when compared to the mean score in superior orientation in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

16. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in teacher rapport with principal in effective schools when compared to the mean score in teacher rapport with principal in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

17. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in satisfaction with teaching in effective schools when compared to the mean score in satisfaction with teaching in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

18. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in rapport among teachers in effective schools when compared to the mean score in rapport among teachers in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

19. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in teacher salary in effective schools when compared to the mean score in
teacher salary in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

20. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in teacher load in effective schools when compared to the mean score in teacher load in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

21. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in curriculum issues in effective schools when compared to the mean score in curriculum issues in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

22. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in teacher status in effective schools when compared to the mean score in teacher status in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

23. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in community support of education in effective schools when compared to the mean score in community support of education in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

24. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in school facilities and services in effective schools when compared to the mean score in school facilities and services in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.

25. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in community pressures in effective schools when compared to the mean score in community pressures in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO.
26. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and representation in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and representation in less effective schools.

27. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and demand reconciliation in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and demand reconciliation in less effective schools.

28. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of uncertainty in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of uncertainty in less effective schools.

29. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and persuasiveness in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and persuasiveness in less effective schools.

30. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and initiation of structure in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and initiation of structure in less effective schools.

31. There will be a significant difference in the correlation between teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of freedom in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of freedom in less effective schools.

32. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and role assumption in
effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and role assumption in less effective schools.

33. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and consideration in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and consideration in less effective schools.

34. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and production emphasis in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and production emphasis in less effective schools.

35. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and predictive accuracy in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and predictive accuracy in less effective schools.

36. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and integration in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and integration in less effective schools.

37. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and superior orientation in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and superior orientation in less effective schools.

38. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and demand reconciliation in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and demand reconciliation in less effective schools.
39. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and initiation of structure in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and initiation of structure in less effective schools.

40. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and role assumption in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and role assumption in less effective schools.

41. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and integration in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and integration in less effective schools.

42. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between curriculum issues and tolerance of freedom in effective schools when compared to curriculum issues and tolerance of freedom in less effective schools.

43. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between teacher status and consideration in effective schools when compared to teacher status and consideration in less effective schools.

44. There will be a significant difference in the correlations between school facilities and services and production emphasis in effective schools when compared to school facilities and services and production emphasis in less effective schools.
Definition of Terms

Leader Behavior

Leader behavior is the behavior of an individual when directing the activities or a group toward a shared goal (Stodgill & Coons, 1956, p. 7).

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII is an instrument developed through the research of John F. Hemphill, and the Ohio State Leadership Studies to measure leader behaviors (Dipboye, 1978, p. 1114).

Leadership

Leadership is the ability and readiness to inspire, guide, direct or manage others; the role of interpreter of the interests and objectives of a group, the group recognizing and accepting the interpreter as spokesman (Good, 1973, p. 332).

Principal

The principal is the administrative head and professional leader of a school division or unit, such as a high school, junior high school, or elementary school (Good, 1973, p. 436).

Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire is a research instrument designed to estimate individual, school or system-wide teacher morale (Rosner, 1974, p. 973).
Teacher

A teacher is a person employed in an official capacity for the purpose of guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils or students in an educational institution, whether public or private; a person who has completed a professional curriculum in a teaching education institution and whose training has been officially recognized by the award of an appropriate teaching certificate (Good, 1973, p. 586).

Teacher Morale

Teacher Morale is the collective feelings and attitudes of a teacher group as related to their duties, responsibilities, goals, supervisors, and fellow workers; state of mind of a teacher with respect to his work; may be influenced by such factors as salary adequacy, tenure conditions, sick leave and pension benefits, degree of participation in policy making and administration, opportunities for advancement, and the intelligence and constructiveness of supervision (Good, 1973, p. 373).

Procedures

1. A review of related literature was conducted.

2. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, and a demographic information form were chosen as the instruments for data collection.

4. Thirty-six school systems within a 50-mile radius of East Tennessee State University were selected to participate in the study.

5. The Systat Computer Program was utilized for data analysis.

6. The results of the study were reported and summarized.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter contains the introduction, problem statement, purpose of the study, significance of the study, limitations, assumptions, procedures, hypotheses, definitions, and the organization of the study. A review of related literature is provided in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 contains the study design and methodology. Chapter 4 provides analyses of data. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations are in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

A review of literature was conducted to identify previous studies in the areas of morale and leadership, to identify instruments used to measure morale and leadership, and to allow the researcher to become familiar with various methods and procedures used in the study of morale and leadership. The section dealing with the significance of morale in education provides a number of definitions of morale by notable authors. Early studies were identified that indicated the importance of studying morale, labeled the effects of morale, and signified the importance of teacher satisfaction in creating a successful school.

Significance of Morale in Education

Morale has been a subject of interest in both industry and education for many years. The concern for studying morale has been to create a more effective working environment within schools. Before morale can be studied, there needs to be a clear understanding of what morale really is. Wiles (1955) defined morale as "The emotional and mental reaction of a person to his job" (p. 50). Likewise, others have referred to personal reactions to work, such as professional interest and enthusiasm displayed toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a given job situation (Bentley & Rempel, 1980). Griffiths (1956) was more specific in defining morale:
If it can be shown that groups which achieve their goals efficiently exhibit a high degree of cohesiveness, think well of their objectives, have confidence in their equipment, and so on, then these manifestations represent high morale; but only if a relationship to goal achievement can be shown. (p. 161)

One of the earliest attempts in studying morale was the Hawthorne experiments conducted by the Western Electric Corporation and published in the 1930’s. As a result of these experiments, it was concluded that production can be increased by the showing of an interest in people as human beings. Concerning the Hawthorne studies, Mayo (1963) wrote;

The operators have no clear ideas as to why they are able to produce more in the test room; but as shown in the replies to questionnaires, there is the feeling that better output is in some way related to the distinctly pleasanter, freer, and happier working conditions. (p. 67)

Bentley and Rempel (1980) elaborated on the perceptions of the individual in determining morale in the following statement:

Morale may be best conceived of as a continuous variable. The level of morale is then determined by the extent to which the individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from the total job situation. High morale is evident when there is interest in and enthusiasm for the job. What is important in morale is what the person believes and feels, rather than the conditions that may exist as perceived by others (p. 1)
Since morale is an emotional and mental reaction of a person to his job, it is an imprecise term. As imprecise as definitions may be, however, it remains a subject of extreme importance and one which has been studied extensively.

Studies have indicated that interest in morale shifts as a result of conflict. The general problem of morale has received considerable attention in times of national peril. Interest in morale seems to decrease rapidly, however, after crises have passed (Anderson, 1953).

Many studies have related the importance of studying morale to those who benefit most from high morale. Teachers are caught in the middle between principals who can determine morale and students who can suffer from lack of high morale. A study by Rogus and Martin (1979) indicated that the first findings deserving of the principal's attention is that teaching by its nature is enormously draining in a physical, emotional, and psychic sense, and for many teaching becomes routine.

It is not surprising to find that increasing numbers of school administrators feel that the very need of the students, parents and school boards can be dealt with more effectively through concern for teacher morale. The primary concern should not be relegated to the mere measurement of morale; rather, focus should be upon those factors that help to provide a professional environment conducive to the development and maintenance of favorable staff morale (Cook, 1979).
Although the scope of educational activities that should take place in schools may be a matter of controversy, few would disagree that the major objective of schools is to promote scholastic achievement of the pupils. There is little doubt that teachers are directly involved in the academic progress of their students. Perhaps teacher morale could be one of the most important factors affecting student achievement (Bhella, 1982).

Studies by Anderson (1953) showed that teachers in secondary schools whose pupils achieve relatively high scholastically appear to have higher morale than do teachers in schools with relatively low pupil achievement. It seems possible to assume, therefore, that morale of teachers does make a difference in the scholastic achievement of their pupils. Apparently teachers with relatively high morale can be expected to teach more effectively. Such results present a challenge to all supervisors and administrators of secondary schools in improving those conditions in their schools which affect teacher morale.

Morale affects the amount of work a person does: Low morale cuts down production. High morale increases it. If morale is high, a staff will do its best to promote effective learning (Wiles, 1955).

Morale, as suggested by Ellenburg (1972), affects more than just productivity or student achievement. It assists in establishing the character of a school. It is one of the factors which may determine whether a school functions at its best, demanding and receiving the utmost from its students, or whether the school plods along, happy just to see the passing of another day.
Measuring Morale

When attempting to measure morale, it is important to have a good concept of morale identifiers. Wiles (1955) suggests that it is possible to determine the quality of morale by careful observation of the way people act. Industry has found a positive correlation between low morale and a high rate of absenteeism and tardiness. Loafing, taking excessive time away from the task at hand, and constant bickering are signs of dissatisfaction with the job. Cheerfulness, promptness, enthusiasm, dependability, and cooperation are indications of high morale.

Wood (1968) identified some characteristics found in schools with good morale. These characteristics are "freedom to operate as professionals, a feeling of belonging, involvement of the faculty in policy development, a principal who knows and understands his teachers, a relationship of helpfulness among teachers and the administration, and low tensions among the professional staff" (p. 353).

Several studies have agreed that there is a correlation between job satisfaction and certain personal traits of teachers. Women teachers are more satisfied with their status as teachers than are male teachers. Furthermore, teachers who are older than average in age enjoy their status as teachers. It could be inferred that those who do not like teaching quit before they reach older age groups (Allred, 1980; Hellen, 1982; Rempel & Bentley, 1970).

After reviewing several studies, Magoon and Linkous (1979) concluded that the attitude, policies, procedures, understanding of individual teachers, and philosophy of the administration are major
teacher morale factors. Conditions that encourage and inspire teachers to do their best should be provided. Every effort must be made to reveal factors which cause teachers or prospective teachers to become dissatisfied, since the educational opportunities of children are influenced by the attitudes and working conditions of teachers.

When teachers feel that they are part of the team—when they believe in what they are doing, feel that administration respects and values what they are doing, and when they have a sense of confidence in the administrative leadership—then and only then can loyalty and high morale be achieved (Washington & Watson, 1976). Many studies indicated that social factors, such as group interaction, supportive relationships, human relations skills, high performance goals, and above all morale, are the most important determinants of productivity and success in human enterprises (Bhella, 1982).

The literature indicated rather conclusively that morale is the result of many interrelated factors. In order to identify various components of morale, factor-analysis methods have recently been used in the development of morale-measuring instruments; this approach involves placing what is believed to measure morale in a correlational matrix and then using appropriate factorial methods of identifying various factors and dimensions (Rempel & Bentley, 1970).

The technique of factor analysis can provide the opportunity to improve both the methods used in assessing faculty morale and the
clarity with which these assessments are reported to educational administrations (Richardson & Blocker, 1963).

The **Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire** is an instrument designed by Bentley and Rempel (1980) to provide a measure of teacher morale. Not only does the Opinionnaire yield a total score indicating the general level of a teacher's morale, but it also provides meaningful sub-scores which break down morale into some of its dimensions. The ten categories included are: (a) Teacher Rapport with Principal, (b) Satisfaction with Teaching, (c) Rapport Among Teachers, (d) Teacher Salary, (e) Teacher Load, (f) Curriculum Issues, (g) Teacher Status, (h) Community Support of Education, (i) School Facilities and Services, (j) Community Pressures. The Opinionnaire provides specific and valid information about crucial problems and tensions which concern the faculty and have an adverse effect on their morale.

**Leadership and Morale**

The **Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire**, often referred to as LBDQ, was developed by John F. Hemphill and members of the Ohio State University for use in obtaining descriptions of a supervisor. It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group. With proper changes in instruction, the questionnaire can also be used by a leader to describe his own behavior. Form XII represents the fourth revision of the questionnaire. It is divided into twelve subscales which are: (a) Representation, (b) Demand Reconciliation,

Leadership should be defined in order for the researcher to develop a concept of the term. Wiles (1955) defined leadership as "any contribution to the establishment and attainment of group purposes" (p. 50).

If it can be established that leadership style of the principal correlates with teacher morale, then principals as administrators should feel the necessity to analyze their leadership behavior in order to fulfill the objectives of schools. From the data collected in a study by Burket (1965), it can be assumed that a significantly positive relationship exists between staff morale and democratic school administration; thus indicating that the more democratic the administration the higher the staff morale.

In order for principals to instill a sense of satisfaction among teachers, principals must help teachers to grow. If one teacher grows, many of the students will also grow, and whenever many students grow, the world becomes a better place for all people (Kampmeier, 1976).

Implications for Administrators

The school exists primarily for the benefit of the student, but the basic psychological needs of teachers must also be met if the educational program is to succeed. The implication is clear that the development of positive morale is dependent upon the integration of
individual needs with school goals and purposes, and effective leadership from the principal. The principal must be sensitive to the human needs of faculty members by creating a wholesome emotional climate. Administrators must be emotionally secure, possess a basic philosophy of respect for individual worth, and be able to envision the potential contribution of each person (Magoon & Linkous, 1979).

Many studies have found that teachers' morale levels were definitely affected by their opinions of whether they were understood and appreciated by the principal. In communicating with the staff, the principal should be careful to demonstrate respect for the teacher as an individual with worth and dignity and as a professional person qualified to do the job for which he or she was hired. Secondly, the administrator should strive to publicly support his or her staff as much as possible. Private support is valuable and will aid in building morale, but public support is essential to the well-being of individuals and the staff as a whole. Finally, the administrator should involve staff members in the operation of the school. When teachers are involved, their understanding of the functions of the administrator increases and this positively affects teacher morale (Ellenburg, 1972).

Kampmeier (1976) pointed out that administrators should use creative leadership to help teachers make good rational choices. In return, administrators can make choices relevant to teachers' decisions.

Six functions were categorized by Sweeney and Pinckney (1983) that described nearly all of an administrator's day. These functions are:
1. Human Resource Management
2. Instructional Leadership
3. Learning Environment Management
4. Noninstructional Management
5. Pupil Personnel
6. School-Community Relations

This study showed that it is in the area of human resource management that principals can make the greatest difference in improving the education and faculty commitment in their schools.

In addition to categorizing administrative functions, Sweeney and Pinckney (1983) wrote that:

1. Teachers in the 1980's place premium on administrative activities that enhance their satisfaction in the classroom; controlling student behavior falls within that realm.

2. Principal's need to pay special attention to practices related to student discipline and to administrative activities that assist teachers to do their best.

Cook (1979) identified five components of leadership that affect teacher morale. Listed below are the five components with a description of each:

1. Administrative Leadership. When this component of administration is not being positively perceived by teachers, the symptoms relating to teacher morale are often resoundingly clear: teachers question, possibly to the point of defiance, the goals and objectives advanced by the administrator.
2. **Administrative Concern.** Teachers, like all other human beings, need to feel important and appreciated. The administrator must be sensitive to the desires of individual teachers.

3. **Personal Interaction.** The symptoms relating to a deficiency in personal interaction may be as obvious as teachers avoiding interpersonal encounters with their administrator or their colleagues by always eating lunch alone, sitting apart at meetings and/or exhibiting behaviors that characterize abnormal social distance.

4. **Opportunity for Input.** Teachers have sought to exercise their leadership in such areas as instructional planning, curriculum organization, and professional control. When thwarted in their attempts to exert leadership here, teachers frequently display symptoms of low morale.

5. **Professional Growth.** This is at least partially evident in the number of teachers seeking graduate degrees, attending after-school workshops and seeking professional advancement. In essence, the administrator must provide every teacher an opportunity for professional growth.

Factors from the **Morale Tendency Score** instrument used by Redefer (1959) reveal that administration, in the total sense of the word, is built upon human understanding. The way teachers perceive leadership behavior is crucial to the administrator's ability to establish a high level of morale. Pryor (1964), in a study of certain Texas schools, found a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of administrative policies, procedures, and practices and the morale status of teachers.
Teacher participation in school administration can also have a positive affect on teacher morale. In a study of teacher attitudes related to participation in administration, Leiman (1961) found that teachers who participate in school administration have higher morale than teachers who do not participate in school administration. Also, teachers who participate in school administration have higher regard for themselves and for the teaching profession.

**Principal's Role in Establishing Morale**

A multitude of studies have indicated that teacher morale is related to the leader behavior of the principal (Dunbar, 1979; Hood, 1965; James, 1982; Laird & Luettelkemeyer, 1976; Lambert, 1968; Magoon & Linkous, 1979).

Hood (1965) determined that although personal factors are the most important of all factors in determining the individual morale level of the teacher, the principal is the key nonpersonal factor in the professional environment of the teacher. The teacher's relationship with the principal is more important in determining morale level than is the teacher's relationship with other faculty members.

The findings of a study by Laird and Luettelkemeyer (1976) supported previous studies which concluded that teacher morale was related to the leader behavior of the principal. In this study, teacher morale was significantly related to the principal's system orientation as well as to his personal orientation. A stronger relationship, however, existed with the person orientation dimension.
Magoon and Linkous (1979) determined that the principal's expectations of a teacher have an effect upon the performance and behavior of the teacher. The teacher's self-image is constantly reinforced, positively or negatively, by the principal's behavior— or the teacher's perceptions of the principal's behavior. Morale tends to be higher in situations where the principal encourages and supports the development of self-improvement.

A study to determine a relationship between teacher morale and the principal's attempts to improve teacher performance was conducted by Perry (1976). The findings from this study were:

1. When considered as truly independent variables, each of the ten subscales of teacher morale was statistically significantly correlated with the principal's professional leadership.

2. Teacher rapport with the principal was positively correlated with the principal's professional leadership rating.

3. Teacher load had a negative relationship with the professional leadership rating of principals.

4. Teacher salary was positively related to the teacher's perception of the principals' leadership to improve teaching performance.

In a study of 24 school systems involving 5000 teachers, the following generalizations were established by Redefer (1959):

1. The morale of teaching faculties is closely related to the quality of education in individual schools.

2. The morale score of teachers has a significant correlation with the rating, by administrators, or superiority in teaching.
3. Elementary school faculties seem to have higher morale than junior or senior high school faculties.

Davis, Ware, Shapiro, Donald, and Stieber (1963) conducted a review of the research between 1958 and 1963 which pointed to the following major conclusions:

1. Morale is a general function of a multitude of interrelated variables and dimensions rather than a function of one or more isolated variables.

2. The immediate supervisor or administrator is extremely important to a teacher's morale. Democratic administration can offset the effects of other factors that tend to produce low morale.

In morale studies of teachers in Oregon and Indiana, certain elements were found to be responsible for differences in teacher morale. For example, the morale scores of women were significantly higher than those of men in four of the ten factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. These elements were salary, status, satisfaction with teaching, and community pressures. Differences in morale were also noted between teachers holding the master's degree and those holding the bachelor's degree. Mean scores were significantly higher in favor of teachers with master's degrees for satisfaction with teaching, curriculum issues, school facilities and services, community pressures, teacher rapport with principal, and teacher load. For the majority of teachers, there was a gradual upward progression in the level of morale with increasing age. This applied to each factor and to the total morale score. As for teacher
experience, there were sharp increases in morale beyond nine years of experience. As might be expected, there was a high correlation between salary level and the level of morale (Rempel & Bentley, 1970).

Sweeney and Pinckney (1983) reported a study dealing with faculty management. It determined that principals who got higher ratings in helping and supporting teachers tended to have faculties who were more committed to high performance goals, more likely to have good working relationships, and more inclined to feel accomplishment in their jobs.

Moris (1981) conducted a study concerning teacher satisfaction and determined that in more satisfying schools:

1. Teachers were less likely to perceive the administration and staff relations as a problem.

2. Teachers perceived principals favorably who were supportive of staff, respected teachers as professionals, and considered teachers' opinions and suggestions.

As first-line administrators in the educational setting, principals are continually confronted with problems of staff and student morale. Consequently, the principal and other educational administrators must learn to improve morale (Magoon & Linkous, 1979). The teacher has influence on the quality of the relationship, but it is the principal who is the most significant factor in creating it and sustaining it (Kampmeier, 1976). Washington and Watson (1976) wrote that the principal can directly influence teacher morale by (a) praising and giving credit when it is warranted; (b) supporting the teacher in conflicts with students and parents; (c) giving special attention to the teacher's physical comfort and other related
matters; (d) assuming responsibility for his administrative actions; (e) demonstrating that he is knowledgeable about current school methods, materials, strategies, and practices; and (f) encouraging the teacher's professional growth.

Teachers and principals often share different perceptions of principals' reinforcing behavior. In a study concerning principals' reinforcing behavior, Lowery (1978) concluded that:

1. Teacher morale is affected by the reinforcing behavior of the principal.
2. Principals perceive their own behavior as being more reinforcing than do their teachers.

Wood (1968) wrote that the following factors are useful for the principal in appraising faculty morale:

1. Utilization of the teacher's talents and providing them with a sense of achievement
2. The principal's success in working with teachers
3. The teacher's relationship with other faculty members
4. How the teacher feels about agreement on purposes and cooperative determination of policy
5. The teacher's relationship and acceptance in the community
6. School policy on sick leave and concern for health of teachers
7. The principal's concern and interest in the economic security of teachers
8. The teacher's relationship with students.
Effective Schools and Leadership

In order to use morale and leadership studies to create more effective schools, means of establishing effectiveness and identifying those responsible for maintaining and improving it need to be discussed. In recent years much emphasis has been placed on improving America's schools. Many studies have been conducted to identify what constitutes effectiveness in schools. Distinguishing characteristics have been recognized that separate effective schools from less effective schools. Responsibilities of principals have been found to have a strong impact on school effectiveness.

Various writers hold different concepts of what constitutes effectiveness. After reviewing literature about effective schools, Stedman (1985) concluded that two types of effective schools exist. Not only are there schools in which high test scores are indicative of effectiveness, but a second type of schools makes student development and the acquisition of a well-rounded academic program its primary goal.

School effectiveness may be the result of teacher motivation. After interpreting the evidence of effective schools, Rosenholtz (1985) stated that "central to a school's functioning is its ability to motivate teachers to make continuous contributions to it rather than to some competing organization" (p. 355).

Concerning rewards for motivating teachers, Rosenholtz (1985) stated,

The results of teaching must outweigh the frustrations.

Rewards flow directly from estimates of one's independence,
worth and special competencies, as well as from external recognition that may be offered by actors within the organizational setting—that is, . . . students, colleagues, or principals . . . . Good teachers are difficult to recruit and almost impossible to retain because the rewards of teaching do not outweigh the frustrations. Exceptions to this are identified in effective schools—schools that are distinctive in important ways. Principals of effective schools have a unitary mission of improved student learning, and their actions convey certainty that these goals can be attained . . . . Because the work of these principals pivots around improving student achievement, teachers have specific, concrete goals toward which to direct their efforts and know precisely when those efforts produce the desired effects. They are further encouraged by a supportive collegial group that lends ideas and assistance where needed. In turn, by achieving goals of student learning, teachers are provided with necessary motivation to continue to produce. The more teachers succeed with students, the greater their certainty that it is possible to succeed and the greater their experimentation procuring success. (pp. 354-355)

Murphy and Hallinger (1985), after analyzing questionnaire results from administrators of schools identified as effective, found a recurring presence of eight general factors:

1. A clear sense of purpose
2. A core set of standards within a rich curriculum
3. High expectations
4. A commitment to educate each student as completely as possible
5. A special reason for each student to go to school
6. A safe, orderly learning environment
7. A sense of community
8. Resiliency and a problem-solving attitude.

It was also found by Murphy and Hallinger (1985) that in effective schools attendance rates were generally high and increasing, dropout rates were generally low and decreasing, discipline policies and practices were enforced, and there was a good deal of parent participation.

In an attempt to improve schools for black urban children Edmonds (1979) identified the following four characteristics of effective schools:

1. Strong administrative leadership
2. Climate of expectation
3. School's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid
4. Acquisition of basic skills takes precedence over all other school activities.

In another study by Edmonds and Frederiksen (1978) effective schools were found to share other similar traits. These traits are:

1. Teachers in the more effective schools do not agree that "culturally disadvantaged" children benefit from programs of compensatory education, but hold that a common standard of instruction can be applied to all.
2. Principals of the more effective schools responded that their students are not separated into ability groups.

3. The more effective schools have smaller classes.

4. The more effective schools have a larger proportion of families who attend PTA meetings.

5. Principals of effective schools believe their schools to have a good reputation among educators in their community.

6. Children who attend schools that are instructionally effective attend school more regularly.

When reporting on effective middle schools, William Kerewsky (1986) discussed characteristics of those schools that were regarded as models for the nation. Among those characteristics were:

1. The entire building had an up-beat, positive atmosphere.

2. Teachers, administrators, and parents had high-expectations for the academic and social success of the youngsters and communicated these frequently,

3. The building was clean and well kept, regardless of its age.

4. Time in class was spent on task not in administrative or disciplinary matters.

5. Parents were involved, knowledgeable, and supportive.

6. The school classrooms, hallways, and playing fields demonstrated order, organization, and effective discipline.

Observations of several middle schools led Garvin (1986) to identify six common denominators in the effective middle level schools. Many of the common denominators were consistent with findings from other effective schools' studies. These common denominators were
1. A clearly defined and articulated mission developed by parents, students, teachers, administrators, and support staff
2. Effective leadership
3. Student-centered teachers
4. Strong parent involvement
5. Ongoing goal development and evaluation
6. Quality of life.

One thing which almost all of these studies show is that in order for schools to become effective there must be effective leadership within the schools. Principals may provide effective leadership in a number of ways. One critical step toward creating effective leadership is to establish a supportive school environment. One effective principal might create such an environment by working through a leadership team while another might instead form functional faculty committees. A third effective principal might develop peer support teams among the teachers, and a fourth might use a variety of techniques to develop a facultywide camaraderie. Yet another effective principal might function as a cheerleader for the school, while a counterpart elsewhere might be sensitive to the needs and personalities of individual teachers and in a quiet, personal way, make each teacher feel important and respected (Rutherford, 1985).

Rutherford (1985) listed effective principals' responsibilities as allocating funding and materials in ways that maximize teaching effectiveness and thus student achievement. In addition, they selectively and systematically apply such other support mechanisms as advantageous scheduling, careful assignment of teachers, and dispensing
of recognition to achieve these ends. To them, a good school environment is one that enhances students' learning and development.

Brookover and Lezotte (1977) determined a difference in the principal's role in the improving schools and declining schools. In the improving schools, the principal is more likely to be an instructional leader, more assertive in his/her institutional leadership role, more of a disciplinarian, and perhaps most of all, assumes responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic objectives.

Summary

A review of the literature identified morale as the reaction of an individual or group to the job situation. Many studies have concluded that morale studies can improve the workplace, resulting in a more effective learning environment (Anderson, 1953; Cook, 1979; Ellenburg, 1972; Griffiths, 1956; Mayo, 1963; Wiles, 1955).

Schools with good morale have been distinguished from schools with poor morale by certain characteristics of schools, personal factors of teachers and administrators, and social factors. Factor-analysis methods have been developed to measure the morale of teachers more effectively.

The study of leader behavior has been instrumental in studying teacher morale. These studies have led to implications that administrators can use in creating an environment that lends itself to higher teacher morale. Many studies have concluded that leader behavior is significantly related to the morale of teachers (Burket,
1965; Ellenburg, 1972; Leiman, 1961; Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Pryor, 1964; R炦efor, 1959).

More specifically studies have indicated that teacher morale is related to the leader behavior of the principal (Dunbar, 1979; Hood, 1965; James, 1982; Laird & Luetkemeyer, 1976); Lambert, 1968; Magoon & Linkous, 1979). These studies have shown that such factors as the personal orientation of the principal, the principal’s expectations of the teacher, and the principal’s attempts to improve teacher performance were important in establishing high morale among teachers.

Effective schools research has provided distinguishing characteristics of effective schools as well as defined the role of the school principal in helping to establish these characteristics (Brookover & Lezotte, 1977; Edmonds & Frederikson, 1979; Garvin, 1986; Kerewsky, 1986; Murphy & Hallinger, 1985; and Rutherford, 1985).
CHAPTER 3

Methods and Procedures

This chapter describes the procedures followed in conducting the study. It includes population identification, sampling, instruments used in gathering data, and the techniques used in the statistical analysis of the data.

Design of the Study

After reviewing the literature, the researcher selected the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII to measure the leadership behavior of principals. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was selected to measure factors contributing to teacher morale. Each of these instruments uses a Likert-type scale to collect data concerning each variable of the study. The PTO provided mean scores for the selected teachers in each school. The mean scores were based on each factor score for use in testing the hypotheses. Total scores (not individual factor scores) were used when reporting morale scores and demographic data only. The LBDQ-XII was also completed by the selected teachers of each school and provided 12 factor scores measuring the leadership behaviors of their principals. Permission to use the LBDQ-XII was granted by the Ohio State University Department of Business Research. Permission to use the PTO was granted by Ralph R. Bentley, retired professor from Purdue University. Copies of each instrument along with scoring information were then ordered by the researcher.
After the sample to be studied had been selected and approval received from the East Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board to conduct the study, informed consent forms, demographic information forms, LBDQ-XII instruments, PTO instruments, and self-addressed, stamped return envelopes were mailed to the teachers of each school. Two weeks later a follow up letter was sent to each teacher, encouraging them to complete and return the instruments.

The returned instruments were hand scored by the researcher, and proper statistical procedures were then applied to the data. The results of the study were analyzed and reported.

**Sampling**

Many schools across the United States share similar problems. Effective schools are not confined to any one area of the country, nor are problems of morale issues faced in any particular region. Perhaps a national study concerning morale and leader behavior would do much to add to the present body of literature. Since such information was not available for this study, an accessible population (Bracht & Glass, 1968) was selected from within a 50-mile radius of East Tennessee State University. In order to identify the population to be studied, three school directories were obtained. Letters were written to the state departments of North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee. School systems and schools from within a 50-mile radius of East Tennessee State University were selected by use of the *North Carolina Education Directory 1985-86*, *Virginia Educational Directory 1985-86*, and *Tennessee Directory of Public Schools 1985-86*. From the population a sample was drawn that
consisted of a variety of schools, principals, teachers, and students. The geographical regions of Western North Carolina, Southwestern Virginia, and East Tennessee were represented by the chosen population. The target population included all teachers working in grades K-12 of the public schools within the three geographical regions. Thirty-six school systems were identified including both county and city systems. There were 482 schools in the 36 school systems which employed 12,624 teachers.

Sample

In order to compare the data between effective schools and less effective schools, effective schools had to be identified. While obtaining permission to conduct the study, each of the 36 superintendents was asked to list his/her two most effective schools, based on the following criteria taken from the effective schools research (Edmonds, 1979; Edmonds & Frederiksen, 1979; Garvin, 1986; and Murphy & Hallinger, 1985).

1. Safe and orderly learning environment
2. A sense of community
3. High expectations
4. Regular attendance of students
5. Time on tasks

Only 13 superintendents responded with permission to survey their teachers. This narrowed the population to 149 schools with approximately 3352 teachers.
After the two most effective schools were selected from each school district, a sample was taken from the remaining less effective schools in each system. When selecting a small sample, Borg and Gall (1983) suggested placing a slip of paper with the name of each individual (school) in the population in a container, mixing the slips thoroughly, and then drawing the required number of names. This procedure was followed to select two less effective schools from each of the thirteen school systems.

After the selection of schools had been completed, an alphabetical list of teachers from each school was obtained. Numbers corresponding with the alphabetical list were drawn from a container to select 50% of the teachers from each school to participate in the study. In order to provide data for the measurement of factors contributing to teacher morale and leader behaviors exhibited by principals, each of the 571 selected teachers was asked to complete the LBDQ-XII, PTO, and a demographic data sheet.

The final sample studied consisted of 83 teachers from 26 effective schools and 75 teachers from 26 less effective schools. A total of 158 teachers returned completed questionnaires.

**Instrumentation**

**Leader Behavior.** Leader behavior in this study was measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII. The review of literature revealed that the LBDQ-XII, developed by Hemphill and Coons (1957) and staff members of The Ohio State Leadership Studies, has been used by numerous researchers when investigating leader behavior.
Each subscale of the LBDQ-XII is composed of either five or ten items. A subscale is necessarily defined by its component items and represents a rather complex pattern of behaviors. Brief definitions of the subscales given by Stogdill (1963) are listed below:

1. **Representation** - speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)

2. **Demand Reconciliation** - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system. (5 items)

3. **Tolerance of Uncertainty** - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)

4. **Persuasiveness** - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)

5. **Initiation of Structure** - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)

6. **Tolerance of Freedom** - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. (10 items)

7. **Role Assumption** - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)

8. **Consideration** - regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)

9. **Production Emphasis** - applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)

10. **Predictive Accuracy** - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately. (5 items)

11. **Integration** - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves intermember conflicts. (5 items)
12. **Superior Orientation** - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)

**Reliability.** Stogdill (1963) reported that the reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The modification consists of the fact that each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in its subscale rather than with the subscale score including the item. This procedure yields a conservative estimate of subscale reliability.

Robert Dipboye (1978) wrote that the **Initiating Structure** and **Consideration** have been found to have high coefficients of internal consistency. Also, interrater agreement appears to be sufficiently high to justify procedures stated in the manual.

**Validity.** In terms of face validity, Dipboye (1978) also wrote that the items are straightforward and seem to match common sense descriptions of leader behavior in a variety of settings. The validity of the LBDQ-XII as correlator of job satisfaction and work group performance would seem to be well established since most studies indicate significant correlations between the LBDQ-XII scales and both satisfaction and performance.

**Morale.** The **Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire** is a 100-item instrument used to measure teacher morale. The literature reviewed revealed the use of this instrument in many morale studies. The PTO appears to be a carefully constructed research instrument designed to estimate
individual, school, or system-wide teacher morale. In its present form the opinionnaire offers both an overall estimate of interest in and enthusiasm for a particular job situation, and 10 subscores reflecting teacher reaction to discrete components of teacher morale (Rosner, 1974).

The following is a brief description by Bentley and Rempel (1980) of the 10 factors included in the revised opinionnaire:

Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport With Principal" deals with the teacher's feelings about the principal—his professional competency, his interest in teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skill in human relationships.

Factor 2 - "Satisfaction with Teaching" pertains to teacher relationships with students and feeling of satisfaction with teaching. According to this factor, the high morale teacher loves to teach, feels competent in his job, enjoys his students, and believes in the future of teaching as an occupation.

Factor 3 - "Rapport Among Teachers" focuses on a teacher's relationships with other teachers. The items here solicit the teacher's opinion regarding the cooperation, preparation, ethics, influence, interests, and competency of his peers.

Factor 4 - "Teacher Salary" pertains primarily to the teacher's feelings about salaries and salary policies. Are salaries based on teacher competency? Do they compare favorably with salaries in other school systems? Are salary policies administered fairly and justly, and do teachers participate in the development of these policies?
Factor 5 - "Teacher Load" deals with such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, "red tape," community demands on teacher time, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

Factor 6 - "Curriculum Issues" solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenship.

Factor 7 - "Teacher Status" samples feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching. Several of the items refer to the extent to which the teacher feels he is an accepted member of the community.

Factor 8 - "Community Support of Education" deals with the extent to which the community understands and is willing to support a sound educational program.

Factor 9 - "School Facilities and Services" has to do with the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

Factor 10 - "Community Pressures" gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher's personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom.

Validity. The initial Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was validated against peer judgments made by fellow teachers. When addressing the validity of the revised form of the opinionnaire, Bentley and Rempel (1980) wrote:
There is no relevant criterion on which to judge the validity of an instrument of this nature, except, to some extent, the relative performance of teachers. Peer ratings, evaluations by administrators, etc., obviously have very limited relevance as a criterion of validity of teacher morale. To the extent that teachers agree with one another, are self consistent in their ratings, and content validity is exhibited, at least adequate validity may be assumed. (p. 7)

Reliability. The revised form was administered to the high school faculties with 20 or more teachers in Indiana and Oregon. The 60 Indiana schools were a stratified random sample, and the 16 Oregon schools were selected primarily from the eastern part of the state. Four weeks later the instrument was readministered in all of the schools included previously. Altogether, test-retest data were obtained for 3025 teachers. The test-retest correlations showed that the factor correlations were predominantly above the .60 level, and for the total scores about 90% of the correlations were .80 or above. There was little difference between the means and standard deviations for both total and factor scores for the test and retest administrations of the opinionnaire.

Demographic information. A demographic data sheet was devised by the investigator to collect personal information from those surveyed that might prove relevant to teacher morale and leader behavior. Information requested pertained to educational degree, sex of the
respondent, age, marital status, and experience in teaching and/or administration. Other studies have considered similar items when focusing on morale and have shown relationships can exist (Allred, 1980; Bhella, 1982; Lowery, 1978; Rempel & Bentley, 1970).

Statistical Analysis

In Chapter 1 of this study, the hypotheses were stated in the declarative form. For statistical treatment, however, the hypotheses were tested in the null format. The t-test for independent samples was used to test for differences in mean scores between effective schools and less effective schools. Champion (1981) stated that the t-test is the most powerful test for assessing mean differences between groups. In order to meet the assumptions of interval data, the values of two, four, six, eight, and ten were assigned to the responses of each instrument. Research hypotheses 1, 2, and 4 through 25 stated in Chapter 1 were tested in the null format at the .05 level of significance using a two-tailed test.

Data analysis for research hypotheses 3 and 26 through 44 included the use of the Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation to determine the degree of relationship between the mean scores. Champion (1981) stated that when all assumptions associated with the Pearson r are satisfied, it becomes perhaps the best measure of association available. In order to meet the assumption of interval level data, the values of two, four, six, eight, and ten were assigned to the responses of each survey instrument. In order to test for significance of difference between the correlations of the two groups, the r
coefficients were transformed to Fisher Z values. Research hypotheses 3 and 26 through 44 stated in Chapter 1 were tested in the null format at the .05 level of significance using a two-tailed test.

Demographic information was analyzed and reported with the findings. Also, the data were analyzed according to the geographical region of the schools studied.
CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was (a) to determine if a significant difference exists between leadership behavior of principals in effective schools when compared to leadership behavior of principals in less effective schools as perceived by teachers, (b) to determine if a significant difference exists in teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools, and (c) to determine if a significant difference exists in the correlations between leadership behaviors of principals and factors contributing to teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools. The principal's leadership behavior was defined as the behavior of an individual when he or she is directing the activities or a group toward a shared goal. The dimensions of the principal's leadership behavior included representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance or uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation. Teacher morale was defined as the collective feelings and attitudes of a teacher group as related to their duties, responsibilities, goals, supervisors, and fellow workers. The dimensions of a teacher's morale included teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures.
This chapter presents an analysis of the data and the findings as they related to the hypotheses developed for testing. Statistics showing the comparison of the principal's leadership behavior in schools that were considered effective and schools that were considered less effective are included in Table 2, while data concerning the comparison of teacher morale in schools that were considered effective and schools that were considered less effective are presented in Table 3. Data concerning the comparison of correlations between leader behavior and teacher morale of effective schools and leader behavior and teacher morale of less effective schools are presented in Table 4. Data concerning the comparison of specific leader behavior dimensions between effective schools and less effective schools are presented in Table 5. Table 6 contains data comparing specific teacher morale dimensions between effective schools and less effective schools. Table 7 contains data pertaining to the correlations between leadership behaviors of principals and factors contributing to teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools.

In addition to analysis of data to test the hypotheses, chapter four contains analysis of data according to geographical location and demographic data. Table 8 contains data comparing teacher morale between the three geographical regions surveyed. Teacher morale scores compared according to demographic data are presented in Table 9.

Analysis of the Sample

The sample surveyed included 293 teachers in schools considered effective and 278 teachers in schools considered less effective.
Respondents included 83 teachers assigned to effective schools, which represented a participation rate of 28%. Seventy-five teachers assigned to less effective schools responded, which represented a participation rate of 27%. The 158 respondents represented approximately 28% of the 571 teachers surveyed. Because all returns were not complete and in order to complete correlations using the Systat computer program, columns of data had to be made even. Therefore, tables of leader behavior data will show n = 82 for effective schools and n = 75 for less effective schools with a total of 157. Tables of teacher morale data will show n = 83 for effective schools and n = 74 for less effective schools with a total of 157. Hypotheses 26 through 44 will show n = 82 for effective schools and n = 74 for less effective schools with a total of 156. Data describing the sample are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective or Less Effective Schools</th>
<th>Total Number of Teachers Selected for Sample</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Effective</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Less Effective</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Effective</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Less Effective</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Effective</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Less Effective</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 1 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score of leadership behaviors of principals in effective schools when compared to the mean score of leadership behaviors of principals in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. In analyzing data for $H_{01}$ concerning principals' leadership behaviors, dimensional scores were computed as mean scores for each respondent and leader behavior means were computed for the dimensional means. Analysis of data revealed no significant difference in teachers' perceptions of leadership behaviors of principals in effective schools when compared to leadership behaviors of principals in less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.56 for principals in effective schools with a standard deviation of 0.99 and a mean score of 7.37 for principals in less effective schools with a standard deviation of 1.07. Statistical analysis indicated a t-value for leader behaviors of 1.11 with a probability of 0.269. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Data for $H_{01}$ are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-value of Mean Differences in Leader Behavior Scores Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 155$ \hspace{1cm} P > .05
Hypothesis 2 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in teacher morale of teachers in effective schools when compared to the mean score of teacher morale of teachers in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data revealed no significant differences in teacher morale in effective schools when compared to teacher morale in less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 6.09 for teachers in effective schools with a standard deviation of 0.85 and a mean score of 5.95 for teachers in less effective schools with a standard deviation of 0.82. Statistical analysis indicated a t-value for teacher morale of 1.08 with a probability of 0.283. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. There was no significant difference in teacher morale between the two groups. Data for H$_{o2}$ are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 155 \quad P > .05$

Hypothesis 3 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlation between the mean score of leadership behaviors or
principals and the mean score of teacher morale in effective schools when compared to the correlation between the mean score of leadership behaviors of principals and the mean score of teacher morale in less effective schools. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in the correlation between leader behavior and teacher morale in effective schools when compared to the correlation between leader behavior and teacher morale in less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.34 for teachers in effective schools with a Fisher Z value of 0.3541 and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.04 for teachers in less effective schools with a Fisher Z value of 0.0400. In order to compare $r$ coefficients, the coefficients had to be transformed to Fisher Z values ($z_r$). To do this, a table of Z values for given values of $r$ (Champion, 1981) was used to obtain the Fisher Z values. With the $z_r$ values obtained, Z scores were computed at the .05 probability level with a two-tailed, nondirectional test. Statistical analysis indicated a Z score of 1.94, which is near significance at the .05 level. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, $H_{03}$ failed to be rejected. There was no significant difference in the correlation of teacher morale and leader behavior between the two groups. Data for $H_{03}$ are presented in Table 4, p. 54.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in representation in effective schools when compared to the mean score in representation in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in representation exhibited by
Table 4

Pearson r values, Fisher Z values (Zp), and Z Values of Correlations Between the Mean Score of Leader Behavior and Teacher Morale in Effective Schools and Less Effective Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r_xy value</th>
<th>Zp values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.3541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.0400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 1.94 df = 154 P > .05

principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 8.26 with a standard deviation of 1.02 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 8.27 with a standard deviation of 1.06 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.04 and a probability of 0.965. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. Data for Hypothesis 5 are presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 5 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in demand reconciliation in effective schools when compared to the mean score in demand reconciliation in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior demand reconciliation between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.66 with a standard deviation of 1.69 for principals of
Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-values of Mean Differences in Leader Behavior Scores Measured by the LBDQ-XII and Reported by Effective Schools and Less Effective Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM</th>
<th>Effective Schools</th>
<th>Less Effective Schools</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 1: REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 2: DEMANDING RECONCILIATION</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 3: TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 4: PERSUASIVENESS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 5: INITIATION OF STRUCTURE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 6: TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 7: ROLE ASSUMPTION</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 8: CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 9: PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 10: PREDICTIVE ACCURACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 11: INTEGRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 12: SUPERIOR ORIENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 155  *P < .05
effective schools and a mean score of 7.19 with a standard deviation of 1.65 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.74 and a probability of 0.083. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. Data for $H_{05}$ are presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 6 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in effective schools when compared to the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior tolerance of uncertainty between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.15 with a standard deviation of 1.38, for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 6.87 with a standard deviation of 1.50 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.21 and a probability of 0.227. Failure to reject $H_{06}$ was based on the data presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 7 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in persuasiveness in effective schools when compared to the mean score in persuasiveness in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in a significant difference in the leader behavior persuasiveness between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.73 with a standard deviation of 1.27 for principals of effective schools and a
mean score of 7.25 with a standard deviation of 1.45 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 2.18 and a probability of 0.031. Therefore, $H_0^{7}$ was rejected, meaning that teachers of effective schools perceived their principals to use persuasion and argument more effectively and to exhibit strong convictions to a significantly greater extent than principals were perceived by teachers of less effective schools.

Data for $H_0^{7}$ are presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 8 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in initiation of structure in effective schools when compared to the mean score in initiation of structure in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior initiation of structure between principals of effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 8.20 with a standard deviation of 1.15 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 7.87 with a standard deviation of 1.07 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.89 and a probability of 0.060, which is near significance at the .05 level. However, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. Data for $H_0^{8}$ are presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 9 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of freedom in effective schools when compared to the mean score in tolerance of freedom in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the
leader behavior tolerance of freedom between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.59 with a standard deviation of 1.53 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 7.66 with a standard deviation of 1.22 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.30 and a probability of 0.767. Failure to reject $H_0$ was based on the data presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 10 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in role assumption in effective schools when compared to the mean score in role assumption in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior role assumption between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.87 with a standard deviation of 1.34 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 7.64 with a standard deviation of 1.29 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.09 and a probability of 0.277. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. Data for $H_{010}$ are presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 11 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in consideration in effective schools when compared to the mean score in consideration in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior consideration
between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.43 with a standard deviation of 1.69 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 7.18 with a standard deviation of 1.56 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.96 and a probability of 0.336. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. Data for H_{o11} are presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 12 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in production emphasis in effective schools when compared to the mean score in production emphasis in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior production emphasis between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 6.91 with a standard deviation of 1.15 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 6.81 with a standard deviation of 1.11 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.57 and a probability of 0.569. Failure to reject H_{o12} was based on data presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 13 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in predictive accuracy in effective schools when compared to the mean score in predictive accuracy in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior
predictive accuracy between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.37 with a standard deviation of 1.29 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 7.13 with a standard deviation of 1.33 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.14 and a probability of 0.257. Failure to reject $H_0$ was based on data presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 14 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in integration in effective schools when compared to the mean score in integration in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior integration between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 7.27 with a standard deviation of 1.92 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 7.21 with a standard deviation of 1.66 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.20 and a probability of 0.844. Failure to reject $H_0$ was based on data presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 15 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in superior orientation in effective schools when compared to the mean score in superior orientation in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior superior orientation between principals of effective schools and principals of less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of
7.68 with a standard deviation of 1.00 for principals of effective schools and a mean score of 7.55 with a standard deviation of 1.07 for principals of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.80 and a probability of 0.428. Failure to reject $H_{015}$ was based on data presented in Table 5, pp. 55-56.

Hypothesis 16 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in teacher rapport with principal in effective schools when compared to the mean score in teacher rapport with principal in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in teacher rapport with principal between effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 6.37 with a standard deviation of 1.60 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 5.93 with a standard deviation of 1.59 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.72 and a probability of 0.088, which is near significance at the .05 level. However, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. Data for $H_{016}$ are presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 17 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in satisfaction with teaching in effective schools when compared to the mean score in satisfaction with teaching in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in satisfaction with teaching between effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 6.64 with a standard deviation of 0.91 for teachers of effective schools and a mean
Table 6
Means, Standard Deviations, and t-value of Mean Difference in Teacher Morale Scores Measured by the PTO and Reported by Effective Schools and Less Effective Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 1: TEACHER' RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 2: SATISFACTION WITH TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 3: RAPPORT AMONG TEACHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 4: TEACHER SALARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 5: TEACHER LOAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 6: CURRICULUM ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 7: TEACHER STATUS</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 8: COMMUNITY SUPPORT OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 9: SCHOOL FACILITIES AND SERVICES</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 10: COMMUNITY PRESSURES</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( df = 155 \) \hspace{1cm} *P < .05
score of 6.71 with a standard deviation of 0.89 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.48 and a probability of 0.630. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, $H_{017}$ could not be rejected. Data for $H_{017}$ are presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 18 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in rapport among teachers in effective schools when compared to the mean score in rapport among teachers in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in rapport among teachers in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 6.63 with a standard deviation of 1.15 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 6.51 with a standard deviation of 1.06 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.64 and a probability of 0.521. Failure to reject $H_{018}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 19 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in teacher salary in effective schools when compared to the mean score in teacher salary in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in teacher salary in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 4.61 with a standard deviation of 1.31 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 4.59 with a standard deviation of 1.30 for
teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.12 and a probability of 0.907. Failure to reject \( H_{019} \) was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 20 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in teacher load in effective schools when compared to the mean score in teacher load in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in teacher load in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 5.96 with a standard deviation of 0.98 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 5.72 with a standard deviation of 1.16 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.39 and a probability of 0.167. Failure to reject \( H_{020} \) was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 21 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in curriculum issues in effective schools when compared to the mean score in curriculum issues in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in curriculum issues in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 6.38 with a standard deviation of 1.29 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 6.13 with a standard deviation of 1.40 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.15 and a probability of 0.251. Failure to reject \( H_{021} \) was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.
Hypothesis 22 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in teacher status in effective schools when compared to the mean score in teacher status in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in teacher status in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 5.23 with a standard deviation of 1.25 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 5.25 with a standard deviation of 1.29 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.09 and a probability of 0.925. Failure to reject $H_{022}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 23 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in community support of education in effective schools when compared to the mean score in community support of education in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in community support of education in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 5.61 with a standard deviation of 1.42 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 5.36 with a standard deviation of 1.47 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.05 and a probability of 0.297. Failure to reject $H_{023}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 24 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in school facilities and services in effective schools when compared to the mean score in school facilities and
services in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in school facilities and services in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 5.62 with a standard deviation of 1.52 for teachers in effective schools and a mean score of 5.29 with a standard deviation of 1.58 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 1.34 and a probability of 0.181. Failure to reject $H_{024}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 25 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in community pressures in effective schools when compared to the mean score in community pressures in less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in community pressures in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by a mean score of 6.08 with a standard deviation of 1.01 for teachers of effective schools and a mean score of 6.19 with a standard deviation of 1.06 for teachers of less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 0.70 and a probability of 0.488. Failure to reject $H_{025}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6, pp. 63-64.

Hypothesis 26 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and representation in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and representation in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations
between teacher rapport with principal and representation in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.16 with a Fisher Z value of .1614 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.35 with a Fisher Z value of .3654 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical analysis indicated a Z score of -1.27. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. Data for $H_{o26}$ are presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 27 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and demand reconciliation in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and demand reconciliation in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and demand reconciliation in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.42 with a Fisher Z value of .4477 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.41 with a Fisher Z value of .4356 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of 0.08. Failure to reject $H_{o27}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 28 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of uncertainty in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of uncertainty in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and tolerance
Table 7
Pearson $r$ Values, Fisher $Z$ values ($Z_F$), and $Z$ Values of Correlations Between Leader Behavior and Teacher Morale in Effective Schools and Less Effective Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$r_{xy}$ values</th>
<th>$Z_F$ values</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND REPRESENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.1614</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.3654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND DEMAND RECONCILIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.4477</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.4356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.3428</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.4599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND PERSUASIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.3206</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.3769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND INITIATION OF STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.1717</td>
<td>-2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.4973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.3769</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.4973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND ROLE ASSUMPTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.2769</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.4001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r_{xy} values</td>
<td>( Z_F ) values</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.2661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.5901</td>
<td>-2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.1105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND PREDICTIVE ACCURACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.2448</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.5230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND INTEGRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.3428</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.4973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL AND SUPERIOR ORIENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.2027</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.3206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPPORT AMONG TEACHERS AND DEMAND RECONCILIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.2554</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPPORT AMONG TEACHERS AND INITIATION OF STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.1511</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.1003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPPORT AMONG TEACHERS AND ROLE ASSIMPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.2448</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$r_{xy}$ values</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAPPORT AMONG TEACHERS AND INTEGRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM ISSUES AND TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER STATUS AND CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL FACILITIES AND SERVICES AND PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective Schools</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 154$, $*P < .05$
of uncertainty in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.33 with a Fisher $Z$ value of $.3428$ for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.43 with a Fisher $Z$ value of $.4599$ for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $Z$ score of 0.72. Failure to reject $H_{028}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 29 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and persuasiveness in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and persuasiveness in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and persuasiveness in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.31 with a Fisher $Z$ value of $.3206$ for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.36 with a Fisher $Z$ value of $.3769$ for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $Z$ score of -0.35. Failure to reject $H_{029}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 30 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and initiation of structure in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and initiation of structure in less effective schools. Analysis of the data revealed a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and initiation of structure in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.17 with a Fisher $Z$ value of $.1717$ for teachers in
effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.46 with a Fisher Z value of 0.4973 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of -2.02. Therefore, $H_{030}$ was rejected at the .05 level of significance, meaning that teachers in less effective schools perceive the relationship between their feelings about their principals and a principal’s ability to define his or her own role and let followers know what is expected to a significantly greater extent than did teachers in effective schools. Data for $H_{030}$ are presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 31 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of freedom in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of freedom in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of freedom in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.36 with a Fisher Z score of 0.3769 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.46 with a Fisher Z score of 0.4973 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of -0.74. Failure to reject $H_{031}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 32 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and role assumption in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and role assumption in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations
between teacher rapport with principal and role assumption in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.27 with a Fisher Z value of .2769 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.38 with a Fisher Z value of .4001 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of -0.76. Failure to reject $H_{032}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 33 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and consideration in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and consideration in less effective schools. Analysis of the data revealed a significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and consideration in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.26 with a Fisher Z value of .2661 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.53 with a Fisher Z value of .5901 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of -2.00. Therefore, $H_{033}$ was rejected at the .05 level of significance, meaning that teachers in less effective schools perceive the relationship between their feelings about their principals and a principal's regards for the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers to a significantly greater extent than did teachers in effective schools. Data for $H_{033}$ are presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 34 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and
production emphasis in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and production emphasis in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and production emphasis in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.05 with a Fisher Z value of 0.0501 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.11 with a Fisher Z value of 0.1105 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of -0.37. Failure to reject $H_{o34}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 35 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and predictive accuracy in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and predictive accuracy in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and predictive accuracy in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.24 with a Fisher Z value of 0.2448 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.48 with a Fisher Z value of 0.5230 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of -1.72. Failure to reject $H_{o35}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 36 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and integration in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with
principal and integration in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and integration in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.33 with a Fisher $Z$ value of .3428 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.46 with a Fisher $Z$ value of .4973 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $Z$ score of -0.96. Failure to reject $H_{o37}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 37 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and superior orientation in effective schools when compared to teacher rapport with principal and superior orientation in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher rapport with principal and superior orientation in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.20 with a Fisher $Z$ value of .2027 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.31 with a Fisher $Z$ value of .3206 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $Z$ score of -0.73. Failure to reject $H_{o37}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 38 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and demand reconciliation in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and demand reconciliation in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the
correlations between rapport among teachers and demand reconciliation in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.25 with a Fisher $Z$ value of 0.2554 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.15 with a Fisher $Z$ value of 0.1511 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $Z$ score of 0.64. Failure to reject $H_0$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 39 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and initiation of structure in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and initiation of structure in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and initiation of structure in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.15 with a Fisher $Z$ value of 0.1511 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.10 with a Fisher $Z$ value of 0.1003 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $Z$ score of 0.31. Failure to reject $H_0$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 40 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and role assumption in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and role assumption in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and role assumption in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.24 with a Fisher $Z$ value
of .2448 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.19 with a Fisher Z value of .1923 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of 0.32. Failure to reject $H_{0.40}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 41 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and integration in effective schools when compared to rapport among teachers and integration in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between rapport among teachers and integration in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.27 with a Fisher Z score of .2769 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.14 with a Fisher Z value of .1409 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of 0.84. Failure to reject $H_{0.041}$ was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 42 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between curriculum issues and tolerance of freedom in effective schools when compared to curriculum issues and tolerance of freedom in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between curriculum issues and tolerance of freedom in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.24 with a Fisher Z value of .2448 for teachers in effective schools and an $r_{xy}$ value of 0.22 with a Fisher Z value of .2237 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z
Hypothesis 43 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between teacher status and consideration in effective schools when compared to teacher status and consideration in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between teacher status and consideration in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an \( r_{xy} \) value of 0.03 with a Fisher Z score of 0.0300 for teachers in effective schools and an \( r_{xy} \) value of 0.00 with a Fisher Z value of 0.0000 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of 0.19. Failure to reject \( H_{o43} \) was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

Hypothesis 44 stated that there will be no significant difference in the correlations between school facilities and services and production emphasis in effective schools when compared to school facilities and services and production emphasis in less effective schools. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the correlations between school facilities and services and production emphasis in effective schools and less effective schools, as evidenced by an \( r_{xy} \) value of 0.08 with a Fisher Z value of 0.0802 for teachers in effective schools and an \( r_{xy} \) value of 0.01 with a Fisher Z value of 0.0100 for teachers in less effective schools. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Z score of 0.43. Failure to reject \( H_{o44} \) was based on the data presented in Table 7, pp. 70-72.

The sample for the study was selected within a 50-mile radius of East Tennessee State University which covers the three geographical areas.
of East Tennessee, Southwestern Virginia, and Western North Carolina. Fifty percent of the teachers from 36 schools in Tennessee were surveyed with 18 schools considered effective and 18 schools considered less effective. Fifty percent of the teachers from eight schools in North Carolina were surveyed with four schools considered effective and four schools considered less effective. Fifty percent of the teachers from eight schools in Virginia were surveyed with four schools considered effective and four schools considered less effective. The greatest response was from Tennessee effective schools with 63 returns which constituted 40.1% of the respondents. This group had a mean PTO score of 6.10 which was the second highest of the six divisions in the three geographical areas. Thirty-five percent of the returns represented Tennessee less effective schools with 55 respondents and a mean PTO score of 5.99. Seven percent of the returns represented North Carolina effective schools with 11 respondents and a mean PTO score of 6.01. North Carolina less effective schools represented 6.4% of the respondents with 10 returns and a mean PTO score of 5.86. The group with the highest morale score was Virginia effective schools with a mean PTO score of 6.11 from a return of 9 which constituted 5.7% of the returns. Virginia less effective schools had the lowest morale score with a mean PTO score of 5.78 from a return of 9 which represented 5.7% of the respondents. There was a total of 157 PTO instruments returned. Data from comparison of teacher morale between the three geographical areas are presented in Table 8, p. 82.
Table 8

Number, Percentage, and Morale Score of Respondents by Geographical Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Effective</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Less Effective</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Effective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Less Effective</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Effective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Less Effective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A demographic data form was mailed with each set of questionnaires. Demographic data concerning education, experience, age, sex, and the marital status of the respondents were reported. The greatest number of teachers responding have a Bachelor's Degree with 85 returns which represented 53.8% of the respondents and a mean PTO score of 5.97. Thirty-eight respondents have a Master's Degree which constituted 24% of the returns and a mean PTO score of 5.94. The group with a Master's Degree plus had the highest morale scores with a mean PTO score of 6.19 from a return of 31 which represents 19.6% of the returns. Only one respondent has a Doctor's Degree, and three respondents did not indicate their educational degree. Data for comparison of teacher morale and the education of the respondents are presented in Table 9, pp. 83-84.

Concerning teacher morale scores compared to experience in education, 64 teachers have less than 11 years teaching experience representing 40.5% of the respondents with a mean PTO score of 5.96.
Table 9
Number, Percentage, and Morale Scores of Respondents Reported by Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree Plus</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPERIENCE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in This Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 9 (continued))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARITAL STATUS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were also 64 teachers in the 11-20 years teaching category representing 40.5% of the respondents with a mean PTO score of 5.96. The 21-30 years teaching category had 17 respondents representing 10.8% of the returns and a mean PTO score of 6.52. The highest morale score for experience was the 31-40 years teaching category with a mean PTO score of 6.53 with eight respondents representing 5% of the returns. Five respondents did not indicate their years experience in teaching representing 3.2% of the returns. Seven of the respondents had 1-10 years in administration representing 4.4% of the returns with a mean PTO score of 6.03. Data for comparison of teacher morale and experience in education are presented in Table 9, pp. 83-84.

Concerning teacher morale scores compared to number of years taught in the same building, 48 teachers have spent less than six years in their present position representing 30.2% of the respondents with a mean PTO score of 5.96. Thirty-two teachers have taught 6-10 years in the same building representing 20.2% of the respondents with a mean PTO score of 5.80. The 11-15 years in the same building category had 26 respondents representing 16.5% of the returns and a mean PTO score of 6.13. The 16-20 years in the same building category had six respondents representing 3.8% of the returns and a mean PTO score of 6.03. Two teachers have taught 21-25 years in the same building representing 1.3% of the respondents with a mean PTO score of 6.85. The highest morale score for years in the same building was the 26-30 years category with a mean PTO score of 7.03 with two respondents representing 1.3% of the returns. One respondent had 31-35 years teaching in the same building representing 0.6% of the returns with a mean PTO score of 6.02.
Forty-one respondents did not indicate the number of years in the same building representing 26% of the returns. Data for comparison of teacher morale and number of years taught in the present building are presented in Table 9, pp. 83-84.

Concerning teacher morale scores compared to the age of the teachers responding, 22 teachers are less than 30 years of age representing 13.9% of the returns with a mean PTO score of 5.90. The greatest number of teachers responding are between 30 and 39 years of age with 60 respondents representing 38% of the returns and a mean PTO score of 5.94. There are 47 teachers in the 40-49 age category representing 29.8% of the returns with a mean PTO score of 5.99. The highest morale score for an age category is a mean PTO score of 6.57 for teachers 50 years of age and over and 25 respondents representing 15.8% of the returns. Four respondents did not indicate their ages representing 2.5% of the returns. Data for comparison of teacher morale and age of the teachers responding are presented in Table 9, pp. 83-84.

Concerning teacher morale scores compared to the sex of the teachers responding, 124 of the teachers are female representing 78.5% of the returns with a mean PTO score of 6.02. Male teachers have the highest teacher morale score based on the sex of the respondent with a mean PTO score of 6.12. Thirty-one male teachers responded representing 19.6% of the returns. Three teachers did not indicate male or female representing 1.9% of the returns. Data for comparison of teacher morale scores and the sex of the teachers responding are presented in Table 9, pp. 83-84.
Concerning teacher morale scores compared to the marital status of the teachers responding, 28 of the teachers are unmarried representing 17.7% of the returns with a mean PTO score of 6.10 which is higher than a mean PTO score of 5.98 for married teachers. The majority of teachers responding are married with 128 returns representing 81% of the respondents. Two teachers did not indicate their marital status representing 1.3% of the returns. Data for comparison of teacher morale scores and the marital status of the teachers responding are presented in Table 9, pp. 83-84.

Summary

The analysis of the data was reported in this chapter. The results indicated that there was no significant difference in the leadership behaviors exhibited by principals in effective schools and less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-XII. Null Hypothesis 1 failed to be rejected.

The results indicated no significant difference in teacher morale scores in effective schools and less effective schools as perceived by teachers and measured by the PTO. Null Hypothesis 2 failed to be rejected.

The results indicated no significant difference in the correlation between the leadership behaviors of principals and teacher morale in effective schools when compared to the correlation between leadership behaviors of principals and teacher morale in less effective schools. Null Hypothesis 2 failed to be rejected.
Hypotheses 4 through 15 concerned the differences between the leadership behaviors of principals in effective schools and the leadership behaviors of principals in less effective schools within the 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences between principals in effective schools and principals in less effective schools on the leader behaviors of representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, or superior orientation. Null Hypotheses 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 failed to be rejected. A significant difference occurred on the leader behavior dimension of persuasiveness. Null Hypothesis 7 was rejected.

Hypotheses 16 through 25 concerned the differences between teacher morale scores in effective schools and teacher morale scores in less effective schools within the ten dimensions of the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences between teacher morale in effective schools and teacher morale in less effective schools on all dimensions of morale measured by the PTO. Null Hypotheses 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 failed to be rejected.

Hypotheses 26 through 44 concerned the differences in the correlations between the leadership behaviors of principals and teacher morale in effective schools and the leadership behaviors of principals and teacher morale in less effective schools within the dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII and the PTO. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences in the correlations between teacher rapport
with principal and representation, teacher rapport with principal and
demand reconciliation, teacher rapport with principal and tolerance
of uncertainty, teacher rapport with principal and persuasiveness,
teacher rapport with principal and tolerance of freedom, teacher
rapport with principal and role assumption, teacher rapport with
principal and production emphasis, teacher rapport with principal and
predictive accuracy, teacher rapport with principal and integration,
teacher rapport with principal and superior orientation, rapport among
teachers and demand reconciliation, rapport among teachers and
initiation of structure, rapport among teachers and role assumption,
rappor among teachers and integration, curriculum issues and tolerance
of freedom, teacher status and consideration, or school facilities and
services and production emphasis. Null hypotheses 26, 27, 28, 29, 31,
32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 44 failed to be rejected.
Significant differences occurred in the correlations between teacher
rapport with principal and initiation of structure and teacher rapport
with principal and consideration. Null Hypotheses 30 and 33 were
rejected.

Teacher morale scores were compared between three geographical
regions and demographic data with morale scores being slightly higher
in Virginia effective schools, teachers with a Master's Degree plus,
31-40 years teaching experience, teachers having taught 26-30 years in
the same building, teachers 50 years of age and older, male teachers,
and unmarried teachers.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, conclusions based on the analysis of the data, and recommendations based on the findings of the study.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare the leadership behavior of principals in effective schools with the leadership behavior of principals in less effective schools as perceived by teachers, to compare teacher morale in effective schools and less effective schools, and to compare correlations between leadership behaviors of principals and factors contributing to teacher morale in effective schools and less effective schools. Specific objectives of the study were

1. To determine if there is a significant difference in the leadership behavior of principals in effective schools when compared to the leadership behavior of principals in less effective schools as perceived by teachers.

2. To determine if there is a significant difference in teacher morale in effective schools when compared to teacher morale in less effective schools.

3. To determine if there is a significant difference in the correlations between the leadership behaviors of principals and teacher morale in effective schools when compared to the correlations between
the leadership behaviors of principals and teacher morale in less effective schools.

4. To report teacher morale scores by the three geographical areas studied, and to report teacher morale scores by demographic data.

The population for this study included 482 schools within a 50-mile radius of East Tennessee State University. The sample included 26 effective schools and 26 less effective schools chosen from the 13 school systems that granted permission for the study. The 26 effective schools were chosen by the superintendents of the districts based on criteria provided by research of effective schools. After the 26 effective schools had been eliminated, two schools were randomly selected from each of the 13 districts to constitute the less effective schools. Fifty percent of the teachers in each of the selected schools was surveyed.

The instruments used to collect the data included the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ) (See Appendix E) and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) (See Appendix F). The questionnaires were mailed during May, 1987, to 571 teachers in the 52 schools in the sample. Instruments were completed and returned by 158 teachers.

The study consisted of 44 hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 was concerned with the comparison of the leadership behavior of principals in effective schools with the leadership behavior of principals in less effective schools. Hypothesis 2 was concerned with the comparison of teacher morale in effective schools and less effective schools. Hypothesis 3 was concerned with the comparison of the correlation between leader
behavior and teacher morale in effective schools and the correlation between leader behavior and teacher morale in less effective schools. Hypotheses 4 through 15 were concerned with comparing behavior within the 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII between effective schools and less effective schools. Hypotheses 16 through 25 were concerned with comparing teacher morale scores within the ten dimensions of the PTO between effective schools and less effective schools. Hypotheses 26 through 44 were concerned with comparing the correlations between the 12 dimensions of leader behavior and certain dimensions of teacher morale in effective schools and less effective schools. In addition, teacher morale scores were reported by the three geographical regions surveyed and demographic data.

Research hypotheses in Chapter 1 were tested in the null format at the .05 level of significance using a two-tailed test. A t-test for independent samples was used to test for significant differences between effective schools and less effective schools in hypotheses 1, 2, and 4 through 25. In hypotheses 3 and 26 through 44, the Pearson r was used to determine the degree of relationship between the mean scores of the variables. The r-values were transformed to Fisher Z values and computed at the .05 probability level to test for significance of difference between the correlations of the two groups.

The findings in the study resulted in rejection of Null Hypotheses concerning the leader behavior dimension of persuasiveness and correlations between teacher rapport with principal and initiation of structure and teacher rapport with principal and consideration. The
findings also included failure to reject Null Hypotheses concerning the mean of total leader behaviors, the mean of total teacher morale scores, and the correlation between the mean of total leader behaviors and the mean of total teacher morale scores. Null Hypotheses concerning leader behavior dimensions of representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation failed to be rejected. Null Hypotheses concerning teacher morale dimensions of teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures failed to be rejected. Null Hypotheses concerning correlations between teacher rapport with principal and representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, superior orientation; rapport among teachers and demand reconciliation, initiation of structure, role assumption, integration; curriculum issues and tolerance of freedom; teacher status and consideration; and school facilities and services and production emphasis also failed to be rejected.

Although differences were not warranted at the .05 level of significance, principals of effective schools rated higher on mean scores in ten dimensions of leader behaviors: demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, role assumption,
consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation. Principals in less effective schools rated higher on mean scores in representation and tolerance of freedom.

Teacher morale was not significantly different in effective schools when compared to less effective schools. There were no significant differences in any of the ten dimensions of teacher morale.

While differences were not warranted at the .05 level of significance, teacher morale scores in effective schools were higher in the following dimensions: teacher rapport with principal, rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, community support of education, and school facilities and services. Teacher morale scores in less effective schools were higher in satisfaction with teaching, teacher status, and community pressures.

The findings might have been different if the sample had been selected using more stringent methods. Using such criteria as observations, student test scores, attendance records, and interviews may have been a more appropriate means of selecting effective schools and less effective schools. Also, the instruments used in this study may not have adequately measured all of the areas that were anticipated from the outset of the study.

Conclusions Based on the Hypotheses

The following conclusions were based on the findings of the study:

1. There is very little difference in the leadership behavior of principals in effective schools when compared to the leadership behavior of principals in less effective schools.
2. Principals in effective schools use persuasion and argument more effectively and exhibit stronger convictions than do principals in less effective schools.

3. Teacher morale in effective schools does not differ from teacher morale in less effective schools.

4. Teachers in less effective schools allow their principal’s ability to define his or her own role and to let followers know what is expected determine their feelings about their principal to a greater extent than teachers in effective schools.

5. Teachers in less effective schools allow their principal’s regard for the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of his or her followers to determine their feelings about their principal to a greater extent than teachers in effective schools.

**Comparison of Teacher Morale Scores by Geographical Regions and by Demographic Data**

The highest teacher morale scores were reported in Virginia effective schools. Based on demographic data, teachers with the highest morale scores have a Master’s Degree plus in education, have 31 to 40 years teaching experience, have taught 26 to 30 years in the same building, are 50 years of age or over, male, and unmarried.

**Recommendations Based on the Findings**

The results of the study suggest that effective schools and less effective schools do not differ greatly in teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s leadership behavior, teacher morale, or the relationships that exist between leader behavior and teacher morale.
However, there seems to be a relationship between teacher morale and the leadership behaviors of principals. Based on these conclusions, the following recommendations were made:

1. Comments added to returned instruments suggest the necessity for the researcher to interview teachers to reveal underlying perceptions of leader behavior and teacher morale.

2. The study should be replicated using more stringent methods of selecting effective schools and less effective schools. Such criteria as observations, attendance records, test scores, and community surveys should be used to improve the method of selection.

3. Leader behavior should be measured by different groups in the hierarchial system to provide a better profile of leader behavior in effective schools and less effective schools.

4. Inservice training and staff development programs should provide opportunities to share with principals leader behaviors deemed important by teachers.

5. Leadership styles should be studied in effective schools and less effective schools as a possible explanation as to why teachers' feelings toward their principal are determined by the principal's leader behaviors to a greater extent in less effective schools.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS
By the way of introduction, I am a doctoral student in the Department of Supervision and Administration, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN. I am currently attempting to collect research data for my doctoral dissertation. My study deals with comparing teacher morale and leader behavior relationships between effective schools and less effective schools.

I wish to mail questionnaires to teachers in four of your system's schools. In order to compare the results between effective schools and less effective schools, I need your assistance in identifying your two (2) most effective schools based on the following criteria:

A safe and orderly learning environment
A sense of community
High expectations
Regular attendance of students
Time on tasks

If you grant permission for this study to be conducted in four of your schools, please list your two (2) most effective schools in the spaces provided below and return this letter in the enclosed envelope. I will randomly select two other schools from your system to participate in the study. Confidentiality of school systems' and teachers' names will be assured.

Thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Shepard
Chairman, Doctoral Program

Jerry Lynn
Doctoral Fellow

Effective Schools
Dear Teacher:

By way of introduction, I am a Doctoral Fellow at East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee. I am presently in the process of collecting data for a study concerning leader behavior and teacher morale.

Since I have been a teacher for the past fourteen years, I realize how busy teachers are at this particular time. However, I am asking that you take a few minutes of your time to provide information that may be beneficial to both teachers and principals. By collecting data from the enclosed questionnaires and demographic data sheet, I will be able to analyze relationships between morale and the leader behavior of principals.

I can assure you that the information you provide will in no way reveal the names of teachers or schools involved in the study.

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, I will be happy to send one to you.

Your response will be greatly appreciated,

Sincerely,

Robert G. Shepard
Chairman, Doctoral Program

Jerry Lynn
Doctoral Fellow
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Principal Investigator: Jerry Albert Lynne
Title of Project: A Study of Leadership Behavior and Teacher Morale in Effective Schools and Less Effective Schools.

The purpose of this study is threefold: (1) to determine if there is a difference between the leader behavior of principals in effective schools when compared to the leader behavior of principals in less effective schools as perceived by teachers, (2) to determine if there is a difference in teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools, and (3) to determine if there is a difference in the correlations between leader behavior of principals and factors contributing to teacher morale in effective schools when compared to less effective schools.

As a teacher, you are being asked to fill out two standardized questionnaires to measure leadership behavior and teacher morale. These questionnaires will take approximately 45 minutes for you to complete.

Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time without prejudice. There are no discomforts, risks, or inconveniences associated with your participation in this study.

If you have any questions concerning this study, you may call Jerry A. Lynne at (615) 872-4678 or Dr. Robert G. Shepard at (615) 929-4415, for answers to those questions.

CONSENT:

I understand the procedures to be used in this study and the possible risks involved. I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. I understand that my responses will be kept strictly confidential, and that I may withdraw at any time.

I also understand (although there are no risks associated with my participation in this study) that: (1) my rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and the ETSU Institutional Review Board do have free access to any information obtained in this study should it become necessary. I also understand that while East Tennessee State University does not provide compensation for medical treatment other than emergency first aid, for any physical injury which may occur as a result of my participation as a subject in this study, claims arising against ETSU or any of its agents or employees may be submitted to the Tennessee Claims Commission for disposition to the extent allowable as provided under TCA Section 9-8-307. Further information concerning this may be obtained from the Chairman of the Institutional Review Board.

Date
Signature of Volunteer

Date
Signature of Investigator
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CONSENT LETTER TO USE THE PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE
Mr. Jerry Lynn  
East Tennessee State University  
Dept. Supervision and Administration  
Box 19000 A  
Johnson City  
Tennessee 37614-0002  

Dear Jerry,

Your letter was forwarded to me at the above address since we have just moved here from West Lafayette, Indiana.

Yes, you have my permission to use the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire in your research. You may be able to secure the needed materials from the University Book Store, 360 State Street, West Lafayette, Indiana 47906.

Sincerely,

Ralph R. Bentley  
Phone # 813-858-6752
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—Form XII

Originated by staff members of The Ohio State Leadership Studies and revised by the Bureau of Business Research

Purpose of the Questionnaire

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

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

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

Published by

College of Administrative Science
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DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully,

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Acts as the spokesperson of the group ................. A B C D E
2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision ................. A B C D E
3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group ................. A B C D E
4. Lets group members know what is expected of them ................. A B C D E
5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work ................. A B C D E
6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group ................. A B C D E
7. Is friendly and approachable ................. A B C D E
8. Encourages overtime work ................. A B C D E
9. Makes accurate decisions ................. A B C D E
10. Gets along well with the people above him/her ................. A B C D E
11. Publicizes the activities of the group ................. A B C D E
12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next ................. A B C D E
A = Always  
B = Often  
C = Occassionally  
D = Seldom  
E = Never

13. His/her arguments are convincing ............. A B C D E
14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures .... A B C D E
15. Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems ........... A B C D E
16. Fails to take necessary action .............. A B C D E
17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group ........... A B C D E
18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups .... A B C D E
19. Keeps the group working together as a team .... A B C D E
20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority ........... A B C D E
21. Speaks as the representative of the group .... A B C D E
22. Accepts defeat in stride ................. A B C D E
23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view .... A B C D E
24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group ........ A B C D E
25. Encourages initiative in the group members .... A B C D E
26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group .............. A B C D E
27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation ........ A B C D E
28. Needles members for greater effort .......... A B C D E
29. Seems able to predict what is coming next ........ A B C D E
30. Is working hard for a promotion .............. A B C D E
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present .... A B C D E
32. Accepts delays without becoming upset ........ A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

33. Is a very persuasive talker ................................ A B C D E
34. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group ........ A B C D E
35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best ........ A B C D E
36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her .......... A B C D E
37. Treats all group members as his/her equals .......... A B C D E
38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace ................ A B C D E
39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group ... A B C D E
40. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions ................ A B C D E
41. Represents the group at outside meetings ........ A B C D E
42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments ................ A B C D E
43. Is very skillful in an argument ................ A B C D E
44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done ........ A B C D E
45. Assigns a task, then lets the members handle it ... A B C D E
46. Is the leader of the group in name only ........ A B C D E
47. Gives advance notice of changes ................ A B C D E
48. Pushes for increased production ................ A B C D E
49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts .......... A B C D E
50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position ........ A B C D E
51. Handles complex problems efficiently ................ A B C D E
52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty ........ A B C D E
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Is not a very convincing talker</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Assigns group members to particular tasks</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Keeps to himself/herself</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Asks the members to work harder</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Is accurate in predicting the trend of events</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Gets swamped by details</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Can wait just so long, then blows up</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Speaks from a strong inner conviction</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Looks out for the personal welfare of group members</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Permits the members to take it easy in their work</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>His/her word carries weight with superiors</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. Gets things all tangled up .............. A B C D E
72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events .............. A B C D E
73. Is an inspiring talker .............. A B C D E
74. Schedules the work to be done .............. A B C D E
75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative .............. A B C D E
76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise .............. A B C D E
77. Is willing to make changes .............. A B C D E
78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done .............. A B C D E
79. Helps group members settle their differences .............. A B C D E
80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors .............. A B C D E
81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order .............. A B C D E
82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs .............. A B C D E
83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage .............. A B C D E
84. Maintains definite standards of performance .............. A B C D E
85. Trusts members to exercise good judgment .............. A B C D E
86. Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership .............. A B C D E
87. Refuses to explain his/her actions .............. A B C D E
88. Urges the group to beat its previous record .............. A B C D E
89. Anticipates problems and plans for them .............. A B C D E
90. Is working his/her way to the top .............. A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her ........................................ A B C D E

92. Worries about the outcome of any new procedure ........................................... A B C D E

93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project ........................................................................ A B C D E

94. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations ............................. A B C D E

95. Permits the group to set its own pace ........................................................................ A B C D E

96. Is easily recognized as the leader of the group ......................................................... A B C D E

97. Acts without consulting the group ............................................................................ A B C D E

98. Keeps the group working up to capacity ................................................................... A B C D E

99. Maintains a closely knit group ................................................................................... A B C D E

100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors ................................................................. A B C D E
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PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE
THE PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

Prepared by Ralph E. Bentley
and Averno M. Rempel

This instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about your work as a teacher and various school problems in your particular school situation. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly.

FORM A USE WHEN RECORDING RESPONSES ON OPINIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES ON OPINIONNAIRE

Fill in the information below. You will notice that there is no place for your name. Please do not record your name. All responses will be strictly confidential and results will be reported by groups only. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

School ___________________________ Date ____________________________

Age _______ Sex _______ Highest Degree Completed ____________________

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you agree, probably agree, probably disagree, or disagree with each statement. Mark your answers in the following manner:

If you agree with the statement, circle "A" ....... A PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably agree with the statement, circle "PA" ............. A PA PD D

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably disagree with the statement, circle "PD" ............ A PA PD D

If you disagree with the statement, circle "D" .... A PA PD D
1. Details, "red tape," and required reports absorb too much of my time .... A PA PD D

2. The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal .... A PA PD D

3. Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal ...... A PA PD D

4. The faculty feels that their suggestions pertaining to salaries are adequately transmitted by the administration to the board of education .... A PA PD D

5. Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school ...... A PA PD D

6. Teachers in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of recordkeeping and clerical work ...... A PA PD D

7. My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty ...... A PA PD D

8. Community demands upon the teacher's time are unreasonable ...... A PA PD D

9. I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are granted ...... A PA PD D

10. My teaching load is greater than that of most of the other teachers in our school .......... A PA PD D

11. The extra-curricular load of the teachers in our school is unreasonable .......... A PA PD D

12. Our principal's leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth .......... A PA PD D

13. My teaching position gives me the social status in the community that I desire .......... A PA PD D

14. The number of hours a teacher must work is unreasonable .......... A PA PD D

15. Teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like .......... A PA PD D
16. My school provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment.

17. Our school has a well-balanced curriculum.

18. There is a great deal of griping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among our teachers.

19. Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction.

20. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences.

21. The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient.

22. Generally, teachers in our school do not take advantage of one another.

23. The teachers in our school cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives.

24. Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society.

25. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions.

26. I love to teach.

27. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching.

28. Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues.

29. I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability.

30. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching.

31. The school schedule places my classes at a disadvantage.

32. Within the limits of financial resources, the school tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc.
33. My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant. A PA PD D
34. Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden. A PA PD D
35. Our community makes its teachers feel as though they are a real part of the community. A PA PD D
36. Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice. A PA PD D
37. Teaching affords me the security I want in an occupation. A PA PD D
38. My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures. A PA PD D
39. Teachers clearly understand the policies governing salary increases. A PA PD D
40. My classes are used as a "dumping ground" for problem students. A PA PD D
41. The lines and methods of communications between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained. A PA PD D
42. My teaching load in this school is unreasonable. A PA PD D
43. My principal shows a real interest in my department. A PA PD D
44. Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school. A PA PD D
45. My heavy teaching load unduly restricts my non-professional activities. A PA PD D
46. I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding. A PA PD D
47. I feel that I am an important part of this school system. A PA PD D
48. The competency of the teachers in our school compares favorably with that of teachers in other schools with which I am familiar. A PA PD D
49. My school provides the teachers with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment ...

50. I feel successful and competent in my present position ...

51. I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies ...

52. Our teaching staff is congenial to work with ...

53. My teaching associates are well prepared for their jobs ...

54. Our school faculty has a tendency to form into cliques ...

55. The teachers in our school work well together ...

56. I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am ...

57. Our school provides adequate clerical services for the teachers ...

58. As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher ...

59. Library facilities and resources are adequate for the grade or subject area which I teach ...

60. The "stress and strain" resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me ...

61. My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically ...

62. I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal ...

63. Teaching gives me the prestige I desire ...

64. My teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family ...

65. The salary schedule in our school adequately recognizes teacher competency ...
66. Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.
67. In my judgment, this community is a good place to raise a family.
68. This community respects its teachers and treats them like professional persons.
69. My principal acts as though he is interested in me and my problems.
70. My school principal supervises rather than "snoopervises" the teachers in our school.
71. It is difficult for teachers to gain acceptance by the people in this community.
72. Teachers' meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff.
73. My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.
74. I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal.
75. Salaries paid in this school system compare favorably with salaries in other systems with which I am familiar.
76. Most of the actions of students irritate me.
77. The cooperativeness of teachers in our school helps make my work more enjoyable.
78. My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.
79. The purposes and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.
80. The teachers in our school have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students.
81. This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards.
82. My students appreciate the help I give them with their school work.

83. To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.

84. Others in our school are appreciative of my work.

85. As a teacher in this community, my non-professional activities outside of school are unduly restricted.

86. As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.

87. The teachers with whom I work have high professional ethics.

88. Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens.

89. I really enjoy working with my students.

90. The teachers in our school show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments.

91. Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes.

92. My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when he visits my classes.

93. My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher's capacity and talent.

94. The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system.

95. Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare.

96. This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff.

97. This community is willing to support a good program of education.
98. Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many social activities . . . A PA PD D

99. Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a teacher . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D

100. I am well satisfied with my present teaching position . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A PA PD D
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DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Please check the appropriate response to each item below.

Education:

Bachelor's Degree ____

Master's Degree ____

Master's Degree Plus ____

Doctor's Degree ____

Experience:

Years Teaching ____

Years Administration ____

Years in this Building ____

Age:

20-29 ____

30-39 ____

40-49 ____

50 and over ____

Marital Status:

Unmarried ____

Married ____

Sex:

Female ____

Male ____
VITA

JERRY ALBERT LYNN

| Personal Data:          | Date of Birth: February 2, 1951 |
|                       | Place of Birth: Jefferson City, Tennessee |

| Education:             | Rutledge High School, Rutledge, Tennessee, 1969 |
|                       | Hiwassee College, Madisonville, Tennessee; education, A.A., 1971 |
|                       | University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee; elementary education, B.S., 1975 |
|                       | Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky; elementary education, M.A., 1978 |
|                       | East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; educational administration, Ed.S., 1985 |
|                       | East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; educational administration, Ed.D., 1987 |

|                         | Teacher, Joppa Elementary School, Rutledge, Tennessee, 1975-1986 |
|                         | Doctoral Fellowship, Department of Supervision and Administration, East Tennessee State University, 1986-1987. |

| Professional Membership: | Grainger County Education Association |
|                         | Tennessee Education Association |
|                         | National Education Association |
|                         | Phi Delta Kappa |