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ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF CAREER LADDER III AND CAREER LADDER I ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' LEADER BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

by

Eugene Hunter Johnson, Jr.

The perceptions of elementary teachers with regard to the leadership behavior exhibited by their principals and to the organizational climate of their schools were examined in this study. The purpose of the study was to determine whether Tennessee elementary principals who achieved Career Ladder III standing exhibited more effective leadership behaviors and maintained a more suitable organizational climates than Career Ladder I principals.

This study followed the ex-post facto research approach and utilized data obtained through use of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire Form 12 (LBDQ-12) and the Revised Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RE). Responses were obtained from 590 teachers who represented 26 randomly selected elementary schools in northeast Tennessee, 11 of which were administered by Career Ladder III principals and 16 administered by Career Ladder I principals.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to the data to determine significance at the .05 level. ANOVA was selected because it permitted the researcher to evaluate the mean differences in perceived leadership behavior and organizational climate simultaneously while maintaining the Type I error rate at the preestablished .05 significance level for the entire set of comparisons.

No significant differences were found in total leader behavior or in any dimension of leader behavior, as measured by the LBDQ-12, for Career Ladder III elementary principals when compared to Career Ladder I elementary principals. No significant differences were found in any dimension of organizational climate, as measured by the OCDQ-RE, for elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals. Recommendations for future research were given.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

The 1980s have evinced a great demand for accountability. Schools, since they account for more than half of the average local budget, are obvious candidates to be required to justify their expenditures. In A Nation at Risk (1983), The National Commission on Excellence in Education presented a need for major overhaul of our schools' programs. They stated that America no longer holds a secure position in the world, and that educational reform is the mechanism for regaining a competitive edge in the world's marketplace.

In 1983 Lamar Alexander, then governor of Tennessee, proposed a sweeping overhaul of the states schools at all levels. The Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 addressed many facets of the schooling process in addition to strengthening and expanding curriculum content. Graduation requirements for all students were increased. Teachers were given a "merit pay" program where those identified as better teachers would receive more pay and would get the opportunity to work an extended contract year with additional remuneration. A Career Ladder program for administrators was initiated with the intent of identifying, training and rewarding those administrators who were truly superior. Russell French, director of the commission
charged with implementing the first year of the Career Ladder program, stated that an administrator’s performance must be outstanding to lead an outstanding faculty. He further identified the rationale for the administrators’ Career Ladder as the notion that no administrator’s performance should merely be average (French, 1984).

Effective schools research has identified the leadership role of the principal as crucial to the success of modern schools (Lipham, 1981; Edmonds, 1982; Denbo & Ross, 1982). Contemporary leadership theories suggest that behavior within an organization is a function of both individual needs and organizational goals. Peters (1987) stressed the need for empowerment of all people in an organization and the elimination of “bureaucratic rules and humiliating conditions.” Effective schools have resulted from the activities of effective principals (Ubben & Hughes, 1987). Wayson (1986) contended that the central problem with schools is a lack of leadership, and cited specific examples of bureaucratic dysfunction. The Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Discipline (1982) itemized characteristics of effective schools that stressed the importance of leadership and open school climate as integral to the development of a sense of ownership and commitment to the school’s purposes on the part of students, staff, and parents. A central dimension of the school principal’s role has been to provide effective teachers with the work environment they need in order to

Much emphasis has been placed upon the implementation of collaborative management practices for the continued success of any organization. Effective leadership has been viewed as the extent to which such practices are a part of an organization and are reflected in the climate of the organization. The domains of competence identified by the Tennessee Career Ladder as major areas were instructional leadership, organizational management, communication and interpersonal relations, and professional growth and leadership. An appropriate evaluation of the Tennessee Career Ladder program for school administrators would seem to be the appraisal of leadership and the influence of that leadership on school climate.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study was whether elementary principals who achieved Career Ladder III standing exhibited more effective leadership behaviors and maintained more suitable organizational climates than Career Ladder I principals.
Significance of the Study

Many studies have been made that illustrate the importance of the principal’s leadership role in effective schools (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Weber, 1971; Edmonds, 1979). The principal must be an efficient and effective manager of material and personnel to achieve the goals of the school, and leadership creates the climate that results in staff and student involvement and productivity. Leadership need not be reserved to the principal, but appropriate leader behavior would permit and encourage leadership acts to emerge from the teachers (Halpin & Croft, 1963).

Studies of the Better Schools program have focused on basic skills testing, per pupil expenditures and teacher testing and evaluation, but there is a lack of empirical data about the effectiveness of the administrative component of the Career Ladder program. This researcher collected and analyzed data about the leader behavior and organizational climate of schools with principals who represented different levels of Career Ladder recognition. The results may encourage the Tennessee State Department of Education to reconsider the criteria for identifying principals as Career Ladder III principals if they are, in fact, no different from Career Ladder I Principals.
**Hypotheses**

The research hypotheses are relevant to a comparison of dimensions of leader behavior of principals, Career Ladder III versus Career Ladder I, as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ-12, See Appendix C). In addition, the hypotheses pertain to a comparison of the dimensions of the organizational climate in schools administered by Career Ladder III versus Career Ladder I principals, as measured by the Revised Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE, See Appendix D). The hypotheses will be tested and reported in the null form in Chapter 4, since this form is more suited to the application of statistical tests.

**Hypothesis 1.** The mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by Career Ladder III principals will be significantly higher when compared to the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 2.** The mean score of the openness index for faculty relations exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals will be significantly higher when compared to the mean score of the openness index for faculty relations exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as
Hypothesis 3. The mean score of the openness index for principal behavior exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals will be significantly higher when compared to the mean score of the openness index for principal behavior exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE.

Hypothesis 4. The mean score in representation will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in representation in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

Hypothesis 5. The mean score in reconciliation will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in reconciliation in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

Hypothesis 6. The mean score in tolerance of uncertainty will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and
measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 7.** The mean score in persuasiveness will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in persuasiveness in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 8.** The mean score in initiation of structure will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in initiation of structure in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 9.** The mean score in tolerance of freedom will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in tolerance of freedom in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 10.** The mean score in role assumption will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in role assumption in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 11.** The mean score in consideration will be
significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in consideration in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 12.** The mean score in production emphasis will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in production emphasis in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 13.** The mean score in predictive accuracy will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in predictive accuracy in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 14.** The mean score in integration will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in integration in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

**Hypothesis 15.** The mean score in influence with supervisors will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared
to the mean score in influence with supervisors in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12.

Hypothesis 16. The mean score in supportive behavior will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in supportive behavior in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE.

Hypothesis 17. The mean score in directive behavior will be significantly lower in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in directive behavior in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE.

Hypothesis 18. The mean score in restrictive behavior will be significantly lower in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in restrictive behavior in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE.

Hypothesis 19. The mean score in collegial behavior will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in collegial behavior in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the
Hypothesis 20. The mean score in intimate behavior will be significantly higher in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in intimate behavior in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE.

Hypothesis 21. The mean score in disengaged behavior will be significantly lower in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to the mean score in disengaged behavior in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE.

Assumptions

1. The participants responded candidly and seriously to the questionnaires.

2. The participants were representative of the total population of schools in the First District of the Tennessee State Department of Education.

Limitations

1. The dimensions of leader behavior were limited to those measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-12, See Appendix C).

2. The characteristics of organizational climate were
limited to those measured by the Revised Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE, See Appendix D).

3. The participants in the study were limited to teachers and principals in randomly selected public elementary schools in the seventeen school districts of the First District of the Tennessee State Department of Education.

4. The participants in the study were limited to public elementary schools with ten or more full time teachers.

5. The teachers surveyed were limited to those who were assigned full time instructional responsibilities at the participant schools.

6. The Career Ladder I principals who were surveyed had at least five years experience as a principal and thus were eligible to apply for Career Ladder III status.

7. Data collection was limited to April and May, 1989.

Operational Definitions

Career Ladder I Principal. A Career Ladder I principal is one who has met the criteria of the Tennessee State Department of Education for recognition at that rank.

Career Ladder III Principal. A Career Ladder III principal is one who has met the criteria of the Tennessee State Department of Education for recognition at that rank.

Leader Behavior. Leader behavior refers to those
specific behaviors exhibited by the school principal that determine the leadership style of that principal.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ-12). The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was the instrument used to assess the teachers' perceptions of the leader behavior of the principal in the school.

Organizational Climate. Organizational climate refers to the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of its members (Taguiri & Litwin, 1968).

Revised Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE). The Revised Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire for Elementary Schools was the instrument used to assess the teachers' perceptions of the climate of their school.

The following terms as defined by Bass (1981) refer to the dimensions of leader behavior assessed in the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII:

Representation. Representation refers to behavior in which the principal speaks and acts as representative of the group.

Reconciliation. Reconciliation refers to behavior in which the principal reconciles conflicting organizational demands and reduces disorder to the system.

Tolerance of Uncertainty. Tolerance of uncertainty refers to behavior in which the principal is able to
tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset.

**Persuasiveness.** Persuasiveness refers to behavior in which the principal uses persuasion and argument effectively, and exhibits strong convictions.

**Initiation of Structure.** Initiation of structure refers to the extent to which the principal initiated activity in the group, organized it, and defined the way the work was to be done.

**Tolerance of Freedom.** Tolerance of freedom refers to behavior in which the principal allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action.

**Role Assumption.** Role assumption refers to behavior in which the principal actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.

**Consideration.** Consideration refers to behavior in which the principal exhibited concern for the welfare of the other members of the group.

**Production Emphasis.** Production emphasis refers to behavior in which the principal applies pressure for productive output.

**Predictive Accuracy.** Predictive accuracy refers to behavior in which the principal exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.

**Integration.** Integration refers to behavior in which the principal maintains a closely knit organization and resolves
intermember conflicts.

**Influence with Supervisors.** Influence with supervisors refers to behavior in which the principal maintains cordial relations with supervisors, has influence with them, and is striving for higher status.

The following terms as defined by Hoy and Miskel (1987) refer to the dimensions of organizational climate assessed in the Revised Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools:

**Supportive Behavior.** Supportive behavior of the principal reflects genuine concern and support of teachers.

**Directive Behavior.** Directive behavior of the principal is rigid, task oriented, close supervision with little consideration for the personal needs of the teachers.

**Restrictive Behavior.** Restrictive behavior of the principal produces impediments for teachers rather than facilitating their work.

**Collegial Behavior.** Collegial behavior is open, supportive and professional interaction among teachers.

**Intimate Behavior.** Intimate behavior is a close interpersonal relationship among teachers both in and away from the school.

**Disengaged Behavior.** Disengaged behavior refers to a general sense of alienation and separation among teachers in a school; they have no orientation toward a common goal.
Procedures

A review of related literature was conducted using the print and microfilm resources of the Sherrod Library at East Tennessee State University. The computer services of the Sherrod Library were used to search Dissertation Abstracts International, Psychological Abstracts, General Periodicals Index, and ERIC documents. The library of the University of Tennessee was also useful in conducting the literature review.

The population for the study was the public elementary schools of the First District of the Tennessee State Department of Education, the principals in those schools, and the full time certificated teachers in those schools. The proportional stratified random sample consisted of 26 elementary schools, 11 of which were administered by Career Ladder III principals and 15 administered by Career Ladder I principals who had met the requirement for experience but had chosen not to apply for higher levels of the career ladder program.

The instruments chosen for the study were the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII and the Revised Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire for Elementary Schools. A demographic data sheet (See Appendix E) was used to collect appropriate data about each respondent's Career Ladder status, experience and other pertinent information.
An introductory letter was sent to the superintendents in the seventeen school districts requesting permission to use selected schools in each district (See Appendix A). A form letter was enclosed for the superintendents to respond in granting permission (See Appendix B). A personal visit was made to inform the principal of each selected school of the purpose of the study and the procedures for collecting data, as well as to establish the date and time for administering the questionnaires. The instruments were explained by the researcher in a group setting at the school site, and were collected later by the researcher. The instruments were administered to those teachers who volunteered to participate, and questionnaires were left at the school to be distributed to teachers who were absent on the date of administration. A minimum acceptable return rate was established at 75 percent of the teachers of each school that was surveyed.

The data were collected and analyzed to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. Analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences between the means for the dependent variables of the two groups.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters:

Chapter I contains the introduction, statement of the
problem, significance of the study, the hypotheses, assumptions, limitations, definitions, procedures, and organization of the study.

Chapter II consists of a review of related literature.

Chapter III presents the instrumentation and research methodology used in the study.

Chapter IV reports the findings and the analysis of data is presented.

Chapter V presents a summary of the study with conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

The literature and research related to the study of better schools, leadership, the leadership role of the principal, and to organizational climate are reviewed in this chapter. The first section includes a review of literature about the better schools movement. The second section is a review of contemporary theories of leadership; the third section is a discussion of the leadership role of the principal. School climate is the focus of the fourth section.

The Better Schools Movement

Since the first school was established in America, public faith in the quality of schools and their influence in the development of our youth has been unwavering. The launch of Sputnik I in 1957 stirred a national concern for the state of our national preparedness, and the focus ultimately concentrated on our school system. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 focused our nation's attention on its schools and brought with it the feelings of dissatisfaction that have characterized national politics since that time. This top-down approach to school improvement ultimately proved to
be short lived in its effectiveness, and attention began to focus on improvement at the state, local, and building level.

The effective schools movement was given impetus by the 1966 publication of the Coleman report that suggested that factors in the home environment, such as social class, parents' income, and exposure to books, were more important to the education of the child than factors such as school facilities, teacher salaries, or even the curriculum of the school. He further suggested that social inequality (resulting from segregated schools) was a significant factor in poor learning for many students (Coleman et al., 1966). Coleman's report had the effect of triggering a vast amount of effectiveness research that supported the belief that schools indeed make a difference, and some schools made more difference than others.

The publication of A Nation at Risk (1983) created an imperative for increasing the quality of our nation's schools, but offered no promise of federal funds with which to do this. In fact, when questioned by the media after the report's release, President Reagan advocated decreased bussing, tuition vouchers, and prayer in the schools (Wayson, Mitchell, Pinnell, & Landis, 1988). Since none of these issues had been raised in the report, and no mention was made concerning the recommendation for a greater federal role, it seemed clear that any action taken would be the
responsibility of the states. Lutz (1986) described the federal force behind reform as limited to the pulpit of national rhetoric. Consequently, the educational reforms of the 1980s has been viewed as a national reform of education with state variations. These state variations have taken shape in quite different manners.

In March, 1984 the New York State Board of Regents approved the Action Plan, which was conceived and developed by the educational bureaucracy of the state rather than by the legislature and governor (Layton, 1986). The nonpolitical nature of the implementation of this program kept it out of the national spotlight, but, according to the sitting Commissioner of Education at the time, the changes implemented as a result of the act were as major and comprehensive as those of any of the state reforms of the 1980s (Ambach, 1984). The Action Plan upgraded graduation requirements by increasing math, science, and social studies requirements for all students and adding a three year foreign language requirement for a Regents diploma. Course requirements were strengthened and mandatory testing was increased for elementary and junior high students, and students were given the option to satisfy more than 1/3 of high school requirements by examination. Annual locally conducted teacher evaluations, student bills of rights and discipline codes were also required by the Plan. Arguably the most far reaching requirement was the preparation of a
Comprehensive Assessment Report for every school in the state to be compared to data from other schools, and to be presented by local school district officials at a public meeting (Layton, 1986). New York's Action Plan had focused primarily on the student and student requirements, but the requirement for annual review of the professional performance of teachers was the most visible phase of the plan that extended beyond the classroom. No requirements for building level administrators were included beyond record keeping and the public presentation of those records.

The California Supreme Court caused sweeping changes in the way schools were funded when it found that inequities resulting from a finance system based on local property taxes were unconstitutional (Serano v. Priest, 1971). Very soon thereafter, the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 virtually cancelled the fiscal power of local school boards and forced the state to change the way schools were funded and governed (Burrup & Brimley, 1982). Some of the school reform issues that California has adopted include increased curriculum content and graduation requirements, shifting the focus from individual scores to school program evaluation on standardized tests, and providing for funding assistance for textbook purchase and facilities construction (Mitchell, 1986). Reorganization of the Commission on Teacher Credentialling resulted in stronger training, certification, professional development, and supervision of teachers, but
no mention is made of administrators other than as facilitators of the teacher control mechanism (Mitchell, 1986).

A special legislative session in the summer of 1984 produced a bill that represents the most massive change in the history of Texas public education. Previous reform measures had reorganized the entire public school curriculum by specifying Essential Elements for every grade and subject taught in Texas. H.B. 72, however, changed the state school board and the state funding formula, raised the pay scale and established a career ladder for teachers, established a system for evaluating teachers and students. It provided for new certification standards and competency testing of teachers, lengthened the school year, raised graduation standards, and enacted a no pass/no play concept (Lutz, 1986a). No provisions of the legislation were reported to deal specifically with the role or expectations of administrators other than as agents to implement the new requirements.

Governor Rudy Perpich of Minnesota created a Governor's Discussion Group for the purpose of recommending to him a plan that was both visionary and acceptable. The result of this project was a set of recommendations that included a measurable core curriculum, school performance assessment, incorporating technology into the curriculum, increased parent participation, creation of new and additional
professional teacher roles, and a provision for free choice of schools as a right of parents. The first five of these recommendations were quickly accepted by the legislature, but the provision for free choice created much consternation at all levels of school governance in the state. After much discussion, the legislature approved a voluntary K-12 options program which all Minnesota school districts can join. Districts that participated were required to allow their students to enroll in other participating districts, and consequently were required to accept (if space was available and subject to racial balance constraints) nonresident students from those districts (Mazzoni, 1986).

The impetus of the reform movement in Tennessee was the newly reelected governor, Lamar Alexander (Achilles, Payne, & Lansford, 1986). In an address on January 28, 1983 the governor proposed the plan, which met the resistance of the statewide teachers' association (TEA). This resistance was based upon the arguments that teacher merit could not be fairly evaluated, tenure must not be abridged, teachers needed a substantial increase in base pay, and there should be a fast track method for currently employed teachers to enter the career ladder (Handler & Carlson, 1984). This opposition was strong enough to defer the passage of the bill until a special legislative session convened the following January.

The Comprehensive Education Reform Act, passed by the
legislature on February 23, 1984, included provisions for increased teacher training and evaluation, as well as revision of the certification procedure. The bill specified funds to hire teacher aids for grades 1-3, 5 days of inservice training per year, an increase in the length of the school year from 175 to 180 days, a computer for every 30 students in grades 7 and 8, college scholarships for prospective math and science teachers, and $1.2 million for schools for disruptive students. Other provisions included appropriations for computer equipment to score basic skills tests and aid teacher efficiency, $450,000 for special residential summer schools for the gifted, $10 million for centers of excellence at universities, and extensive appropriations for textbooks.

The most publicized aspect of the legislation, however, was the establishment of a career ladder for teachers and administrators. These career ladders were integrated into a merit pay concept that provided pay incentives that ranged from $1,000 to $7,000, and three levels of performance were recognized on each ladder. Eleven and twelve month contract options were required to earn all of the pay incentives, but increments of approximately $1,000 were awarded to those administrators and teachers who attained each respective level. The Career Ladder evaluation system has as its primary goal to identify and reward outstanding performance (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual,
The Career Ladder for school principals requires entry level principals to serve with a provisional certificate for at least one year not to exceed three years. In order to meet the requirements to be certified as a provisional principal, the candidate must have met the State Board of Education requirements of three years experience as a teacher and any academic preparation requirements. At the completion of one year of service, the principal is eligible for a Career Level I certificate if he has completed the requirements for certification and has successfully undergone a state approved local evaluation. The Career Ladder I certificate is valid for ten years and is renewable for additional ten year periods, pending satisfactory local evaluation and attendance at the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders every five years (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual, 1988).

The Career Level II certificate is also valid for ten years and is renewable for additional ten year periods pending satisfactory state reevaluation and attendance at the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders every five years. Principals applying for this level must have completed a minimum of two years of experience as a principal, meet certification requirements, and have successfully completed the state evaluation process. This state evaluation process consists of visits by three evaluators who observe the
principal for three hours and collect other information from data sources that include surveys of superordinates, students, and professional personnel; an interview of the candidate; a portfolio assembled by the candidate; and the results of the Career Ladder test for administrators and supervisors. The evaluation team will hold a summative evaluation conference in which scores will be recommended for each candidate. The successful Career Level II candidate must achieve a minimum overall score of 600 with a minimum score of 450 in each of the domains of competency. These domains consist of the observations, interview, portfolio, student questionnaires, professional personnel questionnaires, superordinate questionnaires, and the professional skills test (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual, 1988).

The Career Ladder III certificate is valid for ten years and is renewable for additional periods of ten years pending satisfactory state reevaluation and attendance at the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders every five years. Principals applying for Career Level III must have completed a minimum of four years experience as a principal, meet certification requirements, and have successfully completed the state evaluation process. The state evaluation process is the same as that described for Career Level II except that the minimum cutoff score for Level III is set at 700 (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual,
Discussions of the merits and shortcomings of merit pay and career ladder systems are frequent in contemporary literature. Merit pay was defined by White (1983) as a monetary compensation plan that provided salaries for similar jobs based on the quality of work performance. The rationale for merit pay has been that it rewards past performance, encourages and motivates efforts directed toward improvement, and provides incentives to stay in teaching (English, 1985). In a study of New York teachers, Sergiovanni (1967) identified a sense of accomplishment as the greatest motivation for teachers, and further identified recognition and responsibility as motivational factors.

Salary was described as a dissatisfier by Herzberg (1966) who suggested that salary did not contribute to motivating the worker or increasing job satisfaction. Merit pay systems in public schools have been described by Doremus (1982) as unsuccessful. Educators have, in fact, responded to salary issues by failing to respond to motivators such as professional growth, achievement, and advancement (Owens, 1987). English (1985) confirmed the lack of success of merit pay programs and described merit pay as a simplistic popular approach to a complex problem.

Career ladders have historically been developed to provide opportunities for teacher growth. From the differentiated staffing plans that emerged in the 1960s to
the present, the failure of career ladders in education has been widely documented (Richardson, 1986). At a time when successful industry has been working to flatten organizational structure by reducing layers of management (Peters, 1987), top down, mandated, state level reforms have forced schools into greater centralization (Prasch, 1984). The cost of administering the Career Ladder program in Tennessee was estimated to be $11.5 million in 1987-1988, which represents 12 percent of the funding for the Career Ladder program. Approximately 20 percent of the teachers and administrators who are eligible are on the top two levels (Cornett, 1987). Other states that have funded career ladders or similar programs for the 1987-1988 school year included Iowa, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and Utah (Cornett, 1987).

Educational reforms have cost a considerable amount of money and have demanded major changes in the roles of the practitioners in the field. State level bureaucrats are called upon to deliver programs and services to schools and accurate information to legislators. Teachers and administrators are required to adhere to more rigorous performance standards. Students must take harder courses, and accept the consequences of inadequate performance. Local school boards face an erosion of the discretionary powers that have been historically entrusted to them (Stout, 1986).
Edmonds (1979) and Brookover and Lezotte (1979) measured school effectiveness by student performance on standardized tests of reading and math skills. Other frequent measures of effective schools include quantifiable factors such as the number of books checked out of the library, attendance, the frequency of discipline problems, the number of graduates who go to college, and teacher turnover (Sergiovanni, 1987). Lipsitz (1984) found that principals of effective schools had difficulty in stating what made their school special, and typically answered "You will have to come and see my school" (p. 178). School success is measured in the above mentioned factors as well as abstract concepts such as a sense of purpose, meaningful work, school spirit, and a feeling of cohesiveness (Sergiovanni, 1987).

The key leverage points for school improvement have been identified as those that are close to the classroom. Cuban (1984) stated that effective school improvement plans must be of local origin rather than top down mandates. If the nation aspires to excellence in its schools, improvement efforts must focus on the "inside" of schooling, teaching and learning (Sergiovanni, 1989). Levine (1986) stated that reform in education requires change to take place at the building level; reform cannot be imposed from the top down. Effective schools research has made vividly clear that effective schools are the result of the activities of effective leadership within those schools (Ubben & Hughes,
Leadership

Leadership has been a topic of great interest in the literature of the world since the advent of the written word. The Egyptians, Greeks, Romans and Chinese were but a few of the early peoples who concerned themselves with advising those who aspired to be leaders and describing those who were (Bass, 1981). Defining and describing leadership has been attempted by many researchers in many disciplines, and none of these studies has been accepted as the final word about the subject. In his early work about the subject, Stogdill (1974) identified more than 3,000 studies of leadership, and in the revision by Bass (1981) an additional 2,000 were reported. Underlying this research has been the assumption that good leadership is related to the achievement of organizational success (Rogers, 1980/1981).

Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). True leadership results from having the skills for leadership, matching the appropriate skills with the tasks at hand, and being perceived as a leader by the group (Wiles & Bondi, 1983). James McGregor Burns (1978) defined leadership as a function of complex biological, social, cognitive and
affective processes that are influenced by the structure of the situation.

In his review of research about leadership, Stogdill (1948) concluded that attempts to describe traits that could be ascribed to leaders had yielded results that were confusing at best. Fiedler and Chemers (1974) identified leadership behavior as an act by the recognized leader that caused followers to change their behaviors in a previously designed fashion. Barnard (1938) stated that traits that separated leaders from followers varied from situation to situation. The trend for leadership research was to study leadership behavior rather than leaders.

The Ohio State University leadership studies were organized in 1945 under the direction of Carroll Shartle with the intention of describing what a leader did while acting in the role of leader and how he accomplished what he did (Hemphill & Coons, 1957). The most well known studies that emerged from Ohio State were those related to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Originally developed by Hemphill and Coons, the instrument was refined by Halpin and Winer who isolated two dimensions of leader behavior. The first of these was initiating structure, which refers to the leader's behavior in delineating his relationship with the work group and establishing organizational patterns, communication channels, and procedural methods. Consideration was the
second dimension, and this referred to leader behavior that was indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group (Halpin & Winer, 1957). In an extensive analysis of the Ohio State leadership studies, Halpin (1966) reported that effective leadership is characterized by high initiation of structure and high consideration. He further stated that these were only two of the dimensions of leader behavior and obviously did not exhaust the field. Research has generally shown that leadership high in both initiating structure and consideration is most effective in achieving desired organizational and individual outcomes (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985).

Leadership studies were also conducted at the University of Michigan in the 1950s. Conducted in the Institute of Social Research, largely under the direction of Rensis Likert, these studies primarily focused upon business and industrial organizations (Likert, 1961). The results of the Michigan studies have been found to be difficult to summarize, but Ubben and Hughes (1989) reported that these studies could be summarized in three statements. Effective managers reflected a high task orientation that did not occur at the expense of good interpersonal relations. Effective managers were found to set high performance goals for subordinates, but reflected consideration and some autonomy in deciding how to conduct the work. Effective
leaders also used group supervision and decision making processes. The Michigan studies also found that high morale does not necessarily result in high productivity, but high productivity does tend to result in high morale (Likert, 1967).

A study of small groups of subjects was the design of an investigation conducted at Harvard University under the direction of Robert F. Bales. This study was different in that direct observations of groups of college students were made in an effort to determine characteristics of the role of leader. Bales (1954) reported that there existed two roles of leader - the task leader who kept the group engaged in the assigned task, and the social leader who maintained group unity and respect for the needs of the individuals. These roles were often held by different people within the group.

Remarkably consistent among these studies was the clear emergence of two leadership dimensions that were characteristic of effective organizations. These dimensions have been incorporated into the contemporary contingency theories of leadership. Fiedler's contingency model and House's path-goal theory both maintain that leadership effectiveness is a function of leader personality and behaviors as they interact with task structure and subordinate skills and attitudes (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).
Contemporary Theories of Leadership

Fiedler's Contingency Model

The contingency theory of leadership, developed by Fred Fiedler, states that a leader's effectiveness depends on the interaction of the leader's behavior with the organizational factors that comprise the leadership situation. Fiedler (1967) proposed that the underlying need structure of the leader motivates different leader behaviors in various situations, but this need structure, or leadership style, remains constant. Fiedler (1972) further suggested that this leadership style varies from leader to leader. Some leaders place more emphasis on task achievement needs and others emphasize interpersonal relationships.

To determine which needs are more important, Fiedler developed an instrument to measure personality characteristics of the leader (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). The least preferred coworker (LPC) scale asks leaders to describe the co-worker with whom they could work least well. Task oriented leaders score low on the LPC and relationship oriented leaders score high.

A second major component of the contingency approach is that different types of leaders function more efficiently in different situations. Fiedler (1967) identified three factors that determined the favorableness of the situation: position power of the leader, task structure, and leader-member relations. The most favorable situation is
one in which the group has high respect for the leader, the task structure is simple, and the organization has given strong power to the leader. In the least favorable environment, there is low respect for the leader, the task is complex, and the organization has limited the leader's power. There are environments between these extremes (Hitt, Middlemist, & Mathis, 1986).

The purpose of this model is to identify which leaders are better suited for a given situation. Fiedler's (1971) research has shown that task oriented leaders are more effective in the favorable and unfavorable situations, while relationship oriented leaders are more effective in situations of moderate favorableness. The management strategy is to either assign leaders to the situation that matches their style or to redesign the situation to match the leaders' needs (Hitt, Middlemist, & Mathis, 1986).

**House's Path-Goal Theory**

This theory is so named because the primary emphasis is on how the leader influences subordinates' perceptions of their work goals, personal goals, and paths to the attainment of those goals (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985). The basis of this theory lies in the premise that employees accept leader behavior because it is satisfying to them or because it is instrumental to their future satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). The leader's function is to motivate
workers by clarifying their goals and the paths to these goals, enhancing their job satisfaction, and providing rewards based on job performance. The style of leader behavior that will be most likely to be successful in motivating employees in a particular situation is determined by the personal characteristics of the employees and environmental factors such as the nature of the task, the work group, and the work environment (House, 1973). Structured tasks require more nondirective leadership, while unstructured tasks call for more directive leadership (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985).

House and Mitchell (1974) proposed four leadership styles that have varying effectiveness according to the situation. Directive leadership is leader behavior that clarifies and structures subordinates' activities, while supportive leadership behaviors are concerned with creating a pleasant and friendly work environment and displaying a concern for the well being of subordinates. Participative leadership calls for sharing information, ideas, and decision making with subordinates; the achievement oriented leader sets challenging goals, emphasizes excellence, and shows confidence that the workers will attain high standards.

Path-goal leadership emphasizes the behavior of the leader rather than his characteristics or personality traits. The concepts of this theory are rooted in the
motivation of subordinates by the leader's actions. If a leader can motivate subordinates, the group is more likely to achieve its goals; therefore it becomes a more effective organization (Hitt, Middlemist, & Mathis, 1986).

Managerial Grid

Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton (1964) developed a concept called the Managerial Grid as a leadership training device. The grid has two dimensions: concern for people and concern for production. Its development paralleled the Ohio State studies (Hoy & Miskel, 1987) and it represents a tool to identify the alternatives available to an administrator to improve his leader effectiveness (Owens, 1987). Both dimensions are scored on a nine point scale with the number one representing minimum concern and the number nine designating maximum concern, and it is theoretically possible to map eighty-one leadership styles (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Blake and Mouton (1985) confine their analysis of leadership styles to the corners and midpoint of the grid. The 1,1 style, impoverished management, is characterized by low concern for both people and production, and is conspicuous for its lack of leadership activity. The 9,9 style, team management, is high on concern for both people and production and represents a common interest in organizational purpose by committed people. The 1,9 style,
country club management, reflects a high concern for people that leads to a friendly work atmosphere and low concern for production. The 9,1 style, authority-obedience, is a task oriented style with low concern for people and is characterized by close supervision, tight control, and one way communication. The 5,5 management style, organization man management, is a middle of the road style that reflects a balance of the need to produce work with the morale of the staff.

Blake and Mouton (1985) feel that the 9,9 pattern, the team approach, is the ideal that will most likely lead to optimum results in most organizations. Although the Managerial Grid approach is not structured within a contingency framework, the leadership styles are somewhat flexible (Hanson, 1985). The grid is useful because it introduces a greater range of leadership styles, such as the 5,5 style that other studies have failed to mention, and may be able to more fully describe a given leadership pattern.

**Situational Leadership**

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) developed a concept that leadership must be situationally appropriate. They proposed that different situations vary in terms of leader attention to task behavior and relationship behavior, and this attention is determined by evaluating the maturity level of the group of followers. Subordinates who exhibit low
maturity (unable and unwilling to take the responsibility to
do something) require a directive "telling" style of leader
behavior that is highly focused on task behavior with a low
emphasis on relationships. People who are willing but
unable to take the responsibility to do something also need
directive leadership to counter their lack of ability, but
need supportive leadership to reinforce their willingness to
work (selling). As the work group becomes able to do the
work but may be unwilling (often due to a lack of confidence
or insecurity), a participating style involving high
relationship and low task behavior is indicated. The main
role of the leader is now facilitating and communicating,
with shared decision making evident in the leader-follower
relationship. People at the high maturity level are
characterized by their ability to perform the task and their
willingness, or confidence to do it. A low profile
"delegating" style is in order, with low relationship and
task emphasis on the part of the leader. The work group is
permitted to "run the show."

This theory is a dynamic one in which leader behavior
changes with the maturity of the group. The goal of the
leader is to provide the necessary leadership behavior while
helping the work group mature and assume more of the
leadership itself. As the maturity level of the group
increases, effective leadership will reflect both a
reduction in task oriented behavior and an increase in
relations oriented behavior. Obvious problems that may be associated with this theory are seen when directive leaders force immaturity upon subordinates who are ready for more participative involvement and leaders who place responsibilities on followers who are not ready for them (Owens, 1987).

Hersey (1982) has developed an assessment center procedure to identify candidates for the principalship. Trained assessors use group activities, simulations and interviews to evaluate candidates on twelve dimensions: problem analysis, judgement, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, range of interests, personal motivation, educational values, stress tolerance, oral communication skills, and written communication skills.

**Summary**

Argyris (1957) calls effective leadership "reality-centered leadership." He stated that there is no one correct way to behave as a leader, but the choice of leadership pattern must be based on an accurate diagnosis of the reality of the situation. This diagnosis must consider that reality is perceived differently by each individual within the organization, and thus requires self awareness on the part of the leader and the awareness of others.

In studies by Artis, Brittenham, and Zimman (cited in Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985) it was concluded that the
persistent use of a single leadership style rendered the principal less effective. This leadership must recognize situational contingencies that may be complex, dynamic, and interactive and that demand supportive and participative leadership activities (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985). Those situational contingencies seem to relate to the two dimensions of social systems, nomothetic (organizational) and idiographic (personal), identified by Getzels and Guba (1957) and restated in contemporary leadership theory as task and relationship leader orientation.

Transformational leadership requires the complete understanding that nothing will change unless the people in that organization "buy into it" (Levine, 1986). It is clear that followers' perception of leadership is a critical ingredient for success. If a leader is not perceived to have the skills or traits that will facilitate group attainment of goals, leadership cannot be exerted (Wiles & Bondi, 1983).

Leadership Role of the Principal

Pierce (1934) traced the evolution of the principalship from the position of "head teacher" or "principal teacher" who was assigned to complete various attendance and other required forms to report to the school board. The rapid expansion of school enrollment during the industrial revolution of the late 1800s was coupled with an emphasis on
grading students and coordinating curricula, which in turn increased the need for someone to assume the responsibility for general school management and interpreting the school's work to the community.

Callahan (1962) described the evolution of the principalship as a parallel to the scientific management era of business administration. He stated that the basic organizational pattern, the cult of efficiency, and the instructional schedules of today's schools reflect this "business-like" approach to running schools.

The first elementary school to have an administrative principal was Boston's Quincy School, in 1847. Principals were becoming more involved in administrative and curricular responsibilities, and by the late 1800s the role of the modern school principal was being defined as the person accountable for administrative duties as well as the instructional program of the school building. The position of principal has evolved from the position of head teacher to a greatly enhanced position as an educational leader with administrative line responsibility from the superintendent and the board (Wiles & Bondi, 1983).

Today's principal faces a leadership challenge unlike any before. Societal changes such as increased student mobility, breakdown of the family unit, and declining enrollments and resources have added new responsibilities to the principalship. Wiles and Bondi (1983) identified strong
administrative leadership of the principal as vital for overcoming these modern educational problems.

The role of the principal is central to improving the quality of teaching and the effectiveness of schools (Lipham, 1981; Levine, 1986; Edmonds, 1979; Klopf, Scheldon, & Brennan 1982; Sweeney, 1982). The pioneering work of Halpin and Croft (1963) on elementary school climates followed by the study of Goldhammer (1971) established the importance of principal behavior in the effective school. Hodgkinson (1982) stated that the individual school site is the basic unit of educational change and improvement; consequently the school principal is the leader most vital to improvement of public schools. In a two year study of approximately 20,000 elementary school students in Seattle, significantly greater achievement gains were recorded in schools headed by principals who are perceived by their teachers to be strong leaders (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986). Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds (1979), and Weber (1971) all specified the strong leadership role of the principal as the most significant factor in an effective school, and the importance of this role was confirmed in a review of effective elementary schools by Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980). Strong leadership is a characteristic of both excellent companies and exemplary schools. These leaders are not only effective managers of finance and resources, but they manage people effectively (Levine,
The scope of leadership cannot be limited by equating it with a task, process, or procedure. The role of "instructional leader", "decision maker", and "innovator" are but a limited few of the roles of the effective principal (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985). Sergiovanni (1987) identified six major interdependent leadership roles of the principal in the following statement:

"The effective principal works to define the school's broad philosophy and mission (statesperson leadership) which guides achievement of school educational objectives (educational leadership) through teachers who are committed to these objectives (supervisory leadership) within a supportive school structure and climate (organizational leadership) over an extended period of time (administrative leadership) in cooperation with teachers, other administrators, and staff (team leadership)" (p. 17).

The concept of the principal as instructional leader has been recorded in the literature as long as the position of principal (Pinero, 1982), but has been the source of much criticism. Wolcott (1973) reported that the amount of time spent by principals in the role of instructional leader was not substantial, their time was directed toward maintaining order in the school. Rogus (1983) and Krajewski (1975) confirmed this, and emphasis on the administrative role of
the principal in preserving discipline and maintaining an orderly environment was observed by Cusick (1981).

Mattson (1983) defined instructional leadership in terms of clear goals, distinct functions, and positive climate — a vision of the preferred rather than the existing status of schools. Miller (1984) reported that effective principals are not only committed to instructional improvement but they are also concerned with instructional strategies. This was confirmed by Canady and Hotchkiss (1984). Manasse (1982) identified the importance of the principal's role as instructional leader, but stated that effective principals must also be efficient managers. Cohen and Manasse (1982) and Duke (1982) found that instructional leadership emerges not only from formal emphasis but also from those informal opportunities that emerge during time spent on management activities.

Ubben and Hughes (1989) identified five functions of the principalship: curriculum development, instructional improvement, pupil services, building and resource management, and community relations. They further divided each of these functions into two dimensions: leadership and managerial acumen. In his summary of the research on effective principals, Cohen (1983) identified characteristics associated with effective management of people that included working closely with others, managing conflict, utilizing personal resourcefulness, rewarding
success in those being managed, and giving feedback and support (psychological and material) for effort and taking risks.

Blumberg and Greenfield found three characteristics common to effective principals. The first is a vision of what they want their schools to be like that goes beyond maintaining the status quo. The second factor, a propensity to initiate activity, is characterized by an obsession for initiating structure in interaction with others in order to keep the organization moving in productive directions. The third characteristic of effective principals is their resourcefulness in avoiding being consumed by the organizational maintenance requirements of the job. They delegated assignments, or scheduled a time for them that did not conflict with the pursuit of their vision. In a summary of studies of effective principals, Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) identified four areas of principal leadership. Goals and production emphasis were characterized by the establishment of instructional goals, performance standards for students, and confidence in the ability of students to meet those standards. The second area, power and decision making, stressed active and forceful participation in decision making as well as maintaining appropriate relations with parents and the community power structure. Organization and coordination were described in terms of instructional support for
teachers and direct involvement with classroom activities. The final leadership area, human relations, emphasized the recognition of teachers as unique individuals who must be helped to achieve their own performance goals and be recognized for their achievements.

The roles and expectations of principals are both extensive and extensively varied. These roles are limited and delineated by factors such as superordinate expectations, community characteristics and involvement, the physical and work environments of the school, and the personal goals of the principal (Neagley & Evans, 1980). In a study of 316 Tennessee principals, Richardson (1986) reported that more than 80 percent perceived their ideal role as instructional leader. A study of high and low achieving schools in Maryland by Austin (1978) found that strong leadership of the principal was characteristic of high achieving schools, and he further identified participation in instructional matters, academic orientation, and expectations of success as hallmarks of the effective school principal. Citing a study by Hord, Hall, and Stiegelbauer, Sergiovanni (1987) stated that no principal, exemplary or typical, can provide all of the necessary leadership. Ideas such as team teaching, decentralized decision making, and delegation are suggested as increasingly important ways to share the leadership responsibility and to improve school effectiveness.
Systems theory suggests that the school administrator provide leadership in the integration of the system - within the school and in relation to the school system and community. An administrator's relationships with individuals and groups in his school sets the tone for the organization. A structure of positive interrelationships among individuals and groups fosters change and harnesses human resources in carrying out the educational mission of the school. Moeller and Charters (1966) identified the key to efficiency and effectiveness as cooperation rather than confrontation. Effective administrative leadership is a complex process that involves participation and sharing of power with a faculty (Wiles & Bondi, 1983).

Where emergent leadership is fostered, there exists much more open expression of ideas and suggestions for staff actions (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985). The principal's leadership can be interpreted as an enabling process that frees, encourages, and activates others to join with the principal in the leadership process (Sergiovanni, 1987). Stimson and Appelbaum (1988) reported that principals who involved teachers in decision making were more effective and created a climate that reflected collaboration and greater teacher satisfaction. Blumberg (1968) stated that a review of literature pertaining to job satisfaction confirmed the beneficial consequences of shared decision making powers. Even though all decisions are not made jointly with the
faculty, teachers and support staff should be provided opportunities for input on decisions that are important to them (Wiles & Bondi, 1983). Each person affected by a decision should know how the decision was made. Effective management, stated Handy (1984), is management by consent.

The typical picture that emerges from a study of effective schools is that of an organization guided by a transformational leader - a principal who "clearly, firmly, and simply defines the mission of the school as the achievement of some goal, and who recognizes achievement of that goal is highly dependent upon the commitment, involvement, and skills of the people in his organization" (Levine, 1986, p. 170). What emerges is a clearly defined pattern of leadership directed at providing the structure and support necessary to assist the staff to succeed in meeting these goals.

For whole school development, appropriate management should incorporate: consultation with and participation of the staff, thus invoking their commitment and ownership of the process; willingness of the staff to work collaboratively; identification of the strengths and weaknesses of each individual staff member, realizing that each staff member is a resource; and a climate that fosters constructive and critical dialog among staff members (Reid, Hopkins, & Holly, 1987).
School Climate

Tagiuri (1968) used the concept of climate to describe the internal characteristics that distinguishes one organization from another. More specifically, climate refers to the perceptions of the work environment as expressed by the members of the work group (Wiles & Bondi, 1983; Hoy & Miskel, 1987). Argyris (1957) felt that a conflict existed between the needs of individuals and the organizational demands, and he identified climate in terms of the interactions of persons within the organization. This conflict between organizational demands and individual needs was further described by Getzels and Guba (1957), who described organizations as social systems. According to their model, social behavior is a function of organizationally defined role and the personality and needs of the individual. This informal, social organization within the work group can be studied by examining the school's climate (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985).

Halpin (1966) wrote that there exists a marked difference in how schools "feel." Early studies had emphasized "morale" as the factor that described the organizational climate, but this factor had proven to be less than effective as an empirical measure and failed to adequately describe the school's organizational climate. His experience with the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire studies had shown that high ratings on
initiation of structure and consideration were no guarantee of school effectiveness. He argued that information from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire needed to be supplemented with related information about the organization itself.

Based on this argument, Halpin and Croft (1963) developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire in an effort to assess the climate of the school. They assigned 64 items to eight subtests, four of which pertained to characteristics of the work group and four to the characteristics of the principal as a leader. By assessing the scores and comparing them to a theoretical standard, a school's climate could be located on a continuum that ranged from open to closed. They felt that an open climate indicated a healthy organization while a closed climate was unhealthy. An open climate has been linked with absence of student alienation (Hartley & Hoy, 1972), principals who are more confident, sociable and resourceful (Anderson, 1964), teachers who are more satisfied and loyal (Kanner, 1974/1975), and teacher confidence in the school's effectiveness (Andrews, 1965).

Rutter (1979) concluded in his study of schools in London that climate was a process that actually enhanced student outcomes. Wiles and Bondi (1983) concurred with this and further stated that the responsibility for establishing and maintaining a climate conducive to
effective teaching and learning lay with the school administrator. The role of the principal in establishing and influencing climate is recognized by Halpin (1966) and Hoy and Miskel (1987). Levine (1986) identified the essential role of leadership in providing the environment necessary for students and teachers to clearly recognize and identify with the established goal of their school.

Effective principals recognize that typical school structure may hinder communication, participation and emergent leadership. In the typical elementary school, teachers function in relative isolation from each other and their scope of responsibility rests in planning, conducting and evaluating instructional activities in their own classroom while the principal is responsible for schoolwide decisions. This organization keeps individual teachers in relative isolation and discourages cooperative planning and decision making. Departmentalized schools may even reflect broad diversity of climate perceptions, open in some departments yet closed in others. The integration of multiunit, team oriented instruction fosters involvement as well as encouraging leadership activities throughout the organization (Lipham, Rankin & Hoeh, 1985). Peters and Waterman (1982) proposed that successful organizations foster climates that encourage involvement and leadership at all levels of an organization. The environment encourages experimentation and tolerates failure so that leaders can
emerge and be sustained at all levels of the organization. This concurs with the concept of open climate advanced by Halpin and Crofts (1963).

Litwin and Stringer (1968) identified nine variables that an administrator can manipulate to affect climate:

- **Structure** - the feeling people have about restraints, rules, red tape, and regulations affecting them
- **Responsibility** - the feeling of being your own boss, free from direct supervision, not having to double-check decisions
- **Reward** - being recognized for a job well done, a perception of fairness in rewarding, positive reinforcement
- **Risk** - the challenge in the job, the emphasis on taking risks as opposed to playing it safe
- **Warmth** - the feeling of good fellowship that prevails in the work atmosphere
- **Support** - the perceived helpfulness of superiors
- **Standards** - the perceived importance of goals and performance expectations
- **Conflict** - the emphasis placed on getting problems out into the open, hearing different opinions
- **Identity** - the feeling of being a member of a working team. (p. 110)

The role of the principal is not only to work directly to improve student and teacher progress, but to improve the
processes and conditions that cause and facilitate these outcomes. Effective schools literature is replete with specific examples of these processes and conditions (Fairman & Clark, 1985; Firestone & Wilson, 1984; Willower, 1984), but those examples seem to fit quite nicely in this taxonomy.

Every school is unique, it owes its uniqueness to the climate of the organization (Kalis, 1980). This climate is representative of the informal structure of the work group in that organization. The principal who provides leadership in an effective school is knowledgeable about the formal and informal structure of the school, and he becomes a change agent to improve role relationships, coordination, cooperation, and integration throughout the school (Lipham, Rankin & Hoeh, 1985). Survival in the 21st century depends on an open and participatory organization, evidenced by an atmosphere of trust and collaboration (Parish, Eubanks, Aquila, & Walker, 1989).

**Summary**

The literature describing the national impetus for better schools and the response of various states to that imperative are discussed in the first section of this chapter. Leadership, contemporary theories that have addressed leadership, and the leadership role of the principal are the topics reviewed in the next three
sections. Emerging from this review of literature and research is the importance of the role of the leader. Effective leaders share two important things: they understand how and why organizations change, and they understand how and why people make changes. Effective leaders appear to be those who can help individual group members fulfill their needs by forging a link between that individual and specific organizational tasks.

The final section is devoted to a review of the literature pertaining to school climate. School climate is a reflection of the relationship between organizational demands and individual needs. Interpersonal relationships among the principal and staff are the basis of school climate. A healthy, open climate both supports and is supported by dynamic leadership, and such climate contributes to the perpetuation of an effective school.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology and Procedures

This chapter describes the methods used to conduct this study. The instruments used to collect the data are presented, followed by the procedures employed in data collection. A description of the methodology of data analysis concludes this chapter.

Data Collection Instruments

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ-12)

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII was the instrument used to assess teachers' perceptions of the leader behavior of the principal (See Appendix C).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was originally developed by the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University for use in obtaining descriptions of a supervisor by the group members that he supervises. It was used to describe leaders in any type of organization where the followers have observed the leader in action. Hemphill and Coons constructed the original form of this questionnaire, which was later revised by Halpin and Winer who identified initiation of structure and consideration as the two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior (Halpin, 1966). Initiation of structure was defined as the extent to
which a leader initiated activity in the group, organized it, and defined the way work was to be done; consideration referred to the extent to which a leader exhibited concern for the welfare of the other members of the group (Bass, 1981).

Stogdill (1959) felt that two factors were insufficient to account for all of the observed variance in leader behavior. He proposed 10 additional conceptually independent dimensions of behavior involved in leadership, and included these in LBDQ-12 with consideration and initiation of structure. The 10 dimensions identified by Stogdill and defined as Operational Definitions in Chapter 1 were representation, reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of freedom, role retention, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and influence with supervisors.

The LBDQ-12 consists of 100 brief descriptive statements of ways in which leaders may behave. The members of a leader’s group complete the questionnaire by circling numbers that represent the frequency with which their leader exhibits the described behavior: always, often, occasionally, seldom, never. Some questions are scored inversely to minimize the possibility of rater bias. A high score on any subtest indicates that the followers perceive that dimension of leader behavior to be present in the leader being described; conversely, a low score represents
an absence of that dimension in the perception of the follower (Stogdill, 1963b).

**Reliability.** Reliability was defined by Borg and Gall (1983) as the level of internal consistency or stability of the measuring device over time. Stogdill (1963a) determined the reliability of the subscales of the LBDQ-12 using a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The formula was modified in that each item was correlated with the remaining items in its subscale rather than with the subscale score including the item. The coefficients for subscale reliability were determined from analysis of nine sets of data about various groups of leaders, and they reflected mean values of .69 for representation, .72 for demand reconciliation, .78 for tolerance of uncertainty, .80 for persuasiveness, .76 for initiating structure, .76 for tolerance of freedom, .77 for role assumption, .81 for consideration, .68 for production emphasis, .81 for predictive accuracy, .76 for integration, and .69 for superior orientation. In a study of government administrators, Day (1968) computed correlations to determine the extent to which pairs of subordinates agreed in descriptions of their supervisors, and found values ranging from .39 to .73 for the interdescriber agreement. Schriesheim, House and Kerr (1976) found reliability coefficients between the early LBDQ and the revised version and between the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (Fleishman, 1957) and the revised LBDQ-12 to
range upward from .88.

**Validity.** Validity was defined as the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure (Borg & Gall, 1983). The differential validity of six subscales (consideration; structure, representation, tolerance of freedom, production emphasis, and superior orientation) was tested with the assistance of a playwright who wrote a scenario for each subscale based upon the test items in that subscale. Motion pictures were made using experienced actors to play the roles of both the leader and the worker(s), and observers used the LBDQ-12 to describe the behavior of the supervisor. The actors playing a given role were found to behave significantly more like that role than the other roles. Since roles were designed to portray specific subscales, Stogdill (1969) concluded that the scales measured what they were designed to measure.

Data collected by Stogdill, Goode, and Day (cited in Bass, 1981) intercorrelated the scores for the subscales and subjected them to factor analysis. The results suggested that each factor was strongly dominated by a single subscale. In addition, the validity of the LBDQ-12 was supported by hierarchical factor analysis in studies by Brown (1967), Miller (1973), and Schriesheim and Stogdill (1975).

Dipboye (1978) found that the LBDQ-12 possessed concurrent validity in that its subscales correlated with
the external criteria of job performance and satisfaction, and were capable of distinguishing between persons displaying the behaviors that corresponded to the respective subscale. He further stated that the LBDQ-12 was more content valid than the other Ohio State Leadership Scales because it eliminated the items that pertained to authoritarian and punitive leadership.

Revised Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE)

The Revised Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire for Elementary Schools was the instrument used to assess teachers' perceptions of the organizational climate of the school (See Appendix D).

The Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire (OCDQ) was developed by Halpin and Croft (1963) and was based on previous work in identifying leadership characteristics. Dissatisfied with the two dimensions, consideration and initiation of structure, they conceived of climate as the measure of the quality of principal-faculty relations (Anderson, 1982). The result was a 64 item questionnaire that identified eight dimensions of school climate. Four of the dimensions were concerned with teacher relations and attitudes, the others measured factors associated with teacher-principal relations. Based on a profile of the scores, schools were classified into six
basic school climates that were arrayed along a continuum from open to closed: open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, closed (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

In a comprehensive analysis of the OCDQ, Hayes (1973) concluded that many of the items of the OCDQ no longer measured what they were intended to measure, some of the subtests were no longer valid (e.g., aloofness), some of the subtests reflected low reliability, and a major revision of the instrument was in order. Another criticism of the OCDQ was that it excluded the student and was restricted to social interactions among professional personnel (Hoy & Clover, 1986). Hoy and Clover (1986) proceeded to point out that the initial analysis of data performed by Halpin and Croft was done at an individual level and not an organizational one. Their sample for analysis had been 1151 individuals, not 71 schools; the data had been factor analyzed at the item level without regard to school units. Such analysis ignored the concept of climate as an organizational characteristic, not individual ones.

The revised instrument is a 42 item measure with six subtests that describe behavior of elementary teachers and principals. Three subtests describe behaviors of principals: supportive, directive and restrictive. Collegial, intimate and disengaged behavior were employed to describe teachers. Teachers are asked to describe the interactions between themselves and the principal by
circling a number that represents the frequency that the
described behavior occurs: rarely, sometimes, often, very
frequently. The scores for the teacher descriptors are
standardized and then combined to arrive at a score for
openness of faculty relations, and the standardized scores
for principal behaviors collectively produce a score for
openness of principal behavior. These two openness factors
are independent (Hoy & Miskel, 1986).

Four contrasting types of school climate are possible,
since it is quite possible to have open faculty relations
and closed principal behavior or vice versa. If both
factors are open, the climate is described as open,
characterized by high supportiveness, low directiveness, low
restrictiveness, high collegial relations, high intimacy,
and low disengagement. The inverse of this is the closed
climate, where the descriptors are each reversed. The
engaged climate is characterized by open faculty relations
and closed principal behavior, where the principal is highly
directive, highly restrictive, and low in supportiveness and
the faculty is described as highly collegial, high in
intimacy, and low in disengagement. The fourth climate
type, disengaged, is found where principal behavior is open
but faculty relations are closed. In this instance the
principal is highly supportive and low in restrictiveness
and directiveness, and the faculty relations may be
described as low in intimacy and collegiality but high in
Reliability. Reliability was measured in a study of 70 New Jersey elementary schools. Factor analysis provided reliability coefficients as follows: directive (.89), supportive (.95), restrictive (.80), disengaged (.75), collegial (.90), and intimate (.86) (Hoy & Clover, 1986).

Validity. Factor analysis of two separate samples consistently supported the stability of the relationships among the items measuring each dimension, thus supporting the construct validity of the OCDQ-RE. Each dimension of organizational climate was studied by analysis of variance to determine whether the schools or the individuals constituted the primary source of variation, and between school variance was significantly greater (beyond the .001 level) than within school variance on all dimensions (Hoy & Clover, 1986).

Second order factor analysis indicated that disengaged, intimate and collegial behavior loaded strongly only on factor I, while restrictive, directive and supportive principal behavior loaded strongly only on factor II. Factor I, openness of teacher relations, was characterized by low disengagement, high intimacy, and high collegial relations. Factor II, closedness of principal behavior, was characterized by high restrictiveness, high directiveness and low supportiveness. Both second order factors were properly viewed along an open to closed continuum (Hoy &
Demographic Data Sheet

The demographic data sheet (See Appendix E) that was completed by each respondent was developed to meet the requirements of the study from analysis of studies that had previously been completed. The demographic data sheet underwent peer analysis by the doctoral seminar and the advanced research seminar class at East Tennessee State University, and was accepted as being both valid and reliable for use in the study.

Data Collection Procedures

Population

The Directory of Public Schools, 1988-1989 was used to identify the population of 134 public elementary schools in the First District of the Tennessee Department of Education. The First District is located in Northeast Tennessee and consists of seventeen school systems, ten county systems and seven city systems. The county school systems included Carter, Cocke, Greene, Hancock, Hamblen, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, and Washington. The city systems included Bristol, Elizabethton, Greeneville, Johnson City, Kingsport, Newport, and Rogersville.

Elementary schools containing some combination of kindergarten through grade eight were included; the
principal and all full time certificated teachers in those schools comprised the population. The schools that were included in the population were identified by the following grade spreads in the Directory of Public Schools, 1988-1989:

1. 00-08, kindergarten through grade eight; 2. 00-06, kindergarten through grade six; 3. 00-05, kindergarten through grade five; 4. 00-04, kindergarten through grade four; 5. 00-02, kindergarten through grade two; 6. 01-08, grade one through grade eight; 7. 01-07, grade one through grade seven; 8. 01-06, grade one through grade six; 9. 03-06, grade three through grade six. Elementary schools described as follows were excluded: 1. 00-00, kindergarten; 2. 00-33, special education school with kindergarten; 3. 33-33, special education school; 4. 00-12, combination elementary and secondary school; 5. 05-08, 06-08, and 07-08, middle schools.

The elementary schools in the population were administered by 33 Career Ladder III principals, 6 Career Ladder II principals, and 95 Career Ladder I and probationary principals. Those schools with less than 10 full time teachers were not included in the study, since this was a criterion established by Hoy and Clover (1986) in the development of the OCDQ-RE that was employed in this study. Career Ladder I principals were limited to those who had five or more years of experience as principal, and thus were eligible to apply for the higher levels of the career
ladder. Fifty of the original 95 Career Ladder I principals were found to have this level of experience and were in administrative charge of schools with 10 or more teachers in subsequent analysis of Tennessee State Department of Education documents. All 33 Career Ladder III principals met the minimum number of teachers requirement.

The resulting population of Career Ladder I principals administered schools with a mean full time faculty of 20.38 and a mean student population of 367.46. The Career Ladder III principals administered schools with a mean full time faculty of 21.58 and a mean student population of 381.36.

Sample Selection

After the population was identified, a sample was drawn that represented 35 percent of the schools administered by Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III principals. The proportional stratified random sample consisted of 15 elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals and 11 elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals. The population was identified and listed in alphabetical order in two lists, one for schools administered by Career Ladder I principals and the other for schools administered by Career Ladder III principals. Numbers were assigned to each school in the population strata, and the sample was determined using a table of random numbers (Borg & Gall, 1983). After the specified
number of schools in each strata were identified, alternate schools were identified by continuing along the list of random numbers in the event that permission to survey a school was denied.

**Procedures**

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University. A letter of introduction and explanation was sent to the superintendents of the school districts in the population asking for permission to survey randomly selected schools in their district (See Appendix A). A return form letter was enclosed for the superintendent's use in granting permission to contact the principals in the selected schools (See Appendix B). Permission to contact principals was denied by two superintendents, requiring the replacement of two of the original schools in the sample of schools administered by Career Ladder III principals.

After the necessary permission was obtained, a personal visit was made with each principal to explain the purpose of the study and the procedures for collecting the data. Each principal was asked for permission to distribute the questionnaires at a group faculty meeting and to ask the teachers to return the instruments to the office in a sealed envelope to be picked up by the investigator at a later date. As a result of information gathered in this personal
visit, one school administered by a Career Ladder I principal was replaced because the number of full time teachers had dropped below 10 due to a decline in enrollment since the publication of the *Directory of Public Schools, 1988-1989.*

The instruments and the purpose of the study were explained by the researcher in a group setting at the school site, and were collected two working days later. The instruments were administered to those teachers who volunteered to participate, and questionnaires were left at the school to be distributed to teachers who were absent on the date of administration. Each teacher was provided with an envelope in which to place the completed questionnaires so that anonymity could be assured.

A minimum acceptable return rate was established at 75 percent of the teachers of each school that was surveyed. Four of the 26 schools required a reminder from the secretary and a second collection visit in order to achieve this return rate. The completed instruments were then hand scored and analyzed by the researcher.

**Data Analysis Methodology**

Hypotheses were stated in the null form for purposes of statistical testing, and the .05 level of significance was established for rejection. The null hypotheses stated that there would be no difference between the population means
and any difference found would not be statistically significant at the .05 level. Rejection of a null hypothesis would indicate acceptance of the research hypothesis.

Data from the completed instruments were entered into an IBM Model 60 personal computer equipped with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, PC version (SPSS-PC) for processing. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences between the means for the dependent variables identified in the hypotheses. ANOVA was selected because it permitted the researcher to evaluate the mean differences in perceived leadership behavior and organizational climate simultaneously while maintaining the Type I error rate at the preestablished .05 significance level for the entire set of comparisons.
The purpose of this study was to compare teachers' perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and the school's organizational climate. The principal's leader behavior was defined as those specific behaviors exhibited by the principal that determine the leadership style of the principal. The study was limited to those dimensions measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire: representation, reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role retention, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and influence with supervisors. Organizational climate was defined as the internal characteristics that distinguish one school from another and influence the behavior of its members. The climate dimensions assessed by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire included three that described behaviors of principals: supportive behavior, directive behavior, and restrictive behavior; and three that described teachers: collegial behavior, intimate behavior, and disengaged behavior.

The data were analyzed through utilization of analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test for significant differences between the Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals.
that made up the sample. The level of significance to reject the null hypothesis was set at .05. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences, PC version (SPSS-PC) was used to analyze the data on an IBM Model 60 personal computer in the Department of Supervision and Administration at East Tennessee State University.

Analysis of the data collected and a description of the sample are presented in this chapter. A description of the sample is presented in the first section, and the second section contains the statistical comparison of the leader behavior of Career Ladder I principals and Career Ladder III principals. The organizational climates of schools administered by Career Ladder I principals and Career Ladder III principals are compared in the third section. The next section includes a comparison of the specific dimensions of leader behavior for Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III principals, and the chapter concludes with a comparison of the specific organizational climate dimensions of schools administered by Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III principals.

**Description of the Sample**

The sample included 15 elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals and 11 schools administered by Career Ladder III principals. Five hundred ninety teachers were included in this study, and responses were received
### Table 1
Response from Schools Administered
by Career Ladder I Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>90.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three hundred thirty-seven teachers assigned to schools from 514. The overall response rate was 87.1 percent.
administered by Career Ladder I principals were surveyed and responses were received from 305, an overall response rate of 90.8 percent. The response rate among these schools ranged from 76.0 percent to 100 percent, with a mean of 90.5 percent and a standard deviation of 6.85. The mean number of teachers assigned to these schools was 22.47. Data for schools administered by Career Ladder I principals are presented in Table 1.

Schools administered by Career Ladder III principals were assigned 253 teachers and responses were received from 209, an overall response rate of 82.6 percent. The response rate among these schools ranged from 75.0 percent to 100 percent, with a mean of 84.1 percent and a standard deviation of 9.31. The mean number of teachers assigned to these schools was 23.00. Data describing the schools administered by Career Level III principals are presented in Table 2.

**Leader Behavior**

Null hypothesis 1 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of data indicated no significant difference, as Career Ladder III principals were found to
Table 2
Response from Schools Administered by Career Ladder III Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have a mean score of 368.73 with a standard deviation of 29.65, while Career Ladder I principals had a mean score of 368.75 with a standard deviation of 21.31. ANOVA yielded an F score of .00001 with an observed significance level of .998, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 3.
Table 3

Total Leadership Behavior Scores
By Career Ladder Rank of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>368.754</td>
<td>21.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>368.726</td>
<td>29.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>368.742</td>
<td>24.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = .00001 \quad \text{df} = (1, 24) \quad P = .998 \]

Organizational Climate

Null hypothesis 2 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score of the openness index for faculty relations exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score of the openness index for faculty relations exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. The openness index for faculty relations was computed by first converting the collegial, intimate, and disengaged scores for each school to z scores and then calculating standard scores with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for each dimension. The index score was calculated by adding the standardized scores for collegial...
and intimate, then subtracting the standardized disengaged score. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in the openness index for faculty relations between schools administered by Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals. The mean score for schools administered by Career Ladder III principals was determined to be 54.21 with a standard deviation of 23.78, and schools administered by Career Ladder I principals had a mean score of 46.92 with a standard deviation of 22.52. The calculated F statistic was .63593 with an observed significance level of .433, resulting in failure to reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Openness Index for Faculty Relations
By Career Ladder Rank of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.916</td>
<td>22.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54.214</td>
<td>23.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.004</td>
<td>22.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = .63593 \quad df = (1,24) \quad P = .433 \]
Null hypothesis 3 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score of the openness index for principal behavior exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score of the openness index for principal behavior exhibited in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. The openness index for principal behavior was computed by first converting the supportive, directive, and restrictive scores for each school to z scores and then calculating standard scores with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for each dimension. The index score was calculated by subtracting the standardized scores for directive and restrictive behavior from the standardized supportive behavior score. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in the openness index for principal behavior between schools administered by Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals. The mean score for schools administered by Career Ladder III principals was determined to be -54.70 with a standard deviation of 23.66, and schools administered by Career Ladder I principals had a mean score of -46.56 with a standard deviation of 16.97. The calculated F statistic was 1.04636 with an observed significance level of .317, resulting in failure to reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 5.
Table 5
Openness Index for Principal Behavior
By Career Ladder Rank of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-46.561</td>
<td>16.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-54.695</td>
<td>23.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-50.002</td>
<td>20.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 1.04636 \quad df = (1,24) \quad P = .317 \]

Dimensions of Leader Behavior

Null hypothesis 4 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in representation exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in representation exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in representation between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 20.20 with a standard deviation of 1.31 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 20.09 with a standard deviation of 1.33 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .04148 with an observed significance level of .840, resulting in failure to
reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 6.

Null hypothesis 5 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in reconciliation exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in reconciliation exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in reconciliation between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 18.89 with a standard deviation of 2.03 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 18.69 with a standard deviation of 1.42 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .08021 with an observed significance level of .779, resulting in failure to reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 6.

Null hypothesis 6 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in tolerance of uncertainty between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 35.14 with a standard deviation of 4.14 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 35.37 with a standard deviation of 2.81 for Career Ladder I
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.089</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.195</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.134</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>.04148</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconciliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.693</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.885</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.774</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>.08021</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerance of Uncertainty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.366</td>
<td>2.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.141</td>
<td>4.141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.271</td>
<td>3.358</td>
<td>.02736</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persuasiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.727</td>
<td>3.450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.946</td>
<td>4.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.820</td>
<td>3.888</td>
<td>.01936</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( df = (1, 24) \)
principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .02736 with an observed significance level of .870, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 6.

Null hypothesis 7 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in persuasiveness exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in persuasiveness exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in persuasiveness between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 36.95 with a standard deviation of 4.59 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 36.73 with a standard deviation of 3.45 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .01936 with an observed significance level of .890, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 6.

Null hypothesis 8 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in initiation of structure exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in initiation of structure exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in initiation of structure between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected
in a mean score of 39.02 with a standard deviation of 3.05 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 38.98 with a standard deviation of 3.12 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .00122 with an observed significance level of .972, resulting in failure to reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 7.

Null hypothesis 9 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in tolerance of freedom exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in tolerance of freedom exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in tolerance of freedom between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 38.50 with a standard deviation of 3.34 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 39.43 with a standard deviation of 2.09 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .75615 with an observed significance level of .393, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 7.

Null hypothesis 10 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in role assumption exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in role assumption exhibited by Career Ladder I
Table 7

Initiation of Structure, Tolerance of Freedom, Role Assumption, and Consideration Scores
By Career Ladder Rank of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INITIATION OF STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.977</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.020</td>
<td>3.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.995</td>
<td>3.028</td>
<td>.00122</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.430</td>
<td>2.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.504</td>
<td>3.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.038</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>.75615</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLE ASSUMPTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.584</td>
<td>3.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.884</td>
<td>5.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.711</td>
<td>4.201</td>
<td>.03108</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSIDERATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.411</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.774</td>
<td>3.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.142</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>.25343</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = (1, 24)
principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in role assumption between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 37.88 with a standard deviation of 5.39 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 37.58 with a standard deviation of 3.28 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .03108 with an observed significance level of .862, resulting in failure to reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 7.

Null hypothesis 11 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in consideration exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in consideration exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in consideration between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 36.77 with a standard deviation of 3.83 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 37.41 with a standard deviation of 2.64 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .25343 with an observed significance level of .619, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 7.

Null hypothesis 12 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in production
emphasis exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in production emphasis exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in production emphasis between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 33.04 with a standard deviation of 4.25 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 32.33 with a standard deviation of 3.19 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .23206 with an observed significance level of .634, and the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 8.

Null hypothesis 13 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in predictive accuracy exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in predictive accuracy exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in predictive accuracy between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 18.16 with a standard deviation of 1.68 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 17.94 with a standard deviation of 1.26 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .14898 with an observed significance level of .703, resulting in failure to reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 8.
Table 8

Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Influence with Supervisors
By Career Ladder Rank of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career Ladder I</th>
<th>Career Ladder III</th>
<th>Production Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.631</td>
<td>3.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>4.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.23206</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career Ladder I</th>
<th>Career Ladder III</th>
<th>Predictive Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.036</td>
<td>1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.14898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.14898</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career Ladder I</th>
<th>Career Ladder III</th>
<th>Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.744</td>
<td>2.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>2.570</td>
<td>1.5377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career Ladder I</th>
<th>Career Ladder III</th>
<th>Influence with Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.447</td>
<td>2.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.081</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>.08064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.08064</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ df = (1, 24) \]
Null hypothesis 14 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in integration exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in integration exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in integration between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 17.55 with a standard deviation of 2.57 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 17.89 with a standard deviation of 1.79 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .15377 with an observed significance level of .698, and the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 8.

Null hypothesis 15 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in influence with supervisors exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in influence with supervisors exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ-12. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in influence with supervisors between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 36.63 with a standard deviation of 2.28 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 36.32 with a standard deviation of 3.08 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was
.08064 with an observed significance level of .779, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 8.

**Dimensions of Organizational Climate**

Null hypothesis 16 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in supportive behavior exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in supportive behavior exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in supportive behavior between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder II principals, reflected in a mean score of 25.12 with a standard deviation of 4.17 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 25.16 with a standard deviation of 3.15 for Career Ladder II principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .00120 with an observed significance level of .973, and the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 9.

Null hypothesis 17 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in directive behavior exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in directive behavior exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in directive behavior between Career Ladder III
Table 9
Supportive, Directive, and Restrictive Behavior Scores
By Career Ladder Rank of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.164</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.115</td>
<td>4.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.143</td>
<td>3.537</td>
<td>.00120</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **DIRECTIVE BEHAVIOR** |    |       |     |       |       |
| Career Ladder I      | 15 | 18.023| 2.969|       |       |
| Career Ladder III    | 11 | 19.106| 3.982|       |       |
| Total                | 26 | 18.482| 3.402| .63368| .434  |

| **RESTRICTIVE BEHAVIOR** |    |       |     |       |       |
| Career Ladder I      | 15 | 10.719| 1.448|       |       |
| Career Ladder III    | 11 | 11.455| 1.603|       |       |
| Total                | 26 | 11.030| 1.530| 1.49686| .233  |

df = (1, 24)

and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 19.11 with a standard deviation of 3.98 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 18.02 with a standard deviation of 2.97 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .63368 with an
observed significance level of .434, resulting in failure to reject the null hypothesis. Data are presented in Table 9.

Null hypothesis 18 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in restrictive behavior exhibited by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in restrictive behavior exhibited by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in restrictive behavior between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 11.46 with a standard deviation of 1.60 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 10.72 with a standard deviation of 1.45 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was 1.49686 with an observed significance level of .233, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 9.

Null hypothesis 19 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in collegial behavior exhibited in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in collegial behavior exhibited in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in collegial behavior between schools administered by Career Ladder III and schools administered
by Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 24.26 with a standard deviation of 2.64 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 23.58 with a standard deviation of 2.42 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .46807 with an observed significance level of .500, and the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 10.

Null hypothesis 20 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in intimate behavior exhibited in schools administered by Career Ladder III principals and the mean score in intimate behavior exhibited in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in intimate behavior between schools administered by Career Ladder III and schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 17.29 with a standard deviation of 2.01 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 16.87 with a standard deviation of 1.92 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .29444 with an observed significance level of .592, therefore the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 10.

Null hypothesis 21 stated that there will be no significant difference between the mean score in disengaged behavior exhibited in schools administered by Career Ladder
Table 10

Collegial, Intimate, and Disengaged Behavior Scores
By Career Ladder Rank of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGIAL BEHAVIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.579</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.261</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.868</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>.46807</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMATE BEHAVIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.868</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.289</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.046</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>.29444</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISENGAGED BEHAVIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.362</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.172</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.282</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.34603</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = (1,24)

III principals and the mean score in disengaged behavior exhibited in schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ-RE. Analysis of the data revealed no significant
difference in disengaged behavior between schools administered by Career Ladder III and schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, reflected in a mean score of 6.17 with a standard deviation of .83 for Career Ladder III principals and a mean score of 6.36 with a standard deviation of .80 for Career Ladder I principals. The calculated value of the F statistic was .34603 with an observed significance level of .562, and the null hypothesis was retained. Data are presented in Table 10.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The problem addressed in this study was whether principals who achieve Career Ladder III standing exhibit more effective leadership behaviors and maintain a more suitable organizational climate than Career Ladder I principals. The questions that this study addressed pertained to a comparison of the leadership behaviors exhibited by Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals and to a comparison of the organizational climate of elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III principals. Those leadership behaviors that were chosen included the 12 dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ-12): representation, reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and influence with supervisors. The dimensions of organizational climate that were investigated were the dimensions of the Revised Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE): supportive behavior, directive behavior, restrictive behavior, collegial behavior, intimate behavior, and disengaged
behavior.

The study was conducted on a stratified random sample that included elementary schools administered by 15 Career Ladder I and 11 Career Ladder III principals. The sample was drawn from the population of public elementary schools of the First District of the Tennessee State Department of Education. A total of 590 teachers were surveyed and responses were received from 514, a participation rate of 87 percent. The response rate from each school exceeded 75 percent.

The study was designed to address two general hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 was concerned with the total leader behavior of Career Ladder I elementary school principals when compared to Career Ladder III elementary principals. The second and third hypotheses were focused on the school climate of elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals when compared to elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals. Specifically, these hypotheses addressed the openness of faculty relations and the openness of principal behavior, respectively. The study further focused on the 12 individual dimensions of leader behavior described by the LBDQ-12, and these were the foci of hypotheses 4 through 15. Hypotheses 16 through 21 were concerned with a comparison of the six specific dimensions of the OCDQ-RE.

The hypotheses were tested in the null format using
analysis of variance to determine whether significant differences did exist. The data were tested at the .05 level of significance.

These findings were indicated by the results of this study:

1. No significant differences were found in total leader behavior of Career Ladder III elementary principals when compared to Career Ladder I elementary principals, and null hypothesis 1 was retained.

2. No significant differences were found in openness of faculty relations or in openness of principal behavior in elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals when compared to elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals, and null hypotheses 2 and 3 were retained. The relatively large standard deviations associated with both indices does reflect a rather large variability within each school category and within the sample as a whole.

3. No significant differences were found in any of the specific dimensions of leadership behavior, as measured by the LBDQ-12, for Career Ladder III elementary principals when compared to Career Ladder I elementary principals, and null hypotheses 4 through 15 were retained.

4. No significant differences were found in any of the specific dimensions of organizational climate, as measured by the OCDQ-RE, for elementary schools administered by
Career Ladder III principals when compared to elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals.

Conclusions

The conclusions that follow were warranted, considering the limitations of the study and based upon the findings thereof. The sample was limited to elementary schools of the First District of the Tennessee State Department of Education; therefore, the conclusions are applicable to that population.

1. Career Ladder III elementary principals do not differ in total leader behaviors from Career Ladder I elementary principals.

2. Career Ladder III elementary principals do not differ from Career Ladder I elementary principals in the specific leadership dimensions of representation, reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and influence with supervisors.

3. Elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III principals do not differ from elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals in the climate indices of openness of faculty relations or openness of principal behavior.

4. Elementary schools administered by Career Ladder III
principals do not differ from elementary schools administered by Career Ladder I principals in the specific climate dimensions of supportive behavior, directive behavior, restrictive behavior, collegial behavior, intimate behavior, and disengaged behavior.

Recommendations

This study indicated that the present criteria for the identification of Career Ladder III principals failed to identify more effective school leaders in northeast Tennessee. The failure of the present Career Ladder evaluation system to differentiate between effective and ineffective leaders indicates that the primary goal of the Career Ladder evaluation program, specifically "to identify and reward outstanding administrator and supervisor performance" (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual, 1988, p. 5), has not been met. As a result of this study, it is recommended that the Tennessee State Department of Education devote more attention toward understanding the role of educational leadership as it relates to effective schools; more specifically by identifying criteria that will enable better school administrators to be properly identified and rewarded, and incorporating those criteria in the Career Ladder evaluation process.
These recommendations are also proposed:

1. A replication of this study should be conducted in other districts of Tennessee in order to determine whether the findings may be generalized to the rest of the state.

2. Further study utilizing different instruments or methodology should be conducted to verify the validity of the conclusions.

3. Further study to include the development of an instrument more specific to those criteria for achieving higher Career Ladder status should be conducted to aid in the proper identification of more effective leaders.

4. Further study of both internal and external forces that impact principals' leadership behaviors and school climate should be conducted to identify factors that are associated with effective schools.
References


Tagiuri, R. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In R. T. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), *Organizational climate: Explorations of concept* (pp. 11-34). Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Tagiuri, R., & Litwin, G. H. (Eds.). (1968). *Organizational climate: Explorations of concept*. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
Dear __________

I am currently involved in a research project as a requirement for completion of the doctoral degree in educational administration at East Tennessee State University. I plan to survey teachers' perceptions of their principal's leader behavior and the climate of the school. Anonymity of all schools, systems, principals, and teachers is assured.

These schools in your district were randomly selected:

__________

__________

I request your permission to contact the principals of these schools to arrange to survey their teachers at a convenient time so as not to disturb the educational process. Enclosed is a consent form for your convenience in granting or denying permission to contact the principals. Also enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelop for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

Eugene H. Johnson, Jr.
CONSENT FORM TO CONTACT PRINCIPALS

_____ Yes, you may contact the principals of the randomly selected schools in my district in order to collect data concerning teachers' perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and the climate of the school.

_____ No, you may not contact the principals of the randomly selected schools in my district.

(Superintendent)

(School District)
APPENDIX C
STATEMENT OF POLICY

Concerning the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Use:** The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organizations other than The Ohio State University.

2. **Adaptation and Revision:** The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific situations when such steps are considered desirable.

3. **Duplication:** Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.

4. **Inclusion in dissertations:** Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

5. **Copyright:** In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19--, by The Ohio State University."

6. **Inquiries:** Communications should be addressed to:

   Center for Business and Economic Research
   The Ohio State University
   1775 College Road
   Columbus, Ohio 43210 U.S.A.
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 of consistency in marking 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 or organization that is supervised by the person being described.

Published by

College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Copyright 1962, The Ohio State University
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 the 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
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next ....................... A B C D E
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 judgement 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. Needle 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
53. Is not a very convincing talker ...................... A B C D E
54. Assigns group members to particular tasks ............ A B C D E
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Turns the members loose on a job, and</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lets them go to it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Keeps to himself/herself</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Asks the members to work harder</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Is accurate in predicting the trend of events</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the group members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gets swamped by details</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Can wait just so long, then blows up</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Speaks from a strong inner conviction</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Makes sure that his/her part in the group</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is understood by the group members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Is reluctant to allow the members any</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freedom of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Lets some members have authority that</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he/she should keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Looks out for the personal welfare of group members</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Permits the members to take it easy in their work</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>His/her word carries weight with superiors</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Gets things all tangled up</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Remains calm when uncertain about coming events</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Is an inspiring talker</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 judgement ........ 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
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
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
April 6, 1989

Eugene J. Johnson  
East Tennessee State University  
Department of Supervision & Administration  
P.O. Box 19000A  
Johnson City, TN 37614

Dear Mr. Johnson:

You have my permission to use the OCDQ-RE in your research. I have enclosed an article on the OCDQ-RE, a copy of the OCDQ-RE and a copy of the scoring instrument.

The only request I make of you is that you reference the article in any manuscript or publication which you write, and send me a copy of the results of the research.

Sincerely,

Wayne K. Hoy  
Professor
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Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.
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DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Teachers and principals check the appropriate response:

1. Age: ( ) 29 and under ( ) 30-39 ( ) 40-49 ( ) 50-59 ( ) 60 and over

2. Sex: ( ) Male ( ) Female

3. Race: ( ) Black ( ) White ( ) Other

4. Education: ( ) Bachelors Degree ( ) Masters Degree ( ) Masters Degree + 45 hours ( ) Ed.S. ( ) Ed.D. or Ph.D.

5. School system type: ( ) City ( ) County

6. Career Ladder Status: ( ) Nonparticipant ( ) Probationary ( ) Level I ( ) Level II ( ) Level III

7. Years experience as a teacher: ( ) 0-2 ( ) 3-5 ( ) 6-10 ( ) 11-15 ( ) 16 or more

8. Years as a teacher at present school: ( ) 0-2 ( ) 3-5 ( ) 6-10 ( ) 11-15 ( ) 16 or more

Principals only need to respond to these questions:

9. Years experience as a principal: ( ) 0-2 ( ) 3-4 ( ) 5 or more

10. Years as principal at present school: ( ) 0-2 ( ) 3-4 ( ) 5 or more

11. Are you currently undergoing state evaluation or re-evaluation for the Career Ladder? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If so, for which level? ( ) Level II ( ) Level III
VITA

EUGENE HUNTER JOHNSON, JR.

Personal Data:  
Date of Birth:  June 9, 1952  
Place of Birth:  Bristol, Tennessee

Education:  
Public Schools, Bristol, Virginia  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; physical education and health education, B.S., 1982  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; physical education, M.A., 1983  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; educational administration, Ed.D., 1989

Professional Experience:  
Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University, Department of Physical Education, 1982  
Interim teacher, John Sevier Middle School; Kingsport, Tennessee, 1983  
Teacher and coach, Holston Valley Middle School; Bristol, Tennessee, 1983-1989  
Adjunct instructor, East Tennessee State University, Department of Physical Education, 1984-1986  
Doctoral fellowship, Department of Supervision and Administration, East Tennessee State University, 1989  
Principal, Northside Elementary School, Johnson City, Tennessee, 1989

Honors and Awards:  
Eagle Scout  
Nominee for Roy Van Pangle award for outstanding student in physical education, 1982  
Phi Kappa Phi  
Phi Delta Kappa